

COMMENTS BASED ON 2ND DRAFT OF W912DR-05-R-0001

Section **Paragraph**
C.1

State Concern

D.<tab>We request that all personnel involved in the operation and maintenance of the CWMS/WCDS be exempted from the A-76 competition. Water Control Management personnel are listed as “inherently governmental” in the FAIR ACT (Federal Activities Inventory Reform Act of 1998). As such, the operation and maintenance of the CWMS/WCDS should be exempted unless a formal risk analysis is performed.

Continuation from previous comment: The Infrastructure is defined as the IT assets, IT facilities, communications, operations, security, enterprise services, applications, and information required to support network-centric USACE operations. Key guidelines for migrating to this network-centric enterprise will be to: * Increase efficiencies by leveraging enterprise management technologies and improving IT Service FTE-to-Customer ratios.* Instituting common service levels across USACE.* Adopting a standard architecture across all regions.* Decreasing IT total cost of ownership (TCO).

This paragraph identifies the exempted AIS’s where the SP only maintains operations. Why were these specific AIS's exempted? My concern is that all of these AIS’s tightly integrate and/or interface with every other AIS the SP will be responsible to sustain. Thus having separate development teams would only perpetuate integration, deployment, and end user confusion problems that exist today.

This paragraph states that “...all changes to the enterprise infrastructure will be made only at the behest and approval of the USACE Configuration Control Board (CCB) ...” Is it the intent of this scope to limit the changes to those things that the CCB directs? It appears that this statement will severely limit the SP from consolidating, streamlining, and using innovative technologies to improve the entire network. Will the CCB direct the type of network connection, level of service, etc. related to sites in the field that is currently part of the individual district networks that will become part of the enterprise infrastructure which the SP will be responsible for? I believe that this statement needs to be clarified and then expanded upon in the detailed scope in Chapter 5.

Section Paragraph

State Concern

As an engineering organization we need access to any and all ERDC, HEC, and Corps programs along with technical not IT support. It is not clear from the statements in this section and TE-11 who with engineering knowledge will be required to provide this support.

It now appears that rather than to be exempted entirely, CWMS operation is to be performed by the winning contractor. This change may have some unexpected consequences. 1. Currently IM does not perform this work in most offices – Current IM staff likely does not have CWMS/HEC expertise and thus be unable to compete fairly in this area. 2. The work involved in CWMS operation may not be adequately defined in the contract – A winning contractor may be able to force a costly contract amendment to satisfy this work requirement. 3. An outside contractor may not currently have the expertise in CWMS and HEC software – A winning contractor may seek to hire knowledgeable Corps water management staff and thus deplete the Corps' engineering staff at an inconvenient time. A contractor hiring current HEC staff may hinder the continued development of CWMS. 4. With regard to DCP's, it will not be efficient to have an IT contractor maintain the DCP while having another employee or contractor ma

PWS (C.1-C.4): There is no indication that USACE recognizes the need for and expects an information technology (IT) infrastructure transformation. Many statements imply continuing to operate the current inefficient distributed environment.

It seems there is a set Corps services that is, in my opinion, insufficiently represented in the PWS. In question are those services pertaining to the electronic messaging systems CEEIS is responsible implementing and maintaining. There is very little information outlining the scope of work (24/7/365) involved with these systems including the following: Enterprise management of the Active Directory / Exchange 2003 infrastructure. Sustaining the Corps of Engineers DMS Local Control Center · USACE SMTP Gateway Services · CEEIS SIPRNET classified email · Remote SIPRNET Dial-in Portals (RASP) SIPRNET Circuitry

Section Paragraph

State Concern

Including the operation of CWMS in this endeavor is a serious oversight. CWMS is a complicated system. Several interconnected steps must be performed just to get data to the system. A Service Provider (SP) would have no experience with this Corps Enterprise System. Keeping this system up and running is challenging to the most experienced users. The SP would be responsible for running models which are used in operational decisions. This would have a significant impact, because the SP would not have a clue about daily operations at Fox River/Lake Winnebago or any of our other projects. The learning curve would be a very steep one.

Attachment to my original comments:

attachment continued:

The acceptable performance deviations of 10% or greater are too high, and are considered unacceptable for the Honolulu District. The performance deviations should be 3% at most, with most tolerances in the 0-1% range. The percentage deviations do not address what is allowable as slippage. For example, suppose a tolerance of 1% is allowed for the task of providing helpdesk technical support to all users within a designated time period, but the service provider chooses to totally ignore users located OCONUS (Kwajalein, Palau, etc). Provided the service provider still supports the remaining users, their performance may still technically fall within the 1% tolerance guidelines. The PWS does not address the issue of where deviations are acceptable.

attachment continued:

attachment continued:

The RFP should ask the SP to propose solutions based on three types of services being requested. The first type is the managed services portion. This includes all services which can be clearly defined to specific solution sets, such as help desk; data center operations; core web services such as Directory, single sign on, portal, database, mail, etc.; support, communications infrastructure support (WAN, LAN, MAN); all product and services that provides these solutions, etc. We have provided a matrix of services that identify each area of the PWS which fall under the managed service offering and by which an SP can bid a fixed monthly price. This type service can be clearly defined such that an offeror could bid a specific price for the managed service and recommended SLAs to measure performance.

REMIS and PD2 are not included under exempted AIS and should be

Section Paragraph

State Concern

General concern that unless RFP is carefully written to separate information assurance/security, most contractors will deal with IA statements as add-ons to network admin, system admin or help desk functions. Unless the IA staff is dedicated 100% to information security your security profile will suffer. System scans should be performed religiously, system updates and patches should routinely be applied BEFORE the IAVA is published, and AVTR databases and reports should reflect up-to-the-minute state of the IS system. This is a FULL TIME job and will not be accomplished adequately if split with SA or Help Desk functions.

FOA is used in the USACE Organization Chart (Figure 1), and is listed in the acronym list, but Field Operating Activities is not defined in the list of definitions. It may be helpful to add that definition.

C.1. INTRODUCTION. Para 3 Existing

Text: Without exception, the government will retain sole responsibility for all decisions; especially in the areas of policy, guidance, security, finance and procurement. In addition, all changes to the enterprise infrastructure will be made only at the behest and approval of the USACE Configuration Control Board (CCB), which is chaired by the USACE Chief Information Officer (CIO). Such changes will normally be made through the Installation Contracting Officer's Technical Representative (COTR). Recommended

Re-write: Every attempt has been made to fully describe the IM/IT support services work environment to assist potential Service Providers (SP) in defining and pricing the requirements. SP are encouraged to exercise creative solutions in their proposals that will result in increased efficiency and effectiveness of products and services. SP will work independently to this PWS, but reserve government inherent decisions to the govern

State Concern

More thought should be used regarding the inclusion of the CWMS/Water Control IT/IM functions in the A76 process. The functions are not at all properly defined in the A76 documents. Presently, only a portion of the job duties required of the H&H IT/IM would be covered by this bid. In particular, CWMS only handles a limited portion of water control day to day activities, namely the forecasting function. It does not address actual operational requirements. In Tulsa we use numerous other processes to operate and watch over the system on a real-time basis. None of the specifics are addressed in the A76 documents. Therefore, this would require duplication of personnel & job skills which would not be cost effective. More importantly, we have a barebones WCDS IT/IM staff, which has shrunk over the years due to budget constraints and due to more technologically advanced software we use to get the job done. The software is a combination of in-house, commercial, and governmental software. To maintain this system, we need WCDS IT/IM staff that are more highly integrated with IT skills & hydrology and hydraulics knowledge. The learning curve takes years. So these are not cookie cutter type jobs. Also failure to maintain and properly manage the system in a timely manner presents a significant risk to life and property. We operate 44 lakes and 5 navigation locks with limited flood control capacity, in 2 major river systems, all competing for space, often times with only a few short hours or less to respond to system conditions. Therefore, in the A76 process, extreme care should be exercised in laying out who and what processes get bid out.

Flood control modeling, and disseminating data for flood warning are critical to protect life and property during natural hazards, The COE water management team is the first responders to a hydrologic event that provides and interprets critical time sensitive data needed by emergency management, law enforcement, and State and Federal agencies to support decisions that protects life and property. Their water managements teams calibrates, evaluates, operate and maintain warning equipment that are critical for water supply, droughts, floods, water quality alerts, and other natural hazards. Their staff is a rapid response team that has a can do attitude who is dedicated to protect life and property.. A contractor will only care about profit and the not the best interest of the people. I strongly recommend the COE to reconsider contracting out the water management team and stream gagers without them we are lefts with a contractor that in time of crisis will say sorry it's not covered in my contract. I say this with 20 years of collecting hydrologic data and have worked with 6 COE Districts. In addition I was on the ground collecting flood data for 42 days straight during the flood of the century in Iowa, Wisconsin, Minnesota and Missouri. Again for the best interest of our Nation safety please reconsider contracting the water management teams.

Section Paragraph

State Concern

Recruiting Facilities Management Information System Network Tool (RIFMIS-NT) corrected title and acronym Rental Facility Management Information System Network Tool(RFMIS- Federal Activities Inventory Reform (FAIR) Act requires agencies to prepare two annual inventories. The inventory categories all activities performed by government personnel as either commercial or inherently governmental Inherently Governmental (IG) Activities justification on the following criteria: 1. An IG activity is an activity so intimately related to the public interest as to mandate performance by government personnel. The activity must exercise substantial discretion in applying authority and making decisions. Activity involves: Binding the U.S. to take or not take some action by policy, regulation authorization or order. Determining, protecting, and advancing economic, political, territorial, property by contract management. Significantly affecting life, or property• Ultimate control of property and establishing policy for collection, control, or disbursement of appropriated funds and other federal funds: Mission activities involving decisions that have immediate, significant, and potentially long-term effect on life and property Inherently Government: Provide and interpret time sensitive information needed by emergency services, law enforcement or the military to support decisions regarding the protection of life and property during natural hazard events such as floods, earthquakes or volcanic eruptions or other emergencies. Example: Scientists/technicians involved in response to flood, earthquake, and volcano events (see Attachment 2). Reference: 43 USC 31, 42 USG 5201 et seq. The Disaster Relief Act of 1974, Section 202(a), (b) and Federal Register, vol. 42, no. 70 – Tuesday, April 12, 1977, pp. 19,292 – 19,296; Annual Budget Justification of the USGS; OPM TS-23 January 1976, Research Grade-Evaluation Guide; 5 CFR 2634.904, OGE (Office of Government Ethics) Form 450, A Review Guide, Section “Who Files”; PL 105-270, Section 5 Definitions, (2) (B) (i)-(v).

Section Paragraph

State Concern

Information Paper: Water Management Concerns with the Draft A-76 IM/IT Performance Work Statement (Cont.) Data required by the Districts Water Management staff include data which must be measured in the field. This includes data such as precipitation, lake levels, river stages, water quality data, and weather data. All this data is also needed by numerous other agencies. The National Weather Service – River Forecast Center (NWS) uses this data to make river flood forecasts which are disseminated to the public. The U. S. Geological Survey (USGS) has the responsibility of statistical analysis and publishing of this data. Many other agencies as well as private engineering firms have a need for a least a portion of this data. Much of the maintenance for gauged data needed by the USACE's Water Management is cost shared with other agencies, which may have other cost share partners of their own. Maintenance of some of the USACE's gauges is paid for entirely by the USGS and their cooperators.

The definition of Corps Water Management system (CWMS) is not clear. There is a computer system that uses the acronym CWMS. This system of programs is just a small part of Water Control Management System. The entire water control management system including DCP's and Goes transmitters should be exempt.

No Comments

There was no mention of the Data Control Platforms (DCPs) in the PWS. This is still a function in the Districts that involves IT personnel.

The intent of this A-76 study was to provide competition for IM/IT services, but it appears that this PWS is expanding the IM/IT role beyond the scope of current services.

Communications will be the responsibility of the SP in all of the communication venues that we use. This is what IM currently provides for us with the exception of satellite services. Technically IM has responsibility over that portion now but most of the physical part of it is managed by WM now. (P11) SP will coordinate infrastructure sharing between us and other agencies. The language appears to mean buildings, power systems, and their reliability but does not exclude things like gage sites and related facilities.

(P11) Computer security becomes the responsibility of the SP. This will replace the current security hierarchy to just about the end user level. (P11) The SP's mission appears to mostly one of support. It looks like adequate provision is included to cover emergency and outside of normal hours operations (1 hour response time looks good). (P20) Although the contract has prohibitions regarding the hiring of off-duty personnel to perform SP functions, there is la

Section Paragraph

State Concern

MVN requests feedback on the comments submitted during the PWS comment period.

Concerned that some of the functional elements are not actively engaged in this comment. Those I've talked to were not aware of the comment period. Some did not think that this would impact them since they thought this was just a hardware/software issue.

Water Control Data Systems (WCDS) are not mentioned in this PWS.

The Corps Water Management System (CWMS) is mentioned, but it is a very small subset of any working WCDS. Each District's WCDS is unique. Unless this PWS is amended to address all the Corps' unique WCDS implementations, it is unlikely that any realistic bid could be fielded that would not require later modifications or not have detrimental effects on the Corps' ability to operate water resource projects safely.

While I appreciate that in a highly legislated and regulated environment it is a challenge to create a performance based work statement that focuses on end-results, every effort should be made to ensure that it is based on end-results and not the means nor intermediate steps to achieving the end-results. Since regulations typically prescribe policies and procedures (i.e., methods), only such regulatory requirements that are appropriate and to which the Corps is subject should be included in the PWS - and not generally the additional regulatory requirements created by the Corps. The fewer restrictions imposed on how to deliver desired results the better. Again, the goal is to allow the SP to be as creative and innovative as possible in fully satisfying customer needs at the lowest cost. While most of the descriptions of work talk in terms of results, they are often not end-results, but intermediate steps, procedures, or methods (means treated as ends). If it is a step, procedure, tool, method, or approach to achieving an end-result, then it should not be included in the description of results unless mandated by legislation or regulations produced outside the Corps and to which the Corps is subject.

Section Paragraph

State Concern

IM in the Galveston District has not played a role in Water Management activities except to provide a room for our workstations, electricity and a subnet out of the general IM layout. Our recommendation will be to delete references to Water Control facilities, equipment and programs in the IM/IT A-76 Performance Work Statement. Water Management staff have kept the workstation hardware, OS, and data feeds between other Corps offices up and running. The DCPs, stream gages and other R&D systems have been operated and maintained by the US Geological Survey (USGS) through a cooperative program for many years and proven to be invaluable. The USGS are dependable, accurate, knowledgeable, inventive, and able to access a wide range of expertise throughout the organization. This program has worked extremely well. The described contract pertaining to the DCPs would make it necessary to have two separate groups visiting each site which would cost more, cause problems and impact our operations. We depend on these data to operate our projects during major storm events. Contracting out the operation of our Water Control workstations, particularly involvement with WCDS and administrative data collection, would impact the Water Management community and its mission.

Missing LRH UPS, and USPS

Section Paragraph

State Concern

I thought the intent of the A-76 Program was to use competition and incentives to lower costs and increase efficiency and effectiveness in satisfying customer needs - that is, to get the best ROI by creating an environment that encourages savings and continuous improvements. I believe this is the rationale for the PWS requirement (a) that it be performance based (with the focus on results, not means, to provide the SP with the flexibility to decide delivery methods) and (b) that it include, where appropriate, financial incentives (e.g., for cost savings). The proposed PWS retains for the Government "without exception" responsibility for ALL DECISIONS (pg 4, para C.1) which includes, in addition to all other decisions, "direction, policy? guidance, and program management" (see para C.5) - the SP is simply responsible for executing the decisions made by the Government. In effect, it does not afford the SP any responsibility or creative ideas to make improvements. Furthermore, potential bidders with innovative or creative ideas would be taking a substantial risk and possible subsequent forfeiture of the contract if they assume implementation of their creative ideas knowing they are subject to Government approval after the contract is awarded. The bottom line: the proposed PWS is not consistent with either the spirit or intent of the A-76 program. It provides the SP with no responsibility or authority (all involve decisions) and affords no incentives to cut costs or make improvements in achieving desired results. Consequently, it needs to be reworded to permit the SP the responsibility and authority to make decisions and improve means and ends and it should include financial incentives for costs savings and efficiencies.

3. C.1 Introduction: Recommend adding to the 4th paragraph or adding new paragraph, the following to (a) explicitly solicit innovation and process improvement in proposals and (b) to clarify scope covering both Federal employees and any support contractors: Offerors are encouraged to incorporate process improvements and industry best practices in their proposals. The SP may introduce new technologies and processes in partnership with customers, in order to deliver the best value products or services. The scope of this A-76 study includes the workload and efforts of both Federal employees and support contractors currently performing the respective requirements across multiple locations. Alternatively, this could be added to C.1.5 General Requirements.

The PWS provides insufficient information necessary for potential bidders to prepare a bid package.

Section Paragraph

State Concern

4.<tab>A section specific to Knowledge Management needs to be added. To speak only of collaboration tools or some of the other technologies that support KM does not do justice to the overall KM concept. The Corps has a KM Strategic Plan, yet there is no mention of it in the current document. KM should and will be a significant and critical part of our mission in the near future. Let's not shortchange ourselves by not including it or we'll be paying additional dollars for it in future. A KM section could look something like: USACE's intellectual capital – the knowledge that people gain through experience – if made accessible to USACE personnel, will minimize “reinventing the wheel” and ultimately reduce costs to the taxpayer. Therefore it is the intention of the Government to use Knowledge Management to develop and improve mission control, efficiency, and effectiveness (reference KM Strategic Plan). The SP shall be responsible for providing and maintaining KM information associate

The PWS scope is unclear and required functionality in some areas is not defined.

At our district we also provide: shell scripting writing custom SQL's Water management system administration Visual Basic Programming Perl Scripting Microstation MDL Programming Microstation Basic Programming

Since embedded Water Control IT staff will be impacted, the effect of additional workload and loss of institutional knowledge on existing Water Control elements should be examined. While the SP would surely provide staff capable of meeting operational IT needs, the embedded Water Control IT staff do more than strictly IT, performing many interdisciplinary functions. Additionally, Water Control management have direct control and flexibility over their staff, which maximizes mission capability during a flood event.

This should also get expanded to include local and regional configuration management and steering committees, boards, other than just CEEIS.

Section Paragraph

State Concern

The workload data is totally unreliable and simply unusable. In some cases, there is no indication that any district or division has any workload for a described work item - all zeros under workload. In other cases, the differences in workload quantities for a work item are dramatically different among organizations and frankly unbelievable. I suspect two reasons for the differences: (a) there were different priorities, degrees of commitment, and levels of execution from district to district and/or (b) there was no consensus among information providers on how the request for data was interpreted with different interpretations resulting in dramatically different figures. In any event, it is clear that these figures are often not realistic, meaningful, nor reliable as a workload guide; consequently, potential bidders have no way of judging from the document the amount of work involved. So how does any potential SP know how to bid? It appears that the successful bidder will have to rely on subsequent modifications to the contract and costs to cover expenses that they could only speculate about at the time of their successful bid? This is not a good way for the Government to proceed in soliciting bids knowing that a good portion of the contract will have to be modified after award to make up for the fact that the figures were inaccurate or misleading. Not a good way to ensure an honest competition and that the Government gets the best value.

Most Corps districts are still operating legacy Water Control Data Systems (WCDS) while implementing CMWS. These systems use a different set of software (and possibly hardware) but are not mentioned in the PWS. While they remain the production system in transition, the WCDSs should be added to the exempted AIS's. Their management is detailed in ER 1110-2-249 Management of Water Control Data systems (31 Aug 1994) .

B.<tab>We request that the definition of the CWMS AIS be clarified/modified to reflect that the Water Control Data System(WCDS), in its' entirety, be included as a part of the CWMS AIS. This includes, but not limited to, the data acquisition, data dissemination, database management, hydraulic and hydrologic modeling, hardware, software, planning, budgeting, operation and maintenance. Further discussion/description is attached.

General Comment. PWS does not seem to mention that the SP needs to share all Administrator passwords with the COTR. This should be added.

Section Paragraph

State Concern

Based on new wording in C.1 of the PWS, it appears that Corps Water Management System (CWMS) operation is not exempt. Additionally, other facets of CWMS management, e.g. database administration (C.5.2.5 Server Support and Services), data acquisition (C.5.3.1.4 Devices and Services, C.5.3.5.2.5 Data Radios), data dissemination (C.5.2.2 Web Support and Services), and possibly GIS integration (C.5.2.1.4) would be affected. This office requests the PWS team reconsider inclusion of CWMS operation into the competition due to the critical nature of the water management

General Comment ER 1110-2-249 Management of Water Control Data Systems indicates that "Usage of WCDS computer systems is restricted to those activities which support water control management, ..." The Performance Work Statement dated 28 Feb 2005, includes references to water control facilities and equipment, but it does not provide a clear direction that this separation of processing equipment must be maintained. Additionally, this ER indicates that the WCDS System Administrator must be a supervisory engineer who is a member of the water control management chain of command. The processing equipment and programs are separate from other information management activities and functions in district offices. Recommend that the solicitation be clarified to indicate that Water Control Data Systems as defined by ER 1110-2-249 are not considered to be a part of this solicitation.

Add; The USACE Chief of Staff issued a directive on August 08, 2001 to consolidate, operate, and manage the USACE's Infrastructure as an Enterprise. The USACE's objectives are to initiate the transformation from an ad hoc collection of disparate and redundant implementations to an enterprise infrastructure operated and maintained by a single organization to support a network-centric, knowledge based force. The USACE's strategy to transform itself into a network-centric and knowledge-based organization through a portal (eCorps), which provides a secure, single access point to all data, information and knowledge objects. The USACE enterprise portal will be a robust, scalable portal that provides a single point of entry to the various applications and content valuable to the enterprise. It will eventually become the user's virtual desktop across the USACE. This means that whatever information a user needs, they will log onto the portal and reach it there, either directly or as a link to another site.

Section	Paragraph	State Concern
		<p>What is HQ position regarding maintaining core functionality and compliance with existing ER's (my interest lies with water control)? With the creation of the IM/IT CCB for administering the potential contract, there will be minimal opportunity for those outside the "superpower" group to influence how the Corps' critical IT infrastructure is configured. Such an approach will destroy the Corp's ability to maintain the world's "Premier Engineering Service Agency" by eliminating the ability of engineers to adapt and apply IM/IT technology in ways not yet envisioned. This definitely appears to be a coup to nationalize the Corps IM/IT infrastructure. The CCB should not be afforded the autonomy implied by the PWS. As IM/IT services are just that, a service, the users (engineering, operations, and PM COPs) should be the driving force in determining what types of equipment are needed and where it will be located. The Corps is not a one-size-fits-all entity.</p>
	C.1.4 - USACE	<p>1. Add sentence to read, "The SP shall provide all IM/IT services for unique IMIT mission requirements identified in TE-17." 2. NOTE: There should be a similar comment like this in every mission area.</p>
	C.1.4 - USACE	<p>Add sentence to read, "The SP shall provide all IM/IT services for unique IMIT mission requirements identified in TE-17." NOTE: There should be a similar comment like this in every mission</p>
	1	<p>Hi guys, My first www.comment for you. The first paragraph in C.1 should have a period after the Alaska District. Otherwise, the scope changes drastically.</p>
	1	<p>This paragraph states: "...included in this Performance Work Statement (PWS) are those functions, services, and tasks associated with IMIT Administration and Management, Automation..." Page 10, paragraph 1, however, states: "The SP shall provide all personnel, equipment, tools, supplies, materials, transportation, and any other items and services necessary to perform the functions in this PWS ..." Comment: Based on these two paragraphs, it is unclear whether the PWS addresses the cost of items such as: - PCs, notebooks, printers, etc (equipment) -Testers, tool kits (tools)-Cables, jumpers, disks, etc (supplies) - <tab>GSA van lease (transportation) Cell phone services, copier leases, etc (other items and services necessary to perform the functions in this PWS) Or, if the PWS is limited to "functions, services, and tasks" as stated on page 4, paragraph 1. Please clarify the boundaries of the PWS.</p>
	1	<p>Edit: The second to last sentence is missing a period.</p>

Section	Paragraph	State Concern
	2.1.6.5.2.2	Minor typo in the "Suitability" section, bullet number 8, states "explosions", should be "explosives".
	2.2.49.9	There is no wording stating the government employees will be given the right of first refusal for any positions open in the SP organization if the SP wins the contract. The wording of this paragraph makes it very hard for government employees to try and gain a position with the SP if they are losing their jobs. The wording seems very negative toward Government employees.
	3	The requirement for all changes to the infrastructure to be approved by the USACE CCB precludes the acceptance of any proposal if it contains any changes to the infrastructure. This precludes ingenuity and potential for cost savings. Suggest the wording be revised.
	3	It is assumed the Chief Information Officer is at HQ, who will be on the Configuration Control Board? Will anyone from the district levels be on the CCB? Recommend that some folks from the district level be on the CCB. Recommend the PWS define some level of authority and ability to direct at the district level.
	3	Who does the SP interact at the government regarding policy, guidance, security, finance, and procurement? Is this limited to the CO, COTR, IASM, and CCB or are others involved? Is this interaction limited to HQ or can it occur at any command level? The authority and areas of responsibility of the CCB need to be specifically, completely, and consistently defined. Do they have a role in policy and guidance outside of infrastructure? Infrastructure needs to be defined. Is it limited to automation and communications or does it include other IMIT mission areas? Is all IMIT equipment and software considered infrastructure?
	3	Sentence states the "...government will retain sole responsibility for all decisions..." Please clarify to whom "the government" refers. Will there be authority to direct the SP at the district level? Will decisions be made at the district level?
	3	Does the last sentence in C.1 paragraph 3 mean that the government will make the infrastructure changes normally using the COTR or does it mean that the COTR will normally be used to notify the SP to make authorized infrastructure changes? It is unclear who performs what actions.
	3	The last sentence refers to the Installation COTR. In the case of USACE IMIT services there isn't a traditional "Installation" COTR. Recommend eliminating the word "Installation".

Section	Paragraph	State Concern
	3 of C.1	Existing Text: Without exception, the government will retain sole responsibility for all decisions; especially in the areas of policy, guidance, security, finance and procurement. In addition, all changes to the enterprise infrastructure will be made only at the behest and approval of the USACE Configuration Control Board (CCB), which is chaired by the USACE Chief Information Officer (CIO). Such changes will normally be made through the Installation Contracting Officer's Technical Representative (COTR).
	4	This section fails to mention the majority of the IM mission areas. Is the SP responsible for operation, maintenance, and sustainment of Records Management, VI, or IA infrastructure? What about copiers, VTC, cameras, A/V equipment? Section C.3 states this additional equipment will be hand-receipted to SP for maintenance. Why is this paragraph limited to hardware, software, and communications?
	4	Recommend defining more clearly the arrangement with the SP concerning responsibility for IT hardware. Specifically define who will actually own the equipment, and how will future additional equipment needs be identified and purchased
	5	Can HQUSACE include a distinction in the PWS between Automation Tools and Automated Information Systems? For example, an engineer could develop an Excel macro using Visual Basic for repetitive analysis of data. This is an Automation Tool, not an AIS so the SP does not need to be involved. Consider providing a cost threshold to distinguish between an Automation Tool and an
	5	Where is the definition of Automated Information System? What is material development and where is it defined? Does this mean the SP is responsible for programming and development of all existing AIS? Does this mean the SP is responsible for all programming necessary to the Corps except exempted AIS?
	5	Where is the delineation between system administration and application administration or is the SP responsible for both functions? Often, application administration is performed by the functional proponent such as the CEFMS data manager (an RM accountant) compared to the IT person acting as CEFMS database manager. Similar distinctions must be made for CADD/GIS/CWMS/WCDS/ORM application administration. The Public Affairs Office is responsible for content management of web sites. How is that function identified as governmental and not to be bid on by the SP?

Section	Paragraph	State Concern
	6	<p>The word “operation” needs more precise definition in this context. It is not defined in C.2. Where is the delineation between system administration and application administration or is the SP responsible for both functions? Often, application administration is performed by the functional proponent such as the CEFMS data manager compared to the IT person acting as CEFMS database manager. Similar distinctions must be made for CADD/GIS/CWMS/WCDS/ORM. How does operation differ from maintenance AIS? The C.2 definition refers to maintenance for hardware but not software. What is the precise line between operation and maintenance of an AIS. Should the SP be responsible for maintenance? Where is the definition of Automated Information System? The district-level proponents of exempted AIS were not previously aware of the requirement for SP operation of these systems and do not understand the boundary between government and SP operational duties and responsibilities. Recommend additional clarification of the separation of duties and responsibilities between government and SP be submitted to each functional area at all command levels for each exempted AIS before the final comment period.</p>
	6	<p>MVN requests that existing in-house custom engineering applications that have been developed to meet specific district needs be added to the exempted AIS list.</p>
	6	<p>CWMS is not a complete system for the management of data necessary for water control. CWMS provides some limited functionality for data storage and modeling. CWMS does not have modules for complete data acquisition (AWIPS, DCPs), report generation, or web dissemination. The Water Control Data System (WCDS) is the proper term and CWMS is a just a piece of a WCDS. This was emphasized at the CURG meeting in Sept. 2004 by the districts and divisions. However, HEC and headquarters seem to believe that CWMS is the replacement of WCDS. This is absolutely not true. Anyone that claims that CWMS has replaced WCDS is wearing rose-colored glasses.</p>

Section	Paragraph	State Concern
	6 of C.1	<p>Existing Text: Also, the SP shall accept responsibility for only the operations of all exempted AIS's. A listing of those exempted AIS's follows: Recommended Re-write: Several critical, Enterprise-level AIS have been excluded. Excluded AIS work involves system development/enhancements, contract support, funding, program management and limited operations support. Service Level Agreements (SLA) are provided in Technical Exhibit 7. The SP shall accept responsibility for Wide Area Network (WAN) and WAN Operations Center support as specified in the individual SLA for each AIS. Excluded Enterprise-level AIS are:</p> <p>Rationale for Re-write: Need to define the demarcation for support. These excluded AIS PMs and their support contractors will be responsible for a wide range of support activities. A Service Level Agreement (SLA) must be put in place. If there systems listed here with no SLA, we need to get them in place. General Comment: Which term should be used consistently?</p>
	C 1.22	<p>Normal IT/IM operating hours are specified with the caveat that "...SP shall maintain specified services (from the PRS) 24 hours a day, 7 days a week, 365+ days per year." CWMS/Water Control systems must function 365+ days per year, yet there is no list of "specified services" included in the PWS. System services requiring around the clock operations must be stated in the PWS. The SP will have to have sufficient information to define the amount of manpower required to provide continuous system performance in preparing a bid package. While the PRS MAY provide the necessary details, the PWS should as a minimum list "critical" systems that require around the clock operation.</p>
	C 1.23	<p>Second paragraph goes into detail for Civil Service workers. Is the intent that the Government will pay the differentials in paragraph 2 to any SP employees? If not the last 4 sentences dealing with Federal benefits should be removed. They are also incorrect, since foreign differentials are modified regularly, and may or may not be in place for a particular location at a particular time. To state that a differential for a down-range location IS authorized is simply false. Best to remove it entirely, it is not necessary for Federal Civil Servants, and I doubt that the Government means to pay those allowances to non-Governmental SP employees.</p>

Section	Paragraph	State Concern
	C 1.24.5	Normal IT/IM operating hours are specified with the caveat that "...SP shall maintain specified services (from the PRS) 24 hours a day, 7 days a week, 365+ days per year." CWMS/Water Control systems must function 365+ days per year, yet there is no list of "specified services" included in the PWS. System services requiring around the clock operations must be stated in the PWS. The SP will have to have sufficient information to define the amount of manpower required to provide continuous system performance in preparing a bid package. While the PRS MAY provide the necessary details, the PWS should as a minimum list "critical" systems that require around the clock operation.
	C.1	Paragraph 1 - Add a period between "Alaska District" & "USACE IM/IT".
	C.1	Need a period after "Alaska District" to separate the sentences about which locations are included and which are not.
	C.1	A.<tab>We request that the exempted CWMS AIS in this PWS be additionally exempted from the SP operation responsibility as per the discussion/description attached.
	C.1	PWS: This paragraph lists sites that are excluded from this competition. The Western Processing Center and Central Processing Center are not listed as excluded. They are listed in the acronym list but are not mentioned in the PWS text, in Technical Exhibit 6 (site locations), or Technical Exhibit 4 (facilities).
	C.1	The Water Control Data System (WCDS) should be specifically exempt for the AIS's the SP will have responsibility for. Management of the WCDS system is specified in ER 1110-2-249 MANAGEMENT OF WATER CONTROL DATA SYSTEMS. The WCDS is a critical government function dealing with protection of life and property. The WCDS function has always been managed and operated separated for the IMIT function due it's mission critical nature. There appears to be a misconception that CWMS and WCDS are the same. This is not true. Each District has a unique WCDS function based on local conditions. CWMS is not now or may never be a replacement for the total WCDS function.

Section	Paragraph	State Concern
	C.1	In regards to Water Management operations, what about issues of direct accountability, and response time for contractor personnel? A reasonable response time for most elements may not be responsive for Water Control in an emergency flood event situation. In post-flood public meetings, many questions are asked about accountability; when all Water Control data collection and data processing (IT) is managed by a national SP (contractor or government), who will be responsible for contract non-performance in the event of a local flood event? We need to insure the PWS is detailed enough enable the SP to succeed and provide deterrents to non-performance.
	C.1	Paragraph 1, last sentence – Sentence is not clear. It appears that a period is needed after the wording “Alaska District”
	C.1	PWS: This paragraph lists sites that are excluded from this competition. The 249th Prime Power Battalion is not listed as excluded. Figure 1 in section C.1.1.2 Organization indicates that the 249th Prime Power Battalion is excluded. Technical Exhibit 6 does not include the 249th Prime Power Battalion. Question: is the 249th Prime Power Battalion in scope or excluded.
	c.1	When describing what responsibilities the SP will assume, there is no mention of the records or Corps information
	C.1	(a) Performance-based contracting methods are intended to ensure that required performance quality levels are achieved and that total payment is related to the degree that services performed or outcomes achieved meet contract standards. Performance-based contracts or task orders— (1) Describe the requirements in terms of results required rather than the methods of performance of the work; (2) Use measurable performance standards (i.e., in terms of quality, timeliness, quantity, etc.) and quality assurance surveillance plans (see 46.103(a) and 46.401(a));
	C.1	The paragraph at the bottom of page 4 indicates that the Service Provider is responsible for the operation of Corps Water Management System (CWMS). This program is in the development stage and is not fully utilized within the districts. First the service provider should understand that this is not functional in all areas at this time. Second, I could find no clear definition of what will be required of the Service Provider to "operate" this system. Finally, when CWMS does become fully operational, it will only be one part of the water management mission at the district. Recommend that this be deleted and that the Performance Work Statement be clarified to indicate that Water Control hardware and programs are not covered by this solicitation

Section	Paragraph	State Concern
	C.1	A.<tab>We request that the exempted CWMS AIS in this PWS be additionally exempted from the SP operation responsibility as per the discussion/description attached.
	C.1	PWS: The statement “all changes to the enterprise infrastructure will be made only at the behest and approval of the CCB” implies control at a level of detail that will inhibit cost effective service delivery.
	C.1	<p>Managed Services Approach: Overall, the PWS seems to assume that the SP will provide staff to perform work on a T&M basis while the USACE retains ownership of assets. While this approach will be useful in some areas where demand is hard to quantify (e.g. C.5.1.3 Consulting Services), we recommend that the USACE consider a Managed Services approach in areas such as network services where historical demand data are good and services can be priced according to the quantity used. In a Managed Services approach the SP provides services under specific Service Level Agreements (SLAs). Benefit: This is consistent with the Army’s performance-based contracting approach. This also gives the USACE the flexibility to respond to changing demand for services without the cost of purchasing or retiring equipment. C.1</p> <p>Paragraph 3: Site locations: While the USACE clearly needs to retain responsibility in areas of policy and guidance, the SP will need the flexibility to determine the location of its central computing sites. This is essential in a Managed Services approach. The PWS should specify performance results in areas such as emergency recovery to ensure that the SP is providing the robust capability required. Configuration Control Board: We recommend that the USACE make the SP a full participant on the Configuration Control Board (CCB). This will ensure the collaboration necessary for the effective operation of a Managed Services environment in which both the USACE and the SP have a large stake in optimizing the IT architecture. Benefit: Allowing the SP to determine its sites and collaborate in the overall IT architecture will provide USACE with the highest level of service at the lowest cost.</p> <p>C.1. Paragraph 4: Asset Ownership: In a Managed Services approach, the SP would ultimately own a large portion of the central computing hardware such as CPUs, DASD, tape, and servers. As part of the transition, we recommend that the USACE retain ownership.</p>

Section	Paragraph	State Concern
	C.1	This paragraph gives the perception that flexibility and efficient operations within the SP will be hampered. Industry Best Practices that will be necessary for this competition to gain savings and to compete, do not have Change Management and Procurement Processes limited. This is describing "how" the requirement will be met. Without exception, the government will retain sole responsibility for all decisions; especially in the areas of policy, guidance, security, finance and procurement. In addition, all changes to the enterprise infrastructure will be made only at the behest and approval of the USACE Configuration Control Board (CCB), which is chaired by the USACE Chief Information Officer (CIO).
	C.1	What is the expected time frame for completion of the USACE wide solution?
	C.1	The PWS repeatedly states that the Government will provide strategic and tactical direction, policy, guidance, and program management" but does not provide the SP with "measures", "reasonable response times", "quality control measures", etc.
	C.1	Third paragraph is unclear as to the role of the CCB and appears to remove any level of discretion on the part of the SP to make any procurement decisions. Does this paragraph require that the SP merely acts as an agent of the CCB in the procurement of any equipment? Does this section indicate that each installation (organizations listed in Figure 1?) will have a COTR? What is the definition of an installation?
	C.1	Memorandum from Thomas H. Bushnell, Chief, Plans and Policy Division, PARC Staff, to DCC-W Contracting Directorate Personnel, March 26, 2004 states: "Over the last decade, the acquisition of services has become a significant component of what the Department of Defense (DoD) acquires. Acquiring services on a performance basis provides our customers with better value and enhanced performance because it increases the likelihood of meeting mission needs." PBSA focuses on results not process. Under Secretary of Defense (Acquisition and Technology) memorandum dated 5 April 2000 states: It is the policy of the Department of Defense (DOD) that, in order to maximize performance, innovation, and competition, often at lower cost, performance-based strategies for the acquisition of services are to be used wherever possible."
	C.1	There appear to be few technical descriptions of WCDS/CWMS and its implementation in district offices. If a more detailed work statement for the Water Control mission is not included in the PWS, then a contract amendment would most likely be required at significant cost to the government.

Section	Paragraph	State Concern
	C.1	The draft PWS fails to comply with either the AFARS requirements (5107.304 and 5137.602-1) or DOD or Army guidance. Throughout the document the Government has prescribed the method of performance rather than merely setting forth the results to be achieved. The failure to use a performance based scope of work will not allow the Corps to achieve better value or enhanced performance which is contrary to the goal of OMB Circular A-76, 23 May
	C.1	It is not clear as to the IMIT services being excluded as there is a period missing in the last sentence of the first paragraph. I believe that the period should come after "Alaska District" to reflect that IMIT services for the remainder of the Districts/offices are being
	C.1	The "PWS calls for the Service Provider (SP) to accept responsibility for the operation, maintenance, and sustainment of all infrastructure components (hardware, software, and communications) throughout the enterprise." However, for CWMS which is listed as a exempted AIS, this draft states "the SP shall accept responsibility for only the operations of all exempted AIS's." I interpret this as meaning that development and support of CMWS software would continue by the Hydrologic Engineering Center (HEC) and the SP would provide local CWMS system administration and support. Our Water Management offices provide their own system support. This works well because the embedded IT staff do many interdisciplinary things which are not strictly IT-related. The Water Management IT personnel are also immediately responsible to the Chief of the Water Management office. In addition to direct accountability, this ensures rapid and flexible response to problems that might arise during a critical flood event which can occur any time and will be in operation 24/7 until the flooding is no longer an issue. Additionally, other facets of CWMS management, e.g. database administration (C.5.2.5 Server Support and Services), data acquisition (C.5.3.1.4 Devices and Services, C.5.3.5.2.5 Data Radios), data dissemination (C.5.2.2 Web Support and Services), and possibly GIS integration (C.5.2.1.4) would be affected. This office requests the PWS team reconsider inclusion of CWMS operation into the competition due to the critical nature of the water management and flood control mission.
	C.1	Fourth paragraph needs definition of "Infrastructure". It also conflicts with TE11, which says the SP only does AIS work if asked. This paragraph states that the SP does the work.

Section	Paragraph	State Concern
	C.1	There is a period missing between these two sentences: "This competition covers IMIT services for USACE locations within the continental United States (CONUS) and the Pacific Ocean Division, Honolulu District and Alaska District USACE IMIT services at the Gulf Region Division, Far East District (Korea), Japan District, Europe District, and Transatlantic Programs Center (TAC) are excluded from this competition."
	C.1	The PWS is written such that offerors will form the opinion that USACE does not want to change the way in which it manages and conducts the IMIT program. It appears that we want to continue business as usual but shift some execution responsibilities over to a service provider whose every action will be scrutinized and evaluated by the government. If we approach the competition from this mindset, the result will be that IMIT will cost more than it does today and the service provider's ability to make changes and improvements will be crippled by the government's need to control and approve everything. The PWS should reflect USACE's willingness to change the way it does IMIT today and should invite offerors to propose new and innovative ways of business in accordance with best practices.
	C.1	Please make a distinction between FAR contractual "transition" and "phase-in/phase out" (FAR 52.237-3, and FAR 37.110(c)) and OMB Circular's discussion of "phase-in."
	C.1	Will the SP be required to be responsive to those elements of USACE that are excluded from the competition, and if so, how? Will excluded elements be obtaining their own support separately from USACE or will they continue to use some parts of the infrastructure and services provide by the SP?
	C.1	Since embedded Water Control IT staff will be impacted, the effect of additional workload and loss of institutional knowledge on existing Water Control elements should be examined. While the SP would surely provide staff capable of meeting operational IT needs, the embedded Water Control IT staff do more than strictly IT, performing many interdisciplinary functions. Additionally, Water Control management have direct control and flexibility over their staff, which maximizes mission capability in a flood event.
	C.1	Several versions of the terminology "start of contract performance," "notice to proceed," "notice of award," etc., occur throughout Section C. Need consistency and/or definitions for each term and its application.

Section	Paragraph	State Concern
	C.1	First paragraph: Locations within the continental United States (CONUS) and the Pacific Ocean Division, Honolulu District and Alaska District USACE IMIT services at the Gulf Region Division, Far East District (Korea), Japan District, Europe District, and Transatlantic Programs Center (TAC) are excluded from this competition. Language is vague and ambiguous. A period (.) appears to be missing after "Alaska District".
	C.1	Test run to submit comments.
	C.1	This PWS in effect converts the procurement to a time and materials contract. This is highlighted by section C.1 which states that “[t]his PWS calls for the Service Provided (SP) to accept responsibility for the operation, maintenance and sustainment of all infrastructure components (hardware, software and communications) throughout the enterprise.” This removes any ability of the MEO to provide innovative solutions and process and design improvements and instead puts the MEO in the position of merely being an agent of the Government to implement Government requested changes rather than a true service provided as contemplated by the Circular, regulations and DOD and Army guidance.
	C.1	Several Corps districts are still operating legacy Water Control Data Systems (WCDS) while implementing CMWS. These systems use a different set of software (and possibly hardware) but are not mentioned in the PWS. While they remain the production system in transition, the WCDSs should be added to the exempted AIS’s. Their management is detailed in ER 1110-2-249 Management of Water Control Data systems (31 Aug 1994).
	C.1 - Paragraph 6	Request consistent description of responsibility for service provider listed in C.1 – Introduction; page 4, paragraph C.5.2.1.2; and TE-11, page 2, regarding operation, maintenance, sustainability, and development of AISs. Among these three sections, it is not clear whether or not the service provider is required to support AISs.

Section	Paragraph	State Concern
	C.1 Introduction	Delete “• Corps Water Management System (CWMS)”. This is the only mention of CWMS in the PWS except for Definitions and Acronyms. CWMS is a specific software package developed by HEC, Davis CA for Water Control and Hydrology and Hydrologic Engineering Applications. It is designed to run on Unix Solaris platforms and use an Oracle database. This software has been introduced to and tested by all Water Control Offices but because of the enormous diversity of the Water Control mission across the COE it has not yet been fully developed to supply each Districts needs. As a result it has not been implemented or used by all Districts and used only partially by some Districts. The CWMS software and servers are exclusively Water Control mission essential used for real-time water and flood control to provide the information necessary to operate COE projects as required by the approved project Water Control Manual, Drought Contingency Plan, and Emergency Plan, and to provide for hydroelectric power, a historical record, meet environmental requirements, and prevent loss of property and life. They are currently maintained, operated, and used by Engineers and Scientists not by IM personnel. By including this equipment in this solicitation the potential for contract modification claims is nearly certain as a result of the cost and complexity of this additional work, and the SP may have to assume liability for loss of property and persons if they fail to provide information necessary for making critical decisions as required by Water Managers.
	C.1. Introduction	As stated, it is confusing as to what locations are covered by the competition. "This competition covers IMIT services for USACE locations within the continental United States (CONUS) and the Pacific Ocean Division, Honolulu District and Alaska District USACE IMIT services at the Gulf Region Division, Far East District (Korea), Japan District, Europe District, and Transatlantic Programs Center (TAC)are excluded. "Perhaps the comma after "Pacific Ocean Division" or "Alaska District" should be a period???"
	C.1. Introduction	CEFMS is the abbreviation for "Corps of Engineers Financial Management System" not "Corps Financial Management Information Systems"
	C.1. Introduction	It is "RFMIS-NT" not "RIFMIS-NT"
	C.1. Introduction	This PWS also calls for the SP to accept responsibility for the material development, operation, maintenance and sustainment of all non-exempted Automation Information Systems (AIS). Why the underscore between "non-exempted" and
	C.1.1	Clarify what is meant by “local appropriate use policies.”

Section	Paragraph	State Concern
	C.1.1	C.1 requires that the SP accept responsibility for the material development, operation, maintenance and sustainment of all non-exempted AIS's. C.3.1.4 also requires that the SP be responsible for maintaining and modifying the GFS. However, TE 11, par. 11.0, states that support and service for the AIS's is not to be included in the proposal and that any such required services may be ordered by a separately negotiated delivery order. This is clearly contradictory.
	C.1.1	The figure 34,600 appears to understate the number of individuals who will require support, based on data available relating to number of UPASS ids and number of email accounts in USACE.
	C.1.1.2	May the offerors propose changing the levels or distribution of services among the USACE sites than exists today while still meeting the requirements for customers at all sites?
	C.1.1.2	The Gulf Region Division is missing from the organization chart (fig 1) and the Corps map (fig 2). Even if GRD IT operations is excluded from this competition it (like parts of POD and TAC) needs to be depicted as part of the organization.
	C.1.1.2.3	The second sentence states that 41 districts are the subject of this A-76 competition. I believe the correct number should be 38. Europe, Far East Japan and Korea districts are not included, nor are the four districts in the Gulf Region Division.
	C.1.1.2.3	The paragraph states that there are 41 districts that are the subject of the A-76 competition, but the data only indicates 38.
	C.1.1.2.5	Edit: The seventh bullet includes the word "polices". I believe the word should be "policies".
	C.1.10	Section Says "Planned disruptions to networks and communications services shall not take place during normal working hours" Section C.1.22 says that all work will be performed during normal working hours unless specified in the PRS. The PRS only has after hours work for COMSEC and for unscheduled system disruptions. There does not seem to be a case for major overhaul or scheduled maintenance work. After hours work needs to be made more clear.
	C.1.10	This paragraph addresses planned disruptions to network and telecommunications services. Is there a paragraph within the PWS where unplanned/unscheduled/emergency disruptions are handled and communicated?
	C.1.13	C.1.13 Fire Prevention – consider adding that SP shall participate in all fire and safety drills which may necessitate a disruption in service unless directed otherwise.

Section	Paragraph	State Concern
	c.1.13	Require that the SP coordinate this with the District Safety Officer. Define the separation of roles.
	C.1.13	C.1.20 Contingencies – consider expanding to discuss impact of extreme weather events closing offices, that announcements will be made via radio, television, and other means. Also consider adding that interruptions of service due to these events and participation in fire, safety, and other exercises, will be taking into consideration during performance evaluations.
	C.1.13 – Fire	This is currently the responsibility of the Safety Office.
	C.1.14	This paragraph does not reference any local safety policies. Are contractors subject to local safety policies? What about other local policies?
	C.1.15	The paragraph states accidents resulting in traumatic or death should be reported. What one might consider traumatic is subjective. I recommend that the word traumatic be removed, and make the requirement that any accident resulting in injury, death, or damage to property be reported following the outlined procedure.
	C.1.15	SP is supposed to report accidents that result in traumatic injury. The term traumatic injury should be defined.
	C.1.16	C.1.16 Files AR25-400-2. Records Retention: We recommend that all documents are stored in electronic rather C.1.23 ... Emergency operations. Clarification Request: Please provide additional information on the circumstances under which this might occur and the USACE's approach to procuring the required emergency services.
	C.1.17.2	suggest that the notification to the contracting officer be required to be in a written format.
	C.1.17.3	The SP shall be responsible for search, duplication, and submission of records upon request by the Government. Vague. Not definitized. How is this to be bid?
	C.1.21	Seattle District is pursuing environmental sustainability goals that should be addressed in the PWS. The paragraph on environmental protection doesn't include environmental sustainability text. Suggested text is in the Additional Info comment area.
	C.1.21	If the SP fails to take action as the result of the Government's fault, who is responsible for fines, etc.?
	C.1.22	C.1.22 Normal Operating Hours – consider expanding section to include reference to legal government holidays, how holidays falling on a weekend are dealt with, and maybe a listing of current government holidays.

Section	Paragraph	State Concern
	C.1.22	last sentence should read, shall respond to emergency requests within 1 hr of notification. strike "be prepared"
	C.1.22	It is stated that the SP shall maintain specified services 24/7/365. What are these specified services? Who designates them? Who determines if something is an emergency?
	C.1.22	PWS(2nd Draft): C.1.22. Shouldn't there be more explicit mention of on-call / standby requirements?
	C.1.22	Section says "The SP shall maintain specified services 24 hours day, 7 days a week, 365 days per year" unless specified in the PRS (TE-1). NWS currently does not have a written policy on work outside of normal hours.
	C.1.22	This paragraph states that normal operating hours for IM/IT operations shall be performed from 0700 to 1700 hours, m-f (local time zone). Philadelphia Districts hours of business are from 0630-1745. No network outages or other system outages should be scheduled during this period.
	c.1.22	Recommend that operating hours be expanded to more closely cover the duty hours of USACE users. Recommend local time 0600-1800. Mentioning local time is important because it is not defined where the "help" desk will be located.
	c.1.22	Normal operating hours as shown reflect a reduction in service level to the District. District operating hours are from 0600 to 1800 for normal business. If PWS limits normal operating hours to 10 hours, request ability to locally use 0600 to 1600 instead of 0700 to 1700 at local Commander's discretion. Note that the limit to 10 normal operating hours prevents use of Compressed Work Schedule 10 hour days and reduces the allowable time window for AWS/CWS workers from 0600-1800 down to 0700-1700. This will become a union issue concerning changed working conditions should the MEO win.
	c.1.22	The SP will be prepared to respond to emergency requests within 1 hour of notification. The term 'respond' needs to be clarified.
	c.1.22	The sentence "Any work to be performed outside normal operating hours will be specified in the PRS" should be removed. It limits the government options and the current PRS is very incomplete when identifying activities that can be performed outside normal hours.

Section	Paragraph	State Concern
	C.1.22	Per Seth Shulman re the normal hours of operation: Sentence beginning "Normal operating hours..." reword to say, "Normal operating hours, within an eight hour tour of duty, for IMIT operations shall be from 0600 to 2000 hours, Monday through Friday (local time zone). Mandatory coverage by the SP shall be between the CORE operating hours of 0900 to 1500." Regarding the question on lunch, Seth said that the Fair Labor Standards Act indicates that employees are required to take a 30 minute break after working six hours. I do not think it is necessary to put anything regarding lunches in the PWS as information along these lines will be in the FAR clauses I have to include.
	C.1.22	What is the criteria for a one hour response? What constitutes the SP's response; e.g. Deployable Personnel lists, tier 3 support, on-site support, FEMA support functions or other assets?
	C.1.22 Normal	1. Suggest changing operating hours to 0600-1800. 2. Delete, "Any work to be performed outside normal operating hours will be specified in the PRS." This sentence may result in significant contract modifications.
	C.1.22 Normal	Suggest changing operating hours to 0600-1800.
	C.1.23	There is no mention of providing DTOS-RRV support/deployment which includes exercise preparedness as well as emergency response operations.
	C.1.23	PWS should mention DTOS under this section. Whether or not DTOS is to be supported during emergencies should be stated
	c.1.23	C.1.23 ... Emergency operations. Clarification Request: Please provide additional information on the circumstances under which this might occur and the USACE's approach to procuring the required emergency services.
	c.1.23	Paragraph C.1-23, EMERGENCY OPERATIONS. Recommend that this paragraph address regular or unusual overtime pay rates (or percentages) in a fashion similar to how foreign and TDY is
	C.1.23	PWS: Section C.1.23, Emergency Operations. Request USACE elaborate on the type of services associated with 'emergency operations' and provide some sample scenarios.
	C.1.23	Spoke with Seth Shulman - HQ HR Specialist - He recommended the following change in the 2nd paragraph re the 15-25% post differential. Please change as follows: A foreign post differential, for Government Employees only, is authorized pursuant to Department of State regulations, while personnel are on Temporary..... Next sentence.. Additional compensation, for Government Employees only and pursuant to Department of State regulations, over basic compensation will be granted.....

Section	Paragraph	State Concern
	C.1.23	Why does the PWS define the salary to be paid SP personnel?
	c.1.23	Service is missing for traveling as a team member with the RRV during its deployment for disasters or for periodic readiness exercises.
	C.1.23	The third from last sentence in the second paragraph discusses compensation "for service at designated danger pay costs". This phrase is unclear. Recommend the wording be change to something like "for service at designated hazardous duty areas".
	C.1.23	Must state excluding Federal holidays. Or government shutdown by executive or local order. Paragraph must be written to include or describe personnel who work outside the normal core working to accommodate the mission. An example of this would be a 3rd shift tape backup operator, or personnel who work outside the local core operating hours, because they are supporting customers in another time zone, etc.
	C.1.23, paragraph 2	The section on post differential states, "...a foreign post differential of 15-25% is authorized while personnel are on Temporary Duty to a downrange location". Does the SP get post differential in addition to per diem? FEMA will not reimburse the District for post differential associated with government civilian TDY and will likely not reimburse for post differential costs associated with contractor TDY.
	C.1.23, paragraph 2	At the Honolulu District, IM personnel serving on teams such as the CTOC must deploy with as little as 6 hours prior notice, as required by HQUSACE policy, delineated by ENGLINK. We would like this specified in this paragraph.
	C.1.24	12.<tab> C.1.24 Transition – consider adding a section describing the requirements for a phase out period at the end of the contract and the necessity for a 30 to 60 day observation period where incoming personnel, government or other SP, may observe operations and performance methods of the outgoing SP. This would allow for a more orderly turnover of facilities, equipment, and records to ensure continuity of service with goal of minimizing impact to government operations.

Section	Paragraph	State Concern
	C.1.24	Recommended Re-write: C.1.24. TRANSITION. The SP shall provide a Transition Plan, approved by the Contracting Officer, that will be incorporated into and become part of any contract awarded. The Transition Plan shall include all items listed in C.1.24.1 - C.1.24.7. During the transition period, the Government will be responsible for performing the PWS requirements. Performance of the transition requirements will start the date the SP [the vendor or the Most Efficient Organization (MEO)] is notified in writing to proceed with contract performance. Rationale for Re-write: Most important info to SP will be the fact that they have to propose a Transition Plan and it will be part of the contract. Put that first. Second statement deserves paragraph separation.
	C.1.24	4. PWS(2nd Draft):C.1.24 – pages 20-21 – this section appears to be quite incomplete
	C.1.24	C.1.24.2 Office Space and Equipment – take out generic reference to TE's and replace with specific reference to TE-3 Government Furnished Property and TE-4 Facilities
	C.1.24.1	5. PWS(2nd Draft):C.1.24.1 – In order for this transition plan to work as described; we would ALL need to write an SOP for EACH thing we do. That would take more than the allotted time even assuming that all work could stop in the mean time. Shouldn't the transition emphasize keeping people in positions or training
	C.1.24.1	Recommended Re-write: C.1.24.1. Transition Tasks. List all tasks that the SP is committing to perform during transition period and include: State the SP proposed timeline for the transition period. • State scope and activity or each known requirement for each task • State where and when each transition tasks will be performed and how they will be phased in. • State performance metrics for each task or reference applicable performance metrics listed in PRS. • Identify resources to accomplish each task • Submit standard operating procedures (SOPs) of how to accomplish each task • Explain how each task will be coordinated with the Contracting Officer. Rationale for Re-write: Added Transition to Tasks title, added timeline, scope, where and performance metrics, and cleaned up language.
	c.1.24.2	It is not clear whether the PWS is asking the S.P. to produce a list of what space and equipment requirements that the Government needs to provide specifically for use by the SP for the SP to transition, or whether the SP being asked to make a complete assessment of ALL the facilities and equipment shown in the TE's and provide a list of additional facilities and equipment necessary.

Section	Paragraph	State Concern
	C.1.24.2	Recommended Re-write: C.1.24.2. Office Space and Equipment. SP shall submit a detail proposal for SP-required office space and equipment the Government needs to furnish, based on the government-furnished facilities and government-furnished equipment shown in TE-2 Estimated Current Workload, TE-3 Government Furnished Property, TE-4 Facilities, TE-6 USACE Locations and TE-13 End-user Location Maps. SP is encouraged to propose creative solutions to management practices, products or services provided that will result in increased efficiency and/or effectiveness of IM/IT support. Rationale for Re-write: Cleaned up language. Need to specify which TEs are to be used. Also need to encourage SP to offer creative solutions.
	C.1.24.2	Office Space and Equipment is not clear as to intent.
	C.1.24.2	C.1.24.2 Office Space and Equipment and C.1.24.8 Government-Furnished Facilities and Equipment on Page 21, seem to be related and should be combined.
	C.1.24.4	11.<tab>C.1.24.4 Organization – consider adding the requirement for the SP to provide an Organizational Chart showing the SP’s functional responsibilities along with employees by the end of the transition period.
	C.1.24.4	Transition plan can not possibly identify the workforce by name. Requirement should be for an organization and staffing plan.
	c.1.24.6	This section has no information
	C.1.24.6.	C.1.24.6. Recruiting and Hiring. C.1.24.7. Training. The above headings have no information listed under them.
	c.1.24.7	This section has no information.
	c.1.24.7	No scope information is provided for this item.
	C.1.24.8	states the government will provide the necessary office space, furniture, and equipment at the start of the transition. This alludes that the government will only do it at the start and then quit furnishing such items in the future, whereas later in the PWS it states the government will furnish these throughout the contract. This paragraph seems to be in context to office space and equipment needed by the SP. Again, we need to clearly state what facilities for what purpose we are referring to.
	C.1.24.8	Government-Furnished Facilities and Equipment is not clear as to Intent.
	C.1.24.8	Space requirements identified in the SP transition plan should not exceed the requirement of existing IM/IT space.

Section	Paragraph	State Concern
	C.1.24.9	6. PWS(2nd Draft):C.1.24.9 - let me get this straight - we might not be able to interview for jobs because it might interfere with the transition????? What happens with respect to transition personnel if the MEO does win.
	c.1.24.9	This section calls for a final list of adversely affected or separated personnel to be provided 45 days after contract award (28Feb?). There does not appear to be sufficient time allotted to perform VSIP/VERA and RIF actions that would be necessary prior to developing the final list. It does not appear that affected personnel would have sufficient time to make life altering career decisions. Recommend a longer period be developed in cooperation with Human Resource and career program managers at all command levels.
	C.1.24-C.1.24.9	C.1.24 Transition. Clarification Request: Please provide additional clarification regarding the roles of the Government and the SP during transition. C.1.24.1 Please provide the relevant information for sections C.1.24.1 – C.1.24.7C.1.24.2 Clarification: To the extent that the Government offers or requires the use of Government-owned facilities or equipment, please confirm that the use of those facilities and equipment would be provided without charge to the SP. SP furnished office space: We recommend that the PWS allow the use of SP office space and equipment where that will provide the most effective and efficient solution to the USACE. Benefit: Giving the SP the flexibility to use SP furnished office space and equipment will allow the SP to provide the USACE with the highest level of service at the lowest cost. C.1.24.9 Comment: The process described in the PWS for Affected Government Personnel is similar to best practices in the commercial sector. We recommend retaining this section as written.
	C.1.3	I sent the below email during the comment period last Dec. Unfortunately, my suggestion to describe our "inherently governmental" work was not included in this draft! As my Dec. email says the work we do at the projects is "inherently governmental" by Public Law! It does "appear" that SCADA and GDACS are not part of what is up for contract but we're very concerned that the definitions for SCADA and GDACS are still in the Definition Section, so does that mean they "could" be included somehow?? There are several other areas in the contract that are definitely our work (such as "Inside and Outside Cable Support" at the Projects that we have done for years!!)and I will point out those different sections as directed above. I have many letters from Congressmen and Senators backing our 1990 "inherently governmental" law and again in 2002 when the Corps tried to contract out some of our "minor" work! I would hope that you guys can save all of us a lot of work and trouble by clearing up our work.

Section	Paragraph	State Concern
	C.1.3	I sent the below email during the comment period last Dec. Unfortunately, my suggestion to describe our "inherently governmental" work was not included in this draft! As my Dec. email says the work we do at the projects is "inherently governmental" by Public Law! It does "appear" that SCADA and GDACS are not part of what is up for contract but we're very concerned that the definitions for SCADA and GDACS are still in the Definition Section, so does that mean they "could" be included somehow?? There are several other areas in the contract that are definitely our work (such as "Inside and Outside Cable Support" at the Projects that we have done for years!!)and I will point out those different sections as directed above. I have many letters from Congressmen and Senators backing our 1990 "inherently governmental" law and again in 2002 when the Corps tried to contract out some of our "minor" work! I would hope that you guys can save all of us a lot of work and trouble by clearing up our work.
	C.1.3	Clarification request: Please clarify the requirement to deploy personnel to OCONUS locations. It is our understanding from the rest of the PWS that OCONUS sites are excluded.
	C.1.3	This section says SP shall provide all personnel, equipment, tools, etc to perform the functions in the PWS as specified in C.3., C.4 and C.5. The GFE/GFP provision say the government will provide. These conflict with each other.
	C.1.3	Lines 8 and 9. "The work shall be supported at locations specified in this PWS and the TEs." This statement seems to be prescriptive and to mandate that contractors duplicate the existing system. It doesn't allow contractors leeway to propose new approaches to providing the level of service required by the PWS.
	c.1.3	This section does not address future sites or relocation of existing sites. Construction Offices must be supported as they are established. The SP should be aware that Corps locations are
	C.1.3	Our suggestion would be after the last sentence in C.1.3 SCOPE OF WORK. The SP shall be required to deploy personnel to locations outside the contiguous United States (OCONUS). "USACE Powerhouse workers, nationwide, come under the provisions of 33 USC Sec. 2321 from Public Law 101-640, Title III, Sec. 314 that declares their operation and maintenance work as inherently governmental. Typical IM/IT systems operated and maintained by USACE Powerhouse federal employees include, but are not limited to, SCADA, GDACS, alarm annunciation, communication and project security video surveillance systems used for the safe and efficient critical control of the nations USACE hydroelectric powerhouses and flood control dams."

Section	Paragraph	State Concern
	C.1.3	<p>I sent the below email during the comment period last Dec. Unfortunately, my suggestion to describe our "inherently governmental" work was not included in this draft! As my Dec. email says the work we do at the projects is "inherently governmental" by Public Law! It does "appear" that SCADA and GDACS are not part of what is up for contract but we're very concerned that the definitions for SCADA and GDACS are still in the Definition Section, so does that mean they "could" be included somehow?? There are several other areas in the contract that are definitely our work (such as "Inside and Outside Cable Support" at the Projects that we have done for years!!)and I will point out those different sections as directed above. I have many letters from Congressmen and Senators backing our 1990 "inherently governmental" law and again in 2002 when the Corps tried to contract out some of our "minor" work! I would hope that you guys can save all of us a lot of work and trouble by clearing up our work.</p>
	c.1.3	<p>The Scope of Work does not define the customer base serviced by the SP. Is it only the Corps or does it include others such as the CPACs servicing the Corps at each site, other subordinate or tenant organizations, and Corps contractors? All these groups require the full range of IMIT services. Recommend that service to CPACs and other groups be including in this section. Also recommend that the Corps MOA/MOU for CPAC operation be included. There may be additional Requirements Statements necessary to include provided service in compliance with CPAC requirements. I can provide the MOUs upon request. Note that some CPAC IT equipment such as computers and blackberries is provided by HQDA and would not be turned over to the SP but should be required to be maintained by the SP.</p>
	C.1.3	<p>Part 2 of my first email... The SP shall be required to deploy personnel to locations outside the contiguous United States (OCONUS). "USACE Powerhouse workers, nationwide, come under the provisions of 33 USC Sec. 2321 from Public Law 101-640, Title III, Sec. 314 that declares their operation and maintenance work as inherently governmental. Typical IM/IT systems operated and maintained by USACE Powerhouse federal employees include, but are not limited to, SCADA, GDACS, alarm annunciation, communication and project security video surveillance systems used for the safe and efficient critical control of the nations USACE hydroelectric powerhouses and flood control dams."C.2.1 Definitions SCADA - Supervisory Control and Data Acquisition - Computer systems used through PLC (Programmable Logic Controllers) to monitor and control hydroelectric and flood control systems in USACE Powerhouses. GDACS - Governor Data Acquisition and Control System -Computer systems used through PLC</p>

Section	Paragraph	State Concern
	C.1.3	<p>Where applicable, specific references to technical exhibits (TE) should be made to enhance clarity and link specific sections and TEs.</p> <p>For example, in section C.1.3 Scope of Work, the section loosely refers to locations to be supported in the TEs. Those references should be tightened up with references to specific TEs. C.1.3 should refer to TE-6 USACE Locations.</p>
	C.1.3	<p>Part 2 of my first email. The SP shall be required to deploy personnel to locations outside the contiguous United States (OCONUS). "USACE Powerhouse workers, nationwide, come under the provisions of 33 USC Sec. 2321 from Public Law 101-640, Title III, Sec. 314 that declares their operation and maintenance work as inherently governmental. Typical IM/IT systems operated and maintained by USACE Powerhouse federal employees include, but are not limited to, SCADA, GDACS, alarm annunciation, communication and project security video surveillance systems used for the safe and efficient critical control of the nations USACE hydroelectric powerhouses and flood control dams."C.2.1 Definitions SCADA - Supervisory Control and Data Acquisition - Computer systems used through PLC (Programmable Logic Controllers) to monitor and control hydroelectric and flood control systems in USACE Powerhouses. GDACS - Governor Data Acquisition and Control System -Computer systems used through PLC</p>
	C.1.3	<p>PWS: Section C.1.3, Scope of Work. "Upon request, the SP shall be required to deploy personnel to locations outside the contiguous United States (OCONUS)". Request USACE elaborate on the type of services to be provided by SP for off-shore locations, the duration of those services, and the current level of effort required to provide the services today.</p>
	C.1.3	<p>PWS: This PWS also calls for the "SP to accept responsibility for the material development, operation, maintenance and sustainment of all non-exempted Automated Information Systems (AIS)." Request USACE define "material development".</p>

Section	Paragraph	State Concern
	C.1.3	<p>C.1.3. SCOPE OF WORK. The work to be performed under this contract includes classified and unclassified services in the areas of IMIT Management, Automation, Communications, Information Assurance, Records Management, Printing and Publications, and Visual Information. The USACE mission is, fundamentally, to provide high-quality, responsive engineering, construction, emergency, and scientific services to the Army and the Nation. The SP shall provide all personnel, equipment, tools, supplies, materials, transportation, and any other items and services necessary to perform the functions in this PWS pertaining to current and future USACE mission requirements as specified in C.3., C.4., and C.5. The work shall be supported at locations as specified in this PWS and the TEs. Some USACE organizations that are subject to this A-76 competition support overseas locations or support USACE organizations that are exempt from this A-76 competition. The workload to support these exempted organizations</p>
	C.1.3	<p>For each functional area (e.g. C.1.3.1, IM/IT Management, C.1.3.2, Automation Services and Systems Support, C.1.3.3, Communications, etc.), the PWS further requires that “[t]he government will provide strategic and tactical direction, policy, guidance, and program management for” This language mandates that the Government retain control over the day to day activities of the PWS which removes any flexibility and discretion, and thus creativity, on the part of the SP. In contrast, the language in C.1.3.4, Information Assurance, states that “[t]he SP shall plan for, analyze, develop, implement, maintain, and enhance systems, programs, policies, procedures, and tools to ensure the integrity, availability, and confidentiality of information systems and assets.” This qualifying statement reflects the flexibility that a PBSA should allow.</p>
	C.1.3	<p>Some USACE organizations that are subject to this A-76 competition support overseas locations or support USACE organizations that are exempt from this A-76 competition. The workload to support these exempted organizations is reflected in the workload data included in the TEs and is part of this competition. The workload to support the organizations is included, but the organizations are not which makes this language ambiguous and without definition. How is an offeror to bid this?</p>
	C.1.3.1	<p>This paragraph has the Government and the SP doing the same work. The extent of this work and the boundaries of this work need clarification.</p>

Section	Paragraph	State Concern
	C.1.3.1	Existing Text: C.1.3.1. Information Management and Information Technology Management. The government will provide strategic and tactical direction, policy, guidance, and program management for the IMIT program of USACE. The Service Provider (SP) shall execute the IMIT program. The IMIT program includes: • program management; • strategic planning management; <tab>• consulting services; • capital planning and investment; • programming and budgeting; • infrastructure and asset management; • life-cycle management; • contingency planning; • training for USACE workforce; • management controls; • acquisition; • end-user support and services; • collaboration technologies; • directory services; • systems management; • telework support.
	C.1.3.1	Paragraph describes general IMIT responsibilities for both Government and SP. It closes by stating “The SP shall execute the IMIT program. The IMIT program includes:”, and then proceeds to list both Government and SP functions immediately below. Listing these functions together is confusing when taken in context with the above statement in quotes. I recommend somehow splitting them out between government and SP within the list.
	C.1.3.1	C.1.3.1 and all sub headings are very similar to the sections starting C5.2 and down – confusing and need to combine.
	C.1.3.1	C.1.3.1 states The Service Provider shall execute the IMIT program. The IMIT program includes: . . .consulting services FAR 37.202 and 37.203 state that the following activities and programs are excluded or exempted from the definition of advisory or assistance services: routine information technology services unless they are an integral part of a contract for the acquisition of advisory and assistance services
	C.1.3.1	Addition: We recommend including the following in the list of services included in the IMIT program: Info Assurance Architecture Software design, development, operations, testing, and maintenance Benefit: We believe that the SP can provide the USACE the greatest cost saving when the broadest range of IT/IM services is included. Including software, architecture, and IA gives the SP the opportunity to optimize the entire IT/IM infrastructure so that all its aspects work well together.

Section	Paragraph	State Concern
	c.1.3.2	Under section C.1.3.7 Visual Information, there is no discussion of Webpage Support under the provisions of supporting the Command Information mission of the command. For that matter, there is no mention at all of the Command Information mission of the command, nor is there a delineation of responsibilities under this PWS to clearly identify the role of IM and PAO. This document may have a flaw for the reason that the “systems management” role of IM is not defined versus the “content management” role of the PAO. As this document reads now, this is a glaring weakness that could compromise the PWS and eventual bid. Right now, it is as if the IM team would be responsible for all web activity—this simply is not the case and could effect a cause to misinterpret the requirements.
	C.1.3.2	Will the Corps Enterprise Architecture be made available to offerors since this paragraph says that support must be provided "in accordance with the Corps Enterprise Architecture (CeA)"?
	C.1.3.2	The Configuration Control Board will be given authority for decision making for hardware, software, and IMIT infrastructure changes. The extent of the SP’s involvement with the Configuration Control Board (CCB) is not clear, nor is the personnel that comprise the CCB. This is a governmental function. SP membership on the board could lead to a potential conflict of interest.
	C.1.3.2	Edit: These is an extra space after the first sentence.
	C.1.3.2	C.1.3.2 requires that the SP provide automation products, however, C.1 specifically states that the Government retains sole responsibility for procurement. This is again repeated in C.3.1.2. A true PBSA would give the sole discretion to the SP to make and implement procurement decisions.
	C.1.3.2	The government will provide strategic and tactical direction, policy, guidance, and program management for all function areas in the competition. This “tactical” provision violates requirements for performance-based contracting in A-76 procurements.
	C.1.3.2	PWS: The documents reference compliance with the Army Corps of Engineer Enterprise Architecture (CeA) as a requirement and AQL; however, no documentation on the CeA is provided or readily available. Request USACE provide a copy of relevant documentation, specifications, and/or requirements that describe the CeA in
	C.1.3.2 and	Editing correction: There is an extra blank line between these two paragraphs.
	C.1.3.3	This paragraph requires the SP to coordinate infrastructure sharing with local, state and federal agencies, and with other “entities” --- Who is responsible for determining what infrastructure may be shared and with what entities it may be shared?

Section	Paragraph	State Concern
	C.1.3.3	Need to clarify what level of support is required of the service provider for communication systems in water control facilities. There are many components in a water control gaging facility. If we are not receiving information from a station, we currently dispatch a repair crew. They accomplish all repairs necessary to restore data transmissions. This could include a number of factors such as unplugging an orifice line, reinstalling equipment that has been knocked loose by debris floating down the river, changing batteries on equipment, recalibrating the data collection platform, etc. The satellite upload equipment which is part of a water control gaging facility is an integral part of that station. The Performance Work Statement provide clear lines of responsibility for this equipment or exclude this equipment from the solicitation. I see a potential situation where our work crews are dispatched to the site to make repairs, then having to wait for the Service Provider to se
	C.1.3.3	Communications. Line 2, second sentence. "The SP shall operate and maintain USACE-wide diversified and distributed communications systems ..." Here again it seems that the PWS is restricting contractors from proposing new and better options with respect to providing the service.
	C.1.3.3	These sections should make it clear that we are wanting the SP to take proactive measures.
	c.1.3.3	Define if the SP will take possession (hand receipt) of our Water Gauging Stations located at various places throughout the district. Define how maintenance costs for these will be determined for comparative evaluation purposes.
	C.1.3.3	Recommended Rewrite: C.1.3.3. Communications. The SP shall operate and maintain USACE-wide diversified and distributed communications systems including wireless voice and data, wired voice and data, and video and radio in secure and non-secure modes. USACE network data systems include wide area networks, metropolitan area networks, campus area networks, local area networks, satellite systems, and remote access through virtual private networks, asynchronous digital subscriber lines, digital subscriber lines, dial-up, and associated equipment and infrastructure. The SP shall operate and maintain these technologies in various locations and facilities including fixed buildings, floating plants, temporary field structures, and water control facilities. The SP shall coordinate infrastructure sharing between local, state, and federal agencies as well as other entities. Shared infrastructure includes systems, administrative sites, equipment, power systems, lightning protection, and grounding.

Section	Paragraph	State Concern
	C.1.3.3	<p>Replace “temporary field structures, and water control facilities” with “and temporary field structures”. Water Control is a unique mission with equipment that is exclusively used for real-time water and flood control to provide the information necessary to operate COE projects as required by the approved project Water Control Manual, Drought Contingency Plan, and Emergency Plan, and to provide for hydroelectric power, a historical record, meet environmental requirements, and prevent loss of property and life. These facilities are maintained, operated, and used by Engineers and Scientists not by IM personnel. If these facilities are included in this solicitation the potential for contract modification claims is nearly certain as a result of the cost and complexity of this additional work, and the SP may have to assume liability for loss of property and persons if they fail to provide information necessary for making critical decisions as required by Water Managers.</p>
	C.1.3.3.	<p>I cannot believe the authors of this PWS have any idea of the scope of what they’re proposing. Maintaining the “USACE-wide diversified and distributed communications systems” with respect to desktop computers, cellular services, wireless networks, video, radio, etc...that are utilized in our common day-to-day communications is one thing; however, assuming responsibility for maintaining the network of USACE hydrometeorological gages, DCP’s, security surveillance equipment, remote gate operations, and other mission critical equipment is unreasonable. As a Senior Water Resource Specialist, I must be able to respond quickly to flood situations. The guise of the PWS removes that ability, takes away control that I need to perform my job, and in my opinion places the millions of dollars worth of property and human lives downstream of all the flood control projects at risk and in harms way.</p>
	C.1.3.4	<p>Recommended Re-write: C.1.3.4. Information Assurance. The SP shall plan for, analyze, develop, implement, maintain, and enhance systems, programs, policies, procedures, and tools to ensure the integrity, availability, and confidentiality of information systems and assets. The SP shall provide protection, detection, reaction, and corrective action capability to minimize risks from attacks. The SP shall ensure that compromised or damaged information systems are restored to full functionality and a secure posture. The SP shall provide UserIDs and password management, certification and accreditation with complete documentation, public key infrastructure (PKI) support, communication security (COMSEC) support, information security (INFOSEC) training for end users, information assurance vulnerability alert (IAVA) reporting and compliance, security incident services, and system administrator (SA) and information assurance security officer (IASO) services. These products and services include</p>

Section	Paragraph	State Concern
	C.1.3.4	A statement is made that the SP will provide certification and accreditation for Information Assurance. Since the SP is doing IA for the organization the Certifying Authority (CA) for DITSCAP needs to be independent of the SP. They are the DAA's check that the SP is doing IA IAW the approved SSAA. Need to clarify who will do the Certifying Authority function.
	C.1.3.4	incorporate into paragraph: The SP shall plan and perform AVTR database management, including asset and software configuration management, template management and training reporting, as well as information assurance vulnerability alert (IAVA) reporting and compliance.
	C.1.3.4	The first two sentences in this paragraph conflict with each other.
	C.1.3.4	AR 25-2 states that contractor may not fill MSC, installation or post ISAO, IANO, IAM positions. Will this requirement be changed or will USACE be required to staff those positions?
	C.1.3.4	COMSEC support should not be included in the list of services the SP will provide per TB 3800-41, Technical Bulletin Security: Procedures for Safeguarding, Accounting and Supply Control of COMSEC Material, para 2.7.1(b) which states "The COMSEC Custodian will be a commissioned officer or warrant officer, whenever possible. If a commissioned or warrant officer is not available, a carefully selected noncommissioned officer or a permanent DA civilian (NOT A GOVERNMENT CONTRACTOR) meeting the following grade, rank, or equivalent pay criteria may be appointed..."
	c.1.3.4	Define the role and responsibility of the SP in regard to our district SCADA systems. Include discussions about routers and firewalls. Include the locks and power plant.
	C.1.3.4	Information Assurance Vulnerability Alert (IAVA) has been replaced with Information Assurance Vulnerability Management (IAVM).
	c.1.3.4	The IASO and SA are mentioned but the IANO is not. Does this mean the IANO is an inherently governmental position
	C.1.3.4	The paragraph references COMSEC support...you must be a COMSEC custodian to perform duties in this area. I didn't think non-government could perform these duties?

Section	Paragraph	State Concern
	C.1.3.5	Is it anticipated that the records management program will be comprised of these sub-programs, as outlined in AR 25-1, Chapter 8: recordkeeping systems management, official mail and distribution management, correspondence management, rulemaking (Federal Register), Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) program management, Privacy Act program management, management information control (Paperwork Reduction Act), vital records, terminology, abbreviations and brevity codes, management of records of defunct Army commands and organizations?
	C.1.3.5	C.1.3.5. Records Management. The SP shall execute a Records Management Program for USACE, its mission, its customers, and its strategic collaboration with government and non-government agencies. The records management program includes recordkeeping systems, official mail and distribution, office symbols, correspondence, rulemaking (Federal Register), Freedom of Information Act, Privacy Act, management information control (Paperwork Reduction Act), vital records, and terminology standardization subprograms. The SP shall provide products and services to capture, preserve, and make available essential evidence for USACE decisions and actions, and protect the rights and interests of the Government and individuals. The SP shall plan, analyze, develop, implement, maintain, and enhance systems, programs, procedures, and tools to ensure that the most economical and efficient management of all information of record value (regardless of media and format), document USACE official business, and e
	C.1.3.5	In the last part of this main paragraph the SP is given authority to plan, analyze, develop, and implement, maintain, and enhance systems, programs, procedures, and tools to ensure the most economical and efficient management of all information of record value.... yet the SP is not given those same privileges in managing the overall records management program in the beginning of the paragraph. What will the SP be doing?
	C.1.3.5	The first sentence indicates that the “government” will be providing direction, policy, guidance, and program management. The SP shall execute the program. The sentence is structured to suggest that the SP will only be performing (executing) tasks when directed by the government. Why is it necessary to introduce the paragraph with the first sentence if the Army directive is explicit about program management for the records management program?
	c.1.3.6	Recommend defining more clearly, for bidding purposes, the printing policy. Include discussion of what type of copier will be located and where in each office. Seems this will be necessary to get a fair bid. Will future policy changes be dictated from the CCB or will individual districts have the final say? Include discussion of this.

Section	Paragraph	State Concern
	C.1.3.6	<p>Recommended Re-write: C.1.3.6. Printing and Publications.</p> <p>The SP shall execute the Printing and Publications program for USACE, its mission, its customers, and its strategic collaboration with government and non-government agencies. The printing program consists of liaison services with the Department of Army Printing Service (DAPS), Document Automation and Production Service and the Government Printing Office including printing, large-format plotting, binding, duplication, and copying for paper and electronic media. The publications program includes forms management, publications management, and copier program management. SP is encouraged to propose creative solutions to management practices, products or services provided that will result in increased efficiency and/or effectiveness of IM/IT support.</p> <p>The government will provide strategic planning, policy, directives and final approval of any major changes to IM/IT support. Rationale for Re-write: 1.<tab>Added DAPS to list o</p>
	C.1.3.7	<p>Recommended Re-write: C.1.3.7. Visual Information. The SP shall execute the Visual Information (VI) program for USACE, its mission, its customers, and its strategic collaboration with government and non-government agencies. The VI program includes production and support of audiovisual, photography, videography, graphics, multimedia, computer animation, technical illustration, desktop publishing, video teleconferencing, exhibits, and technical editing and writing products and services. Rationale for Re-write: 1.<tab>Added and support to production, and added VTC and exhibits to list. 2.<tab>Removed first sentence and added last two sentences as commented on earlier.</p>
	c.1.3.7	<p>Recommend “conference support” be identified in this paragraph.</p>
	c.1.3.7	<p>Under section C.1.3.7 Visual Information, there is no discussion of Webpage Support under the provisions of supporting the Command Information mission of the command. For that matter, there is no mention at all of the Command Information mission of the command, nor is there a delineation of responsibilities under this PWS to clearly identify the role of IM and PAO. This document may have a flaw for the reason that the “systems management” role of IM is not defined versus the “content management” role of the PAO. As this document reads now, this is a glaring weakness that could compromise the PWS and eventual bid. Right now, it is as if the IM team would be responsible for all web activity—this simply is not the case and could effect a cause to misinterpret the requirements.</p>

Section	Paragraph	State Concern
	C.1.3.7	A statement is made that the SP will provide “desktop publishing, and technical editing and writing products and services. Current PAO has Public Affairs Specialists (1035) and Writers (1082) that do writing, editing, desktop publishing and photograph as part of the PAO function. These are done outside the current Visual Information functions of the Visual Information Specialists (1084) and Photographers (1060). PA Specialist’s Training Program includes writing, editing, desktop publishing and photograph as part of their training. It is unclear what VI functions the SP will do and what functions the PAO will do.
	C.1.3.7	Under section C.1.3.7. Visual Information, there is no discussion of Webpage Support under the provisions of supporting the Command Information mission of the command. For that matter, there is no mention at all of the Command Information mission of the command, not is there a delineation of responsibilities under this PWS to clearly identify the role of IM and PAO. I think this document is flawed for that reason as the "systems management" role of IM is not defined versus the "content management" role of the PAO. As this document reads now, this is a glaring weakness that could compromise the PWS and eventual bid. Right now, it is as if the IM team would be responsible for all web activity -- this simply is not the case and could effect a cause to misinterpret the requirements.
	C.1.3.7	Addition to last sentence. Should read: "... technical and substantive editing..."
	C.1.3.7	Under section C.1.3.7. Visual Information, there is no discussion of Webpage Support under the provisions of supporting the Command Information mission of the command. For that matter, there is no mention at all of the Command Information mission of the command, not is there a delineation of responsibilities under this PWS to clearly identify the role of IM and PAO. I think this document is flawed for that reason as the "systems management" role of IM is not defined versus the "content management" role of the PAO. As this document reads now, this is a glaring weakness that could compromise the PWS and eventual bid. Right now, it is as if the IM team would be responsible for all web activity -- this simply is not the case and could effect a cause to misinterpret the requirements.
	c.1.4	Recommend TE-17 Unique Missions and Workloads be introduced and discussed here.

Section	Paragraph	State Concern
	C.1.4	<p>Recommended Re-write: USACE WORK ENVIRONMENT.</p> <p>The various missions assigned to USACE are distributed among the districts and other offices. The distribution is not uniform. Each division, district, center, laboratory, and field operating activity has a unique, diverse, and complex combination of missions that are described in a Technical Exhibit to this PWS. A general description of the business and IM/IT support work environments for today and the future can be found in the Corps Enterprise Architecture Technical Exhibit (TE). USACE on-board staff, that make up the majority of IM/IT customers can be found at TE 13. Rationale for Re-write: Need to point prospective SPs to CeA and staffing map. Added TE 13 and CeA TE to text.</p>
	C.1.4	<p>All organizational levels identified in the first sentence are not consistent with those identified in the third sentence.</p>
	C.1.5	<p>Part 1 of 3 Part Comment: As stated on Page 4 of the 2nd Draft PWS, the Corps Water Management System (CWMS) is exempt. CWMS software provides reservoir and river system status, flow, and decision support information needed to accomplish the water management mission of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. Section C.1.5. GENERAL REQUIREMENTS of the 2nd Draft PWS states, “The SP shall abide by the provisions and regulations set forth in this PWS”. The water management mission U.S. Army Corps of Engineers is regulated per ER-110-2.249 “Management of Water Control Data Systems”. This ER regulates “the management of water control data systems (WCDS) including the equipment and software used for acquisition, transmission, and processing of real-time data used to regulate water projects for which the Corps of Engineers is responsible”. The ER further defines WCDS as “all hardware and software within the jurisdiction of a Corps of Engineers office which has been acquired and is being used for acquisition, transmission, processing, display, and dissemination of hydrologic, meteorological, water quality, and project data for the purpose of supporting the water control mission of the Corps of Engineers. This includes computer workstations, microcomputers, X-terminals, port servers, hardcopy devices, water control subnet local area network (LAN) components, data communication devices and circuits, uninterruptible power supplies, field data collection platforms, and other associated components.” Additionally, ER-110-2.249 states that “the WCDS is a dedicated purpose system existing only to support the regulation of the Corps of Engineers Congressionally authorized water resource projects”. However, WCDS is neither defined or included in TE-17. Please include and define WCDS in the document.</p>

Section	Paragraph	State Concern
	c.1.5	General Requirements states “the SP shall abide by the provisions and regulations set forth in this PWS and all applicable federal, state, and local statutes”. Therefore, in abiding by Engineer Regulation 1110-2-249, the SP would not have responsibility for the Management of Water Control Data Systems. That direct responsibility is assigned to the Water Control Management chain of command. This needs to be submitted into the PWS.
	c.1.5	Recommend defining “applicable” statutes and define who will provide these to the SP. Also recommend that USACE and district policies be included.
	c.1.5	This section should be expanded to include other requirements the SP must abide by such as policy and directives. Recommend policy include local, regional, Corps, Army, and DoD policy levels. If SP is expected to abide by Best Practices or audit responses or security guidelines or other requirements, it should be stated here. See C.1.6.5.3 for requirement to follow security policies. Should this be consistent for all mission areas?
	c.1.5	Paragraph C.1.5. Add the following: "SP standard Operating Procedure updates shall be coordinated with and approved by the Government prior to implementation."
	C.1.5	<p>The Rock Island District operates twenty navigation locks and dams on the Mississippi River and Illinois Waterway, and three flood control reservoirs in Iowa. All projects are operated in compliance with regulations from higher authority. Our regulators coordinate closely with our EOC as well as with other State, Local and Federal agencies. Many times projects must be regulated during “off duty” hours at a moments notice. Improper operation of these projects could result in damage to private property and endanger public safety.</p> <p>Proper regulation of these water resource projects is only made possible by timely access to our Water Control Data System (WCDS). The Rock Island WCDS is made effective by Water Control personnel that not only understand project regulation and hydrology, but also understand IT technology and how to integrate it into the WCDS. This requires a unique skill set by Water Control System Managers and Data Acquisition Managers. It takes years to gain the experience and develop the skills required to manage a WCDS. Because of the critical mission Water Control plays in operating this nation’s water resource projects, great care must be taken in defining which portions of the WCDS are eligible for the SP to perform. It is recommended that the SP perform the Site Manager’s duties as defined in ER 1110-2-249.</p>

Section	Paragraph	State Concern
	C.1.5	Throughout the PWS, must clarify whether the SP must comply with regulations, etc. in effect at the time of award or whether it must comply with later issued regulations, etc. If so, will additional payment be made if the new/revised regulations create additional
	C.1.5	1. PWS(2nd Draft):C.1.5 - bad sentence at top of p. 12 The SP shall plan, analyze, develop, implement, maintain, and enhance systems, programs, procedures, and tools to ensure that the most economical and efficient management of all information of record value (regardless of media and format), document USACE official business, and ensure that the accessibility of record information throughout the life cycle of the information. C.1.3.6. Printing and Publications.
	C.1.5	5.<tab>Consider combining sections 1.5 General Requirements and all of 1.6 Personnel into a single General Requirements section. Both of the current sections address general requirements of the SP. a)<tab>It is not clear what the management requirements of the SP are. It is also not clear what periodic reports are required. Consider adding a Service Provider Management Requirements section such as the following: SP responsibility shall include the planning, programming, administration, management, and execution necessary to provide the specified services in this PWS. The SP shall perform all related administrative services required to perform work including, but not limited to, material requisitioning, Quality Control, financial control (cost control/savings), status/tracking reports, and correspondence. The SP shall also maintain accurate and complete records, files, and libraries of documents to include, but not limited to, federal, state, and local regulations, codes, laws, tech
	C.1.5 General	Include local policy, Corps policy, Army policy, directives.
	c.1.5.2.1	How do we know the proper level of investigation each SP contracted staff need? Is the investigation required to be complete before the contractor walks in the door – that is can they get a logon ID and password before a background check has been completed?
	C.1.5.5.7	2nd Sentence - "The supervisor and alternate shall be available 24 hours a day, 7 days a week,..." - unclear whether both had to be available 24/7 at the same time or only when each is on 'duty'. I would assume that not both have to be available 24/7 at the same

Section	Paragraph	State Concern
	C.1.6	Non-citizen Personnel: We recommend that the SP be allowed to employ individuals who are legal permanent residents or who have legal work visas. These individuals must pass appropriate security requirements. Benefit: There are many trustworthy and highly skilled individuals in the IT industry who work permanently in the United States and are not citizens. Allowing the SP to employ such individuals will ensure that the SP can provide the USACE with the top technical skills required.
	C.1.6	3. PWS(2nd Draft):C.1.6- also bottom of page 12 - subject verb agreement All SP personnel occupying an IT-I or IT-II position must be a U.S. citizen. (Each SP employee...must be a U.S. citizen. or All SP personnel...must be U.S. citizens.)
	C.1.6	2. PWS(2nd Draft):C.1.6 - bottom of page 12 - must be understandable on the telephone
	C.1.6	Clarify what is meant by "DAA that accredited the system."
	C.1.6.	Add to PWS C.1.6. - Personnel shall have advanced and effective communication skills.
	C.1.6.1	Recommended Re-write: C.1.6.1 Program Manager(s) and Key Personnel. The SP shall provide the name and telephone numbers of the program manager(s) and an alternate(s). The SP shall provide name, title, phone numbers and e-mail address for each individual that has lead responsibility for providing onsite IM/IT support at each installation as shown in Figure 1. The SP must assign a program manager(s) to be responsible for the overall management and coordination of the USACE-wide effort and shall be the central point of contact with the Contracting Officer. The program manager(s) shall be available for discussion with the Contracting Officer or designated representative during normal operating hours. When performance is required outside normal operating hours, an individual shall be designated by the SP to act for the program manager(s). The SP shall furnish to the Contracting Officer a copy of the SP's organizational chart for the performance of this PWS during the transition period.
	C.1.6.1	PWS: This paragraph refers to program managers and project managers. The use of these terms and the distinction between them is not clear. We recommend the term program manager be reserved for the SP individual with overall responsibility and authority for all aspects of USACE IMIT contact performance. We recommend that the term project manager be reserved for an individual with lead responsibility for a project such as deploying a new phone system. We recommend that the management point of contact at each installation in Figure 1 be given a title reflective of the responsibilities, e.g., IMIT onsite manager.

Section	Paragraph	State Concern
	C.1.6.1	Is the Program Manager described in this paragraph the same individual described as the Supervisor in para. C.1.6.5.6?
	C.1.6.1	Program Manager(s) and Key Personnel. Second sentence. "The SP shall provide onsite program manager(s) at each installation as shown in Figure 1 ..." This prescribes the support be provided the way the service is provided now. This requirement should be addressed in a performance-based style that would allow contractors to propose management structures that reflect current, new organizational and management designs and approaches.
	C.1.6.1	In the sentence "The SP shall provide onsite program manager(s) at each installation as shown in Figure 1 during normal operating hours." "installation" should be changed to "organization" or "activity" or "site" since the items listed in figure 1 are not installations.
	C.1.6.1	PWS: This paragraph states, "The program manager(s) shall be responsible for the overall management and coordination of the effort." This statement implies an organizational structure for the SP with the work for each installation managed locally. This is contrary to USACE ideas for centralization of IMIT work. Organizing by installation may not facilitate the SP's ability to deliver quality service at the lowest price. We recommend that USACE not impose any organization structure on the SP and that the SP have the maximum flexibility to leverage experience and best practices in structuring the delivery organization.
	C.1.6.1	This is a direct statement that instructs the SP how to meet a particular customer support criteria rather than a performance based criteria that doesn't specifically identify a particular solution. If performance criteria were developed for on-site support, it could be possible to reduce costs. As an example, this sentence requires an on site staff member from the SP at both the NWD Division office and NWP District office, both located in downtown Portland, OR. It is possible that with a performance based statement to perform this function, a bidder could propose one person servicing both of these sites. Is it the governments intention that the site program manager be different than the on-site supervisors and alternates required in C.1.6.5.7?

Section	Paragraph	State Concern
	C.1.6.1	Clarification request: Please clarify the role of the Program Manager (PM) at each installation. We assume that a PM is a very senior individual. Recommendation: We believe that the PWS should allow a centralized solution in which very senior PM-level individuals are not required at all installations. The SP would provide appropriate on-site personnel to handle those issues that could not be resolved from a central facility. Benefit: Today's computing and communications capabilities can provide an immediate high-quality technical response from a central location that will solve most problems. This allows the SP to use expensive technical resource effectively and lower the overall cost of services to the USACE.
	C.1.6.1	requires the SP to “. . . provide onsite program manager(s) at each installation as shown in Figure 1 during normal operating hours.” This is a directive statement that instructs the SP how to meet a particular customer support criteria rather than a performance based criteria that doesn't specifically identify a particular solution. If performance criteria were developed for on-site support, rather than specifying a prescriptive requirement, it could be possible to reduce costs. The use of performance based criteria would allow the SP the flexibility to have a single program manager be responsible for multiple sites, as long as response times, etc. are met. This provision violates requirements for performance-based contracting in A-76 procurements.
	C.1.6.1	The second sentence states that the SP shall provide onsite program manager(s) at each installation as shown in Figure 1 during normal duty hours. Three points: 1) The word "installations" is a bad word to use. We don't have installations in the traditional sense. The word "activities" should be used, or another word. 2) Not all of the "installations" shown in Figure 1 are included in the competition. 3) Some of the installations shown in Figure 1 are co-located. In those instances, the SP should be allowed to have a single program manager oversee work for two activities.
	C.1.6.2	Who will provide badging (CAC card and local ID) services, AKO account activation and building access roster services? While later sections of the PWS state that the SP will operate the DEERS/RAPID card station those sites that don't have this will have to work the logistics of getting new personnel to a CAC issue site.
	c.1.6.2	Recommend changing last sentence from “AKO email account” to “AKO account including email” for clarity.
	c.1.6.2	Should last word be Officer, Officers, Office, or Offices? Each has different meaning. Recommend using Offices.
	C.1.6.2	Will the USACE Security Officer have the ability to grant SP access to specific areas at specific sites?

Section	Paragraph	State Concern
	C.1.6.2	The SP shall provide to the Contracting Officer a list of all employees who will perform under this PWS during the transition period. The term "transition," as used here, is ambiguous. Circular A-76 describes this period as "Phase In."
	C.1.6.2	The second paragraph addresses using CAC for building/area access. In some buildings/areas, a CAC is not used. Another card or form of identification is used. The paragraph should be written to be more generic in the form of card or identification required for building/area access.
	C.1.6.2	Edit: The last sentence uses the word "account" and refers to "Common Access Cards". The first is singular and the later is plural. "Common Access Cards" should probably be changed to singular.
	C.1.6.2	Could not find a reference to what is and duration of "the transition period." Please provide.
	C.1.6.2	Is it the intent of the PWS that new SP employees will obtain an AKO account and CAC prior to obtaining Contracting Officer approval?
	C.1.6.2	Identification of SP Employee. ADD. THE LIST SHALL CONTAIN THE SP'S NAME, CONTRACT NUMBER, FULL NAME OF EMPLOYEE,, JOB TITLE OR POSITION HELD BY EACH EMPLOYEE.....SECURITY CLEARANCE,, and
	C.1.6.3	Conflict of Interest. The SP shall not employ off-duty COTR or government surveillance personnel Why just these two groups. All Government personnel should be restricted. as quality assurance evaluators, quality assurance specialists, technical monitors, or inspectors or for any other position, if such employment would create a conflict of interest or be contrary to the policies contained in conflict-of-interest directives used by USACE and its entities as determined by the Contracting Officer.
	c.1.6.5	Paragraph C.1.6.5. Security Requirements. Add the following: "Since a variety of internal and external audit groups may perform reviews/audits of IMIT operations and use the General Accountability Office (GAO) Federal Information System Controls Audit Manual (FISCAM) to perform their work, the SP personnel and all representatives of the SP shall refer to the checklists in the FISCAM to ensure effective internal controls are in place, are effective, and are complied with. In addition, the SP personnel should coordinate any procedures established with other organizations (e.g., human resources, Security, and Resource Management) in place to ensure effective internal management security controls."
	C.1.6.5.1	line 4 add "or leased" after "...upon entering and exiting USACE-owned..."

Section	Paragraph	State Concern
	C.1.6.5.1	The last sentence addresses search in USACE-owned facilities. It should apply to USACE-leased facilities as well. Recommend changing the sentence to read ... USACE-owned or leased facilities...
	C.1.6.5.1	Add under Search and Seizure that any SP with SECRET or TOP SECRET clearance shall be required to submit to random drug testing at SP expense. Currently this is required of Gov't employees in these position should not it also be required of the SP
	C.1.6.5.1	Addresses USCAE owned facilities and Federal complexes. It does not address commercially rented space, where some CORP offices are housed.
	C.1.6.5.1	There should be a statement somewhere in the document about the use of government equipment, is subject to monitoring for lawful purposes, etc.
	C.1.6.5.2	The SP shall be responsible for the cost of all security assurance background investigations needed in the performance of tasks included in this PWS. In the past the Army or DOD has provided this service and funded it, at least for Government personnel? Do all Government personnel now have to fund this, or is this just for
	c.1.6.5.2.1	Does "high risk positions" mean IT-I and IT-II positions or something else? Are these requirements or number of current positions identified somewhere?
	C.1.6.5.2.1	Level of Investigation Required. Why specify that SP personnel occupying high-risk positions have a favorable BI and not those occupying low to moderate risk positions? It seems that you have set the same standard for both classes of SP employees which is unfairly onerous.
	C.1.6.5.2.1	PWS: Section C.1.6.5.2.1. "Employees occupying positions that require access to classified material must hold appropriate security clearances up to Top Secret level." Request USACE specify the locations that require these security clearances and the functions performed.

Section	Paragraph	State Concern
	C.1.6.5.2.1.	<p>Level of Investigation – SP site, unclassified: Some of the USACE services may be provided from a SP site and involve unclassified materials. For such locations, we recommend that the employees pass the same level of investigation already required at those sites to protect the business–essential data of commercial firms. Level of Investigation – USACE site: We recommend that all SP employees working at USACE sites comply with USACE security requirements for classified and unclassified information. Benefit: Allowing the SP to provide some USACE services from existing SP sites will bring added efficiencies and provide the highest service levels at the lowest cost to the USACE. These existing sites already have personnel security requirements to protect the IT/IM services performed for commercial and other government customers.</p>
	c.1.6.5.2.2	<p>Recommend “access” be changed to “physical and/or virtual access”. Remote access to systems by unsuitable individuals should be</p>
	c.1.6.5.3	<p>Is Physical security the only area that the SP must follow USACE, Army, and DoD policy? Its inclusion here and omission in other areas implies this. Recommend all policy for followed in all mission areas and stated as such in PWS.</p>
	c.1.6.5.3	<p>Recommend coordinating this with the district Security Officer. Also, considering some of these duties are now the responsibility of the district Security Officer (varies from district to district), it will be difficult to compare proposals between contractors and the Government.</p>
	C.1.6.5.3	<p>The SP would be limited in its approach for efficiently handling Physical Security Plans following this paragraph. Could not the SP submit one Enterprise Physical Security Plan to the COTR and not at each local or regional locations? The Physical Security Plan shall be submitted through each local government security office to the Contracting Officer and to the Regional Security Program Manager during the transition period. The Government will perform final review and acceptance of the Physical Security Plan and any subsequent changes. Changes to the Physical Security Plan shall be submitted to the Contracting Officer not later than 3 workdays prior to the proposed effective date of the change. The SP shall supply information for security audits authorized by the Contracting Officer.</p>
	C.1.6.5.3	<p>Clarify what is meant by “local government security office” and “Regional Security Program Manager.” The Government will not be responsible in any way for damage to the SP’s property or to the SP personnel’s personal belongings that are damaged or destroyed by fire, theft, accident, or other occurrence. Overly broad, unduly burdensome. Makes the SP liable even if the Government is negligent in causing fire, theft, accident or other occurrence!!!</p>

Section	Paragraph	State Concern
	C.1.6.5.3	C.1.6.5.3 Physical security. Level of Physical Security: Some of the USACE services may be provided from a SP site and involve unclassified materials. For such locations, we recommend that the SP use the same physical security procedures already required at those sites to protect the business–essential data of commercial firms. Benefits: Allowing the SP to provide some USACE services from existing SP sites will bring added efficiencies and provide the highest service levels at the lowest cost to the USACE. These existing sites already have the physical security requirements to protect the IT/IM services performed for commercial and other government customers.
	C.1.6.5.3 –	Why is this a requirement for IM? Formerly, it was a requirement for the Security and Law Enforcement Office.
	C.1.6.5.4	Appropriate control of lock combinations does not include providing combinations to the COTR for any reason. Access to lock material or facilities should be done IAW with Army Regulations firstly.
	C.1.6.5.7.	Is the "onsite supervisor" referenced in this paragraph the same as the "program manager(s)" referenced in paragraph C.1.6.1 ?
	C.1.6.6	Does this paragraph need to address at whose cost, especially as this might require some travel.
	C.1.7	C.1.7 Quality Control – consider beefing up this section by adding references the SP developing an assessment plan covering all services required by the PWS specifying areas to be reviewed on both a scheduled and unscheduled basis; a method acceptable to the Government for identifying, preventing, and resolving deficiencies in the quality of service performed under the PWS before the level of performance becomes unacceptable and that also addresses processes for corrective action without dependence upon Government direction; a customer complaint feedback system for corrections of validated complaints and to inform the customer of corrections; and methods of direct and indirect communications including regular and formal meetings with the CO or COTR.
	c.1.9	Recommend adding “SP shall identify all facilities used to support this contract prior to use. CO shall be notified of any new facilities prior to use for approval.”

Section	Paragraph	State Concern
	C.3	This whole page does not clearly define whether the facilities are in reference to Government facilities and equipment we are providing to be serviced by the SP and those being provided for specific use and occupancy by the SP for their use in providing service, which confuses the whole section. C.3.1.1. Government furnished facilities and C.3.1.1.1. Modifications, seem to refer to space assigned and used by the SP. It is especially confusing in the last sentence of C3.1.1.2. Real Property Leased by Government where it states, "Property leased or rented by the Government, which will be provided to the SP, is listed in TE-4." In reviewing TE-4, it lists not only leased property but also Government owned property right down to various gauging stations, but TE-4 was not found to be directly referenced anywhere else other than in this paragraph on leased property. The way this is written the prospective SP may think all the property in TE-4 for their use, which cannot be the case.
	C.3.1.2	Does the USACE plan to continue to capitalize desktop and infrastructure hardware or shift the risk to the contractor and begin including the hardware as an element of the overall computing service provided by the contractor?
	C.3.1.2	Corps Enterprise Architecture (CeA): We recommend that the USACE specify that the architecture be established by mutual agreement between the USACE and the SP. Benefit: Mutual agreement will enable the USACE/SP team to create an optimum solution using best practices. The resulting architecture will provide the best overall solution that incorporates both USACE and SP assets.
	C.3.1.2.1	paragraph should read: No later than 10 days prior to the start of contract performance, the SP shall provide written identification of equipment custodians and alternates that "will" hold hand receipts....
	C.3.1.2.1	Sub-paragraph (c) instructs the SP to use APPMS and barcodes to manage equipment. Some equipment, under a certain dollar threshold, is not tracked in APPMS nor is a bar code used. Other methods may be employed to track some equipment.
	c.3.1.2.1	Property Issue. Some of the property items listed were purchased with specific project funds, including laptops, computer monitors, data loggers, printers, etc. I feel that a lot of the equipment listed should remain the property of the end user. Property management is very labor intensive and I feel should be the responsibility of the local individual using the equipment.

Section	Paragraph	State Concern
	C.3.1.4	This essentially removes all of the responsibility for decision-making for IT provisioning from the Service Provider (SP) and places it with the Government. This means that the contract is a services-based contract (perform these specific services as directed by the Government) as opposed to a performance-based contract where the SP is free to choose the method of meeting requirements.
	C.3.1.4	It is unclear whether or not this paragraph applies to Government-furnished local or regional automated information systems.
	C.3.1.6	appears that it would fit better in C.4., SP responsibilities. However, if it stays where it is, the C.5. reference is incorrect and should be changed to C.4.
	c.5	Suggest adding a summary of general contractor tasks that would enable a network-centric enterprise. For example: The USACE requires a comprehensive, integrated approach that will require the following tasks: 1. Analyze the existing architecture to design a recommended solution, 2. Recommend a preferred infrastructure to implement the proposed solution, 3. Recommend a phased migration and implementation plan, 4. Implement a recommended objective architecture including the following features, 5. Provide an enterprise infrastructure operated and maintained by a single organization to support a network-centric, knowledge-based force, 6. Consolidate all network management functions, 7. Provide service management to the Districts, 8. Centralize IT procurement to standardize the equipment, optimize cost savings via equipment leasing, and S/W maintenance, 9. Consolidate the help desk and implement network security, 10. Evaluate and recommend a network infrastructure to optimize the new consolidated enterprise architecture.
	C.5.1	C.5.1 – IMIT Management Section - special or ad hoc project support is not addressed. Recommend adding the following sub-section: Special Projects – The SP shall provide expert assistance as directed in aiding the Government when special projects arise. Examples of special projects include, but are not, limited to, Knowledge Management, e-Gov, Electronic Document Management, and other ad hoc projects as the requirements are identified by the Corps???
	C.5.1.1	The heading of this paragraph is "Program Management", yet the paragraph discusses "project management". The effort described in this paragraph does not seem to fit the definition of Program Management provided in paragraph c.2.1. Recommend the paragraph heading be changed to "Project Management".
	C.5.1.3.4	19.<tab>C.5.1.3.4 New Technologies – recommend adding industry best practices here as well – i.e. stay abreast of new technologies and industry best practices.

Section	Paragraph	State Concern
	C.5.1.5	More detail is needed in this paragraph and its sub-paragraphs. Separate budgets must be prepared for each organization shown in Figure 1, including their subordinate directorates, offices and field offices, except for those activities not included in the competition. The budgets must indicate which items are charged to overhead, department overhead, specific projects or are reimbursable. IMO budget personnel also make determinations as to what bills are costed to which accounts. They also review and certify bills for payment to insure they are correct, negotiate bill adjustments with service providers, review bills for indications of unauthorized use of government resources, provide supervisors with evidence to use to justify disciplinary actions and reimbursements to the government by employees for unauthorized use of government resources. They, then, make monthly cost distributions in CEFMS.
	C.5.1.6.2	Must each proposed individual purchase be approved or will the CCB approve a plan for replacement at the commencement of contract performance covering all future purchases? If CCB approval is granted, must the SP also seek contracting officer approval? If not, conflicts with previous provisions.
	C.5.1.6.6	20.<tab>C.5.1.6.6 Physical Layout Designs (Floor Plans) – section was not clear about what was being supported. For example, our Logistics Management Office partners with our CADD section (in Engineering) to maintain the floor plans. IM consults with LM when office or cubicle changes need to be made, designs and implements related changes to the cabling system, and makes appropriate changes to cabling documentation. IM maintains diagrams on where network and phone connections are on each floor, how they are numbered, and how and where the cabling connects in the Communication closet on each floor.
	C.5.2.2	Will HEC or local field sites still have control of real-time CWMS Data Dissemination? Real time data dissemination is critical to our water management operations as well as emergency management operations.
	c.5.24	Fax machines are not listed.

Section	Paragraph	State Concern
	C.5.3.1.4	The stream-gauging program will be impacted. The PWS proposes that the SP install, program, and maintain Data Collection Platforms (DCPs). Currently the role of personnel performing these tasks is not limited to the care of DCPs, but includes non-IT related stream-gauging support: maintenance of mechanical equipment, cleaning of intakes to wells, and taking field measurements of streams. Implementation of this proposal would lead to additional personnel performing tasks that were previously consolidated - this does not appear to be efficient or cost effective. Additionally, Corps districts have cooperative agreements with other federal and state agencies for maintenance and data sharing; stakeholders should be included in the process.
	C.5.3.2.4.4	Is the SP expected to provide switchboard operators at all locations? Please clarify
	C.5.3.4.4.1	The paragraph should add a little more detail by stating for both fixed and mobile systems.
	C.5.3.5.2.8	Radio and Microwave Towers. What organization or institution issues "tower climbing certifications"?
	C.5.4	Paragraph says SP will be responsible for performing "information assurance security officer (IASO) services". Per AR25-2, the Installation IASO position may only be filled by a Government employee. You can have multiple IASOs at an installation, but only one Installation IASO per Installation. By DoD definition and HQUSACE usage and operations, each District should have an Installation IASO. The text should be modified to "information assurance security officer (IASO) services other than that of the installation IASO".
	c.5.4..2.7	Add "authorized" between "end user's" and "network". As written, it compels automatic re-establishment of access.
	C.5.4.10	System backups should include backup of voicemail systems, PC's (data backups and Ghost Imaging), IT equipment (i.e. Routers, switch) configurations, etc. The frequency of backups should allow the recovery of a minimal loss of data, and quick recovery during a system failure or disaster.
	C.5.4.4.3	There is no mention that I can see stating the SP will also operate the CAC equipment to issue CAC IDs and cut the actual cards. Should this also be a function of the SP?
	C.5.4.7.1	Network Scanning: What tools and what criteria are expected?
	C.5.5 & C.5.5.4	C.5.5 Clarification: Please provide additional information on the USACE requirements for records management. C.5.5.4 Clarification: Please provide additional information on the USACE requirements for correspondence management.

Section	Paragraph	State Concern
	C.5.5.1.15	Records Storage: The requirement for local Records Holding Areas at each level of command precludes the savings that could be realized by combining and consolidating Records Holding Areas
	C.5.5.1.9	In relation to Temporary Records. RS 257: Is it intended that these records be given the same life cycle management reviews and inspections as paper records, above? It is not explicit in the T.E.
	C.5.5.2.1.	In this paragraph it refers to delivering freight. I am not sure of the other Districts, but in SPK, we do not deliver freight.
	C.5.5.6.1	Should the paragraph also include the retrieval of electronic records as well from either an EDMS or file server backups?
	C.5.7.3.4.	The SP shall provide cataloging, cross referencing, disposition, and submission to the Digital Visual Library (DVL) "and or" onsite archives. "and or" should just be "and". IAW ER 25-1-91 submission to the DVL is not optional.
	C.6.1.1.	Add ER 25-1-2 31 August 1999 LIFE CYCLE MANAGEMENT OF INFORMATION SYSTEMS (LCMIS)
	C.6.1.5.	Add ER 25-1-74 21 Mar 94 ELECTRONIC MAIL
	C1.23	This comment concerns services provided during emergency operations in general. I did not see deployment time mentioned anywhere in the document. In Emergency Operations, USACE employees are normally expected to deploy within 6 hours of notification. Will the SP be required to do the same. If not, the impact to USACE response should be researched.
	C1.23	Is this requirement intended for SP to provide all IT personnel and support during emergency operations including manning of mobile emergency vehicles? If so, then DTOS and related requirements for rapid deployment need to be stated?
	C1.23	In the emergency operations section, work under PL 84-99 and work under PL 93-288 (Federal Response Plan) are mentioned in the introductory paragraph. However, the next paragraph refers to danger pay and post differential pay. These pay incentives are not normally related to our work for FEMA under the FRP. Those are pay items for OCONUS work like the Global War On Terrorism Mission in Afghanistan and Iraq.
	C1.24.6	No scope information is provided for this item.
	last	Define more clearly, in terms of the role of the SP, the difference between responsibility for operation versus development of the exempted AIS systems. Seems like currently these roles overlap quite a bit making it difficult to get a comparative proposal between a private contractor and the government.

Section	Paragraph	State Concern
	last	<p>CEMVS-ED requests that all personnel involved in the operation and maintenance of the CWMS/WCDS be exempted from the A-76 competition. Water Control Management personnel are listed as “inherently governmental” in the FAIR ACT (Federal Activities Inventory Reform Act of 1998). As such, the operation and maintenance of the CWMS/WCDS should be exempted unless a formal risk analysis is performed.</p>
	last	<p>CEMVS-ED-H requests that the exempted CWMS AIS in this PWS be additionally exempted from the SP operation responsibility as per the following reasons: Water Control Management is a “real-time” mission critical function. The Water Control Data System (WCDS) is the primary decision support system utilized by the Corps water control management community in performing their mission critical function. The Corps has been undergoing a modernization of the WCDS by replacing computer hardware, upgrading data acquisition hardware and software, creating a corporate water control database system, and upgrading and developing new modeling and decision support software. This modernization effort of the WCDS is actually producing much more than a data system, and therefore, to capture the scope of the modernized system, the WCDS has been incorporated into the overall Corps Water Management System (CWMS). The CWMS is an AIS that is being designed for water managers and water management decision makers within the Corps. The WCDS is a nationwide integrated system of hardware, software, and personnel that allows access to virtually any data and information in the system. Water Control Management and the WCDS are designated as “Mission Critical Functions” in a “real-time” mode (24hrs/day, 365days/yr). The WCDS is comprised of many different parts. These include data acquisition, data dissemination, database management, hydraulic and hydrologic modeling, hardware, software, planning, budgeting, operation and maintenance. All of these parts form the “WCDS”. The WCDS is undergoing a Corpswide “modernization” process that began in 1991 and is targeted for completion in 2010. This process is directed by the Army, through the Life Cycle Information Management System (LCMIS), to develop the most efficient and effective WCDS possible. A great amount of time, effort, and funding has been expended on this project, Corpswide. This “modernization” is being designed with great forethought.</p>

Section	Paragraph	State Concern
	last	<p>This “modernization” is being designed with great forethought, creativity, and effort that will allow for improved responsiveness in information acquisition, processing, display, and communications exchange and will allow the water control personnel to serve its customers in a more real-time manner. Water Control personnel were trained to be a “jack of all trades”, having the responsibility of a person of many “hats”. These “hats” consisted of administering and operating a multitude of data collection systems, a multitude of computer operating systems, and a multitude of applications which are utilized to perform the Water Control critical mission. Personnel involved with administering and operating water control computers need to be intimately involved with the whole water control process and mission. They must know the unique hardware and the operating systems, and at the same time, know the specialized software (Hydraulic and Hydrologic modeling software, meteorologic software, GIS, etc.) and how that software interacts with the operating systems and the overall WCDS. This approach allows the water control personnel to become more intimately involved with the entire system, which in turn, allows water control personnel to make more timely, more informed, and more confident decisions in the daily activities. This is accomplished with hydraulic/civil engineers and hydrologic technicians who have been trained for this mission. These personnel operate, maintain, and troubleshoot the WCDS. Currently, the WCDS is a very cohesive system. Taking away one of the integral parts would disrupt the cohesiveness and adversely impact the efficiency and effectiveness of the WCDS and how we serve our customers. The Corps has numerous partnership MOU’s and MOA’s with other Federal and State agencies who utilize the WCDS. Fragmenting the cohesive system will create less efficiency and effectiveness for these frequent users. It is imperative that the physical locations of the WCDS c</p>
	last	<p>Recommend clarifying the definition of the CWMS AIS to reflect that the Water Control Data System (WCDS), in its’ entirety, be included as a part of the CWMS AIS. This includes, but not limited to, the data acquisition, data dissemination, database management, hydraulic and hydrologic modeling, hardware, software, planning, budgeting, operation and maintenance. Further discussion/description is in comment above.</p>

Section	Paragraph	State Concern
	last	It is imperative that the physical locations of the WCDS components stay with the water control personnel who interact with the WCDS on a continuous basis and who make decisions for this mission critical function. As stated in ER –1110-2-249, Management of Water Control Data Systems, “efficient, reliable, and uninterrupted operation of the WCDS is required to ensure no adverse impact, whether intentional or unintentional, on public health, safety and welfare”. Disrupting the cohesiveness of the WCDS will adversely
	last paragraph	The last paragraph states that "Also, the SP shall accept responsibility for only the operation of all exempt AIS's." Comment: This statement covers the CWMS without specifically stating what the operational responsibility is. Are we to assume that the SP will perform all operational tasks as outlined in the draft? This statement is vague.
	Last paragraph	Introduction, page 4, last paragraph Need a very clear delineation for what the service provider is responsible for and what remains for the functional community. Please use examples, e.g., CWMS (Is the water control gage collection network included and defined as a service provider activity?); Use CEFMS to define the SP responsibility versus the user responsibility (data manager versus database manager). Is it included or not?
	RS 87 –	Break out classified and unclassified. The deviation would be 1% deviation for unclassified and 0% for classified. Apply this to both RS 87 and RS 88. Define USACE safety and standards or define plans, e.g., Fire Prevention Plan, Physical Security Plan, etc.
	RS 104 –	1. Correct paragraph number reference C.5.3.14 – should read C.5.3.1.4. 2. Delete last sentence of standard, “Must submit frequency management actions.” Should read, “Upon service request or as required, provided user orientation training, activate, troubleshoot, operate, maintain, replace, or deactivate GPS and DGPS devices and supported related services with other agencies no later than the assigned completion date.”
	RS 39 –	RS 39 refers to project plan. What is the definition? C.2.1 – definitions, needs to have project plan added to include who is responsible. Clarify verbiage in all RS areas, e.g., service requests, project plans, etc.
	rs 70	Why would an SR be required from an end user. If a server fails it should be brought back to the point before it failed. Restoring data should be a part of that. End users should not have to ask, it should be done as a part of getting the system running again. Assigned completion date? Should be part of the system restore timeframe.

Section	Paragraph	State Concern
	RS271	Who determines the criteria so mailroom personnel can select the best method and most economical cost?

TE-17

C.2

Replace CRD with A&VT

Delete “DCP Data Collection Platforms”. The only reference to a DCP in the PWS is page 112 paragraph C.5.3.1.4 concerning devices that are exclusively Water Control mission essential equipment used for real-time water and flood control to provide the information necessary to operate COE projects as required by the approved project Water Control Manual, Drought Contingency Plan, and Emergency Plan, and to provide for hydroelectric power, a historical record, meet environmental requirements, and prevent loss of property and life. They are maintained, operated, and used by Engineers and Scientists not by IM personnel. By including this equipment in this solicitation the potential for contract modification claims is nearly certain as a result of the cost and complexity of this additional work, and the SP may have to assume liability for loss of property and persons if they fail to provide information necessary for making critical decisions as required by Water Managers.

Delete “Differential Global Positioning System (DGPS) A Global Positioning System (GPS) with an additional correction (differential) signal added. This correction signal improves the accuracy of the GPS and can be broadcast over any authorized communication channel.”. The only reference to a GPS in the PWS is page 112 paragraph C.5.3.1.4 concerning devices that are exclusively Water Control mission essential equipment used for real-time water and flood control to provide the information necessary to operate COE projects as required by the approved project Water Control Manual, Drought Contingency Plan, and Emergency Plan, and to provide for hydroelectric power, a historical record, meet environmental requirements, and prevent loss of property and life. They are maintained, operated, and used by Engineers and Scientists not by IM personnel. By including this equipment in this solicitation the potential for contract modification claims is nearly certain as a result of the cost and complexity of this additional work, and the SP may have to assume liability for loss of property and persons if they fail to provide information necessary for making critical decisions as required by Water Managers.

State Concern

Delete “CWMS Corps Water Management System”. The only mention of CWMS in the PWS is the introduction where it is listed as an exempted AIS. CWMS is a specific software package developed by HEC, Davis CA for Water Control and Hydrology and Hydrologic Engineering Applications. It is designed to run on Unix Solaris platforms and use an Oracle database. This software has been introduced to and tested by all Water Control Offices but because of the enormous diversity of the Water Control mission across the COE it has not yet been fully developed to supply each Districts needs. As a result it has not been implemented or used by all Districts and used only partially by some Districts. The CWMS software and servers are exclusively Water Control mission essential used for real-time water and flood control to provide the information necessary to operate COE projects as required by the approved project Water Control Manual, Drought Contingency Plan, and Emergency Plan, and to provide for hydroelectric power, a historical record, meet environmental requirements, and prevent loss of property and life. They are currently maintained, operated, and used by Engineers and Scientists not by IM personnel. By including this equipment in this solicitation the potential for contract modification claims is nearly certain as a result of the cost and complexity of this additional work, and the SP may have to assume liability for loss of property and persons if they fail to provide information necessary for making critical decisions as required by Water Managers.

Delete “Supervisory Control and Data Acquisition (SCADA) Computer systems used through PLC (programmable logic controllers) to monitor and control hydroelectric and flood control systems in USACE powerhouses..”. The only reference to SCADA is in the Definitions and Acronyms. SCADA is a series of specialized software and servers developed and maintained under different contracts with firms scattered across the continent that provide real-time water and flood control data using a variety of methods. This mission essential equipment and software exist exclusively to meet the Water Control need for real-time water and flood control information necessary to operate COE projects as required by the approved project Water Control Manual, Drought Contingency Plan, and Emergency Plan, and to provide for hydroelectric power, a historical record, meet environmental requirements, and prevent loss of property and life. They are maintained, operated, and used by Engineers and Scientists not by IM personnel. By including this equipment in this solicitation the potential for contract modification claims is nearly certain as a result of the cost and complexity of this additional work, and the SP may have to assume liability for loss of property and persons if they fail to provide information necessary for making critical decisions as required by Water Managers.

Section Paragraph

State Concern

Delete "SCADA Supervisory Control and Data Acquisition". The only reference to SCADA is in the Definitions and Acronyms. SCADA is a series of specialized software and servers developed and maintained under different contracts with firms scattered across the continent that provide real-time water and flood control data using a variety of methods. This mission essential equipment and software exist exclusively to meet the Water Control need for real-time water and flood control information necessary to operate COE projects as required by the approved project Water Control Manual, Drought Contingency Plan, and Emergency Plan, and to provide for hydroelectric power, a historical record, meet environmental requirements, and prevent loss of property and life. They are maintained, operated, and used by Engineers and Scientists not by IM personnel. By including this equipment in this solicitation the potential for contract modification claims is nearly certain as a result of the cost and complexity of this additional work, and the SP may have to assume liability for loss of property and persons if they fail to provide information necessary for making critical decisions as required by Water Managers.

Both the term and definition descriptions for several entries on pages 67 and 68 are messed up. Both the term and definition from the previous box are added to the term and definition within the next box. This must be corrected.

The Definitions list does not include essential terms associated with the Corps Water Management System/Water Control Data Systems. Add the following terms and their definitions to the dictionary: DRGS LRGS NOAAPORT DCP CW MS HEC- DSS SHEF SHEFIT Sensors Precipitation Gage Pressure Gage Bubbler Gage Shaft Encoder If the definitions of these terms are not known by the IM/IT community tasked with developing the PWS/MEO, all references to CWMS and Water Management/Water Control should be excluded from the PWS.

Section Paragraph

State Concern

Delete "GPS Global Positioning System". The only reference to a GPS in the PWS is page 112 paragraph C.5.3.1.4 concerning devices that are exclusively Water Control mission essential equipment used for real-time water and flood control to provide the information necessary to operate COE projects as required by the approved project Water Control Manual, Drought Contingency Plan, and Emergency Plan, and to provide for hydroelectric power, a historical record, meet environmental requirements, and prevent loss of property and life. They are maintained, operated, and used by Engineers and Scientists not by IM personnel. By including this equipment in this solicitation the potential for contract modification claims is nearly certain as a result of the cost and complexity of this additional work, and the SP may have to assume liability for loss of property and persons if they fail to provide information necessary for making critical decisions as required by Water Managers.

Definition for Configuration Control Board identifies the board as a process. Need clarification between configuration control as a process and the CCB as a board. The definition refers to responsibilities for AIS but nothing else. This is inconsistent with other sections in the document. Is configuration control and the CCB limited to AIS, automation, communications, infrastructure or what? The overall premise of this PWS is that the CCB will be the authoritative body for determining Corps policy for IMIT that the SP then executes. However, this is never fully stated and CCB authority is inconsistently stated. Please clarify.

C 2.2 Water Control Data System (WCDS) is not listed in the table of Acronyms.

C.2 Remove the acronym "COTR." The acronym "COTR" is used throughout the PWS. The correct term is "Contracting Officer's Representative" or "COR." COTR is a misnomer. A contract may have "technical points of contact." A Government's technical point of contact is not appointed by the Contracting Officer, has no contractual authority and is provided solely as a point of contact to a contractor for technical assistance. ONLY a COR is "designated in writing by the Contracting Officer to act as an authorized representative of the Contracting Officer to perform specific contract administration activities within the scope and limitations as defined by the Contracting Officer.

C.2 Section C.2 does not address fire prevention. Describing methods used to control or extinguish a fire is not fire prevention. What is the fire prevention requirement?

Section	Paragraph	State Concern
	C.2.1	Section C2.1 DEFINITIONS of the 2nd Draft PWS omits definitions for “Water Control Data Systems (WCDS)”. A definition needs to be added to the document. According to ER 1110-2-249, the definition of a Water Control Data System is, “All hardware and software within the jurisdiction of a Corps of Engineers office which has been acquired and is being used for acquisition, transmission, processing, display, and dissemination of hydrologic, meteorologic, water quality, and project data for the purpose of supporting the water control mission of the Corps of Engineers.” Please add this definition to Section C2.1.
	C.2.1	Section C2.1 DEFINITIONS of the 2nd Draft PWS has an incomplete definition for “Engineering and Scientific Applications”. Please change this definition to include Water Control Data Systems (WCDS). The definition for “Engineering and Scientific Applications” should read as follows: “Any Commercial Off The Shelf (COTS), Government Off The Shelf (GOTS), or Water Control Data Systems (WCDS) automated application tool used for production of engineering designs, analyses, models, drawings, cost estimates, equipment schedules, project regulation, or other engineering products. These applications require specialized education, experience, and training to operate and maintain.”
	C.2.1	What is the definition of "private party"?
	C.2.1	C.2.1 Definitions SCADA - Supervisory Control and Data Acquisition - Computer systems used through PLC (Programmable Logic Controllers) to monitor and control hydroelectric and flood control systems in USACE Powerhouses. GDACS - Governor Data Acquisition and Control System -Computer systems used through PLC (Programmable Logic Controllers) to monitor and control governor systems which control hydroelectric turbines in USACE Powerhouses.
	C.2.1	No definition for Water Control Data System included in the definition table. Water Control is mentioned in TE-17 but NO definition is provided. If adding here, should add WCDS to acronym table, C.2.2.

Section	Paragraph	State Concern
	C.2.1	7. PWS(2nd Draft):C.2.1 (definitions) – Many of the definitions of technical terms and phrases are badly distorted. In particular, definitions of technical phrases like “World Wide Web Workload” simply break the term into “World Wide Web” and “Workload” giving separate definitions for each and thus rendering the definition useless. This term should mean the workload associated with upkeep of websites, the workload that is accomplished using web sites, some combination of the two or something completely different. Given the amount of work that is done on and through “WWW” it is very important to have clear definitions. Also worth noting are the definitions (created with the same algorithm) for “Worm World Wide Web” and “Web-Based Application War Dialing” these terms should not be comical but their definitions render them silly. Luckily, these concepts refer to relatively unlikely risks in the real world.
	C.2.1 Definitions	RS 39 refers to project plan. What is the definition? C.2.1 – definitions, needs to have project plan added to include who is responsible. Clarify verbiage in all RS areas, e.g., service requests, project plans, etc.
	C.2.1. Definitions	All the definitions following Vital Records look like two definitions in one. For example, the definition immediately following Vital Records is "War Dialing Vital Records." It has two definitions in one box. The definitions from that point on always include one of the definitions from the previous box. This pattern continues to the end of the Definition paragraph.
	C.2.1. Definitions	Upon service request – doesn’t fit as used in the standard for RS 42. C.2.1- Definitions – Expand service request definition. It doesn’t fit standards.
	C.2.1. Definitions	The definition for Acquisition starts out addressing acquisitions of IT services/equipment/products, but ends by being generic. Should it not be pointed out here or elsewhere that by law any IT acquisitions must be preceded by IM technical review and validation?
	C.2.1. Definitions	The definition for Tier III is a bit confusing. Should it be "End-user devices, that are not Tier I or Tier II, used to communicate with or within systems." ...or are they truly (as the current definition implies) used only to communicate with systems that are not Tier I or Tier II?
	C.2.1. Definitions	The HelpDesk definition may need to be expanded to include other than software and hardware related issues. A true IM/IT help desk should be the first stop of for all IM/IT areas, i.e. telephones, communications, networks, etc.

Section	Paragraph	State Concern
	C.2.1. Definitions	I may be wrong, but I believe the definition for Accountable Personal Property should include one year life expectancy "and/or" an acquisition cost of \$5,000 or more. We definitely have as accountable property items that cost less...a CPU, printer, digital camera are good examples.
	C.2.1. Definitions	While Office Symbol is mentioned on page 130 and perhaps other areas in context, perhaps Office Symbol needs to be included in the definitions.
	C.2.1. Definitions	I would suggest that the Army Knowledge Management definition state that it is "The Army-wide effort to transform the Army INCLUDING (rather than AND) USACE..." After all, USACE IS part of the Army.
	C.2.1. Definitions	Need to enhance definition of Information Management Plan to include "apply IM technology wisely AND SECURELY,..."
	C.2.1. Definitions	Perhaps the following definition needs to be added: Structured Query Language (SQL) - A specialized language for managing, updating and querying a database.
	C.2.2 Acronym	Need to add CDR - Contract Discrepancy Report
	C.2.2 Acronyms	To allow "one stop" reference of acronyms, all the acronyms embedded within the Definitions should also be in the Acronyms. The following are the ones (best I could tell) that need to be included in Acronyms: AHA, ANSI, APF, ARMOSH, BASOPS, BOA, C4ISP, C4/IT, CLS, CONUS, COP, DGPS, DPP, DPPS, ECS, EPROM, ERS, FMS, HM, HTML, IRM, LAT, M/CATV, MADR, MC, ME, NAFI, NF, OV, OEM, PLC, PM (preventive maintenance.), QAP, QASP, RISC, RMB, SG, TA (technical architecture), TCP/IP, XML. Two more that need to be included (but were not used in the Definitions) are: C3I and QC.
	C.2.2.	PRIP is included on the list of acronyms on page 89, but not in the statements of work (that I could find).
	C.2.2.	CPIC "Capital Planning and Control" Correct Acronym Definition is "Capital Planning and Investment Control"
	C.2.2. Acronyms	ATMP - Automated Training Management Program
	C.2.2. Acronyms	Editing comment: The acronyms are not always in alphabetical order. For example, CCB and CBT. Another, EEOSTATS, E-GIS, EDMS, EEOC, EFT.

Section	Paragraph	State Concern
	C.2.2. Acronyms	Potential additional acronyms: ADAB - Active Directory Advisory Board AKM - Army Knowledge Management APP - Accident Prevention Plan ANC - American/Alaskan Native Corporation BCE - Base Civil Engineer C3I - Command, Control, Communications and Intelligence CECI - Corps of Engineers Corporate Information CO - Commanding Officer CPAC - Civilian Personnel Administration Center CSS - Combat Service Support CWIS - Civil Works Information System DHS - Department of Homeland Security EEP - Employee Emergency Plan FPP - Fire Prevention Plan G&A - General and Administrative GCIWW - Gulf Coast Intracoastal Water Way GUI - Graphical User Interface JER - Joint Ethics Regulation LATAM - Latin America (projects) MODEM - Modulate/demodulate NAS - Network Attached Storage OEEP - Occupant Emergency Evacuation Plan PSP - Physical Security Plan RIO - Regional Information Officer RFQ - Request for Quote SFO - Support for Others SADBUD - Small And Disadvantaged Business Utilization SMR - Specialized Mobile Radio TCS - Temporary Change of Station TDY - Temporary Duty WYSIWYG - What You See is What You Get
	C.2.2. Acronyms	CID is Criminal Investigation "Division"...not "Command"
	C.2.2. Acronyms	The following acronyms, as listed in the PWS, may be incorrect: CCVT should be CCTV CEEIS - Corps of Engineers Enterprise "Infrastructure" Services P3e - Primavera version 3e PBAC, not PRAC - Program Budget Advisory Committee SLA - Service "Level" Agreement
	C.2.2. Acronyms	DA - Data Administration
	C.2.2. Acronyms	May want to add the following acronyms: DSP - District Strategic Plan DST - District Support Team
	C.2.2. Acronyms	Few more acronyms listed within the Definitions that need to be included in Acronyms: APF,T1,VIDOC
	C.2.2. Acronyms	Additional acronym: CGO - Continuing Government Organization
	C.5.2.5	There does not appear to be any reliable count of server systems, types of server systems (e.g., data, application, web, etc.) nor mention of criticality.
	C2.1 Definitions	Omitted definition: Data Base Administration - The responsibility of managing a database system, including installation, implementation, configuration, security, data storage and access, integrity, performance of the database system. This is merely an offered definition, you may be able to find a better one.

Section **Paragraph**
C.3

State Concern

Define if the PCs and software sitting on our desks be furnished (hand-receipted) to the SP?

Recommend that HQDA IT equipment provided to CPACs residing and supported at Corps sites be either excluded from this list or identified as equipment that will supported by the SP but not Hand-receipted to the SP.

Where are the provisions to insert new technology, hardware, or software into the SP managed property? What if an office determines a need for an additional computer, printer, copier, blackberry, etc.? How is additional equipment purchased during the life of the contract handled? Since IT refreshes every 18-24 months, expect many changes in equipment and requirements. Where is the mechanism to handle these changes? If all IT equipment is updated during the contract life would this mean hundreds of thousands of contract modifications?

What Government Furnished Property Clause is expected to be cited in the Solicitation? 52-245-4 or 52-245-5 or some other?

PWS: Will the Government credit a SP's cost proposal for any savings it may realize if the SP proposed solution does not require use of some Government Furnished Property described in this section and detailed in TE-03?

this section would not allow the use of GFE for off-hours notification or trouble shooting. EX blackberries could not be used by "on-call" personnel to receive automatic notification of system problems and laptops could not be used to do remote trouble shooting. Suggest that the section be revised to allow this type of use.

Paragraphs in this section reference TE 3 as a listing of gov't-furnished equipment, yet the title of the TE is gov't-furnished property. Which is it?

c.1.3.2.2

Is the SP responsible to provide these requests for equipment replacement at customer request? If so, a requirements statement should be created for timely response.

C.3

Please clarify intent of this phrase, "...only for performance of the instant contract." Instant seems out of place here.

Section	Paragraph	State Concern
	C.3	This whole page does not clearly define whether the facilities are in reference to Government facilities and equipment we are providing to be serviced by the SP and those being provided for specific use and occupancy by the SP for their use in providing service, which confuses the whole section. C.3.1.1. Government furnished facilities and C.3.1.1.1. Modifications, seem to refer to space assigned and used by the SP. It is especially confusing in the last sentence of C3.1.1.2. Real Property Leased by Government where it states, "Property leased or rented by the Government, which will be provided to the SP, is listed in TE-4." In reviewing TE-4, it lists not only leased property but also Government owned property right down to various gauging stations, but TE-4 was not found to be directly referenced anywhere else other than in this paragraph on leased property. The way this is written the prospective SP may think all the property in TE-4 for their use, which cannot be the case.
	C.3	Does the USACE manage IT asset requirements institutionally or by programs and projects?
	C.3	All approved equipment and software are reimbursable and remains the property of the Government. Precludes innovation and eliminates the ability to gain efficiencies.
	C.3	"Property listed in those documents shall be used only at the Government-furnished Facilities" This provision defines how the mission should be performed by requiring that the Government-Furnished Property and Equipment (GFP/GFE) be used only at its current location. This GFP section dictates a solution rather than providing a performance based requirement. A performance based specification would instruct the SP that they could use the identified GFP/GFE in whatever way needed in order to meet the performance requirements. This would give the SP the option of proposing more efficient deployments and operations of IT equipment, including possible operation of some equipment at non-government facilities.
	C.3	Government Furnished Property and Services. How will emergency care be handled since we are working on Army installations in many cases?
	C.3	Must the GFP/GFE be used at its current location? What is the criteria for replacement equipment? What is the criteria for KO approval for purchases?
	C.3	What is meant by the term "instant contract"? Also referred to in C.3.1.5.

Section	Paragraph	State Concern
	c.3 and TE-3	In Seattle, each Office is responsible for equipment they use in their business processes (that involves property accountability and hand receipt holders) including IT equipment (ITe). The second sentence in c.3 and words in the TE-3 Disclaimer implies that the SP (through government ownership) will use and control all the GFE identified in TE-3. The TE-3 GFE list includes all of the ITe in the district not just the equipment being used by the SP in the performance of their tasks. So what is the intent of the TE-3 list? All the equipment that the SP will be called upon to support, all of the ITe will be transferred to the SP and they will manage all of the IT resources, or the TE-3 list needs to specifically describe the GFE that will be furnished the instant contract in performance of the PWS support to the districts?
	C.3. 1.2.1	It appears the intent is to include all government property in Tech Exhibit 3 and turn it over to the contractor to maintain in the future. Currently, this is not IM's responsibility.
	C.3.1.1	The Government should allow the SP to propose, as part of their solution, the Data Centers and enterprise call center facilities. If the MEO/SP wishes to use the Government facilities, then the costs of those facilities (lease, utilities, annual O&M, etc.) should be included as part of the managed services offering. If the SP proposes a different facility for the Data Center and enterprise call center, again, those costs should be included in the offering. By forcing the SP to use Government furnished facilities in all cases, the industry service provider is negatively affected in trying to provide low cost solutions and the MEO team is provided with a substantial competitive advantage.
	C.3.1.1	PWS: Section C.3.1.1, Government-Furnished Property. Re: "The government will furnish facilities and space." Is it USACE's intent to have all services provided from GF facilities?
	C.3.1.1	The PWS is requiring new services that are not being provided today and for which space is not currently allocated. For example, an enterprise call center providing help desk services and desk top management will require a facility to host the personnel and services. Currently, this service does not exist today and there is no facility for these people in the current infrastructure. The most cost efficient method for a SP to provide this service is to leverage existing capability within the contractor's infrastructure and facilities. This reduces total cost of ownership to the Government by: 1) eliminating the costs of the Government facility or avoid the cost of leasing new facilities to host the new/expanded service such as an enterprise call center; 2) allow economies of scale by leveraging existing staff and augmenting staff for increased user community - not create a new organization;

Section	Paragraph	State Concern
	C.3.1.1	Recommend that the Data Centers and the Call center not be Government Provided Facilities and be priced separately by all parties (including the MEO)as part of the solution. The PWS is requiring new services that are not being provided today and for which space is not currently allocated. For example, an enterprise call center providing help desk services and desk top management will require a facility to host the personnel and services. Currently, this service does not exist today and there is no facility for these people in the current infrastructure. The most cost efficient method for a SP to provide this service is to leverage existing capability within the contractor's infrastructure and facilities. This reduces total cost of ownership to the Government by: 1) eliminating the costs of the Government facility or avoid the cost of leasing new facilities to host the new/expanded service such as an enterprise call center;
	C.3.1.1	Is it the Government's intent to require the successful SP to use the existing data centers at Vicksburg and Portland? Please provide the current cost to the Government of leasing, operating and maintaining the Government data centers at Vicksburg and Portland as well as the Government costs for procuring and installing equipment (including communications services/circuits), operating and maintaining the projected facility to host the enterprise call center and Help Desk. The SP should be allowed to propose a solution that is the most cost effective and reduces total cost of ownership.
	C.3.1.1.	PWS: This paragraph appears to imply that the Government will furnish all facilities and space necessary for performance of the work on the IMIT contract. Request USACE clarify if this is correct. If it is not correct please specify what work will be performed in Government facilities and what work will be performed in SP provided facilities; specify any constraints on SP facilities including locations permitted and prohibited; specify if SP facilities used for performing work on the IMIT contract can be used to perform work
	C.3.1.1.2	However, in the case of loss or damage beyond fair wear and tear, the SP's liability shall be to reimburse the Government for 100 percent of all expense incurred. Overly broad, unduly burdensome. This makes the SP liable even in the event of the Government's negligence!!!!!!!!!!!!!!
	C.3.1.1.2	In the second sentence, consider changing the phrase "all expense incurred" to read "all damages and expense incurred".
	C.3.1.2	Does the USACE plan to continue to capitalize desktop and infrastructure hardware or shift the risk to the contractor and begin including the hardware as an element of the overall computing service provided by the contractor?

Section	Paragraph	State Concern
	C.3.1.2	The Government reserves the right to purchase GFE for the Service Provider. This provision violates the requirements for performance-based contracting in A-76 procurements. Precludes innovation and ability to gain efficiencies.
	C.3.1.2	The Government will establish and maintain a USACE Configuration Control Board (CCB) that will retain deliberation and approval authority for all changes to the USACE-wide IMIT infrastructure. This CCB will have as its Chairman the USACE Chief Information Officer (CIO). This provision violates the requirements for performance-based contracting in A-76 procurements.
	C.3.1.2	Strongly Recommend that all life cycle product and services, which support the proposed solution, be priced by each offeror (including MEO)including procurement, install, refresh and disposal for the PoP. By having the SP provide hardware and software as part of their offering, the SP can insure that their solutions are cost effective. The SP has the ability to leverage strategic vendor relationships to significantly reduce the cost of products. This savings is passed on to the government by the low monthly costs. The solutions should significantly reduce TCO by reducing O&M staffing requirements, offering extremely competitive pricing for products and services, alternative financing (leasing verses buying), lowest cost asset acquisition over time, technology refresh, equipment trade-in and consolidation of maintenance contracts. The SP has the ability to select the right product to support their respective solution sets.
	C.3.1.2	Wherever possible, the Government should get out of the equipment (i.e. hardware and software) ownership business. As part of a managed services solution, the SP should provide all required HW and SW as part of their service to the customer. This substantially reduces the TCO to the customer. This model is becoming widely used by government agencies today. When the government needs specific equipment, the SP can provide and handle product procurement as cost-reimbursement (i.e. reimburse the service provider with actual cost of equipment with appropriate profit and overhead). In some cases the cost of the additional equipment can be rolled into a monthly lease fee. The acquisition costs, maintenance and replacement (end of life disposal) can be handled best by the SP and reduces costs to the Government. The SP has the ability to consolidate existing licenses and product maintenance agreements allowing for optimized
	C.3.1.2	Government-Furnished Equipment. First sentence. When does the Government want the purchase justification delivered?

Section	Paragraph	State Concern
	C.3.1.2	<p>“...The Government will establish and maintain a USACE Configuration Control Board (CCB) that will retain deliberation and approval authority for all changes to the USACE-wide IMIT infrastructure.” This open-ended requirement in the PWS could, depending on how implemented, remove flexibility from the SP to institute changes to the infrastructure which could significantly infuse cost efficiencies. This type of detailed government approval, depending on how implemented, could result in the SP being merely a labor agent making government desired changes. Government disapproval of a change could result in the SP not meeting a performance metric. This also removes much of the responsibility and accountability to meet service levels from the SP and shifts it to the Government.</p>
	C.3.1.2	<p>By having the SP provide hardware and software as part of their offering, the SP can insure that their solutions are cost effective. The SP has the ability to leverage strategic vendor relationships to significantly reduce the cost of products. This savings is passed on to the government by the low monthly costs. The solutions should significantly reduce TCO by reducing O&M staffing requirements, offering extremely competitive pricing for products and services, alternative financing (leasing verses buying), lowest cost asset acquisition over time, technology refresh, equipment trade-in and consolidation of maintenance contracts. The SP has the ability to select the right product to support their respective solution sets. The Government no longer has to worry about compatibility of existing equipment with the SP’s solution (servers, software versions, workstations, etc. have defined life cycles and require periodic refreshment).</p>
	C.3.1.2	<p>Does the USACE track total life-cycle costs of desktop and server hardware?</p>
	C.3.1.2	<p>The thrust of this paragraph and included subparagraphs is preservation and protection of government property and the government's interest. May an offeror propose alternative methods and processes for acquiring and managing property in order to reduce overall costs and still maintain appropriate levels of accountability and responsibility?</p>
	C.3.1.2	<p>To make this more clear, a line should be added to the paragraph stating that the SP will pay for the repair or replacement if the damage is due to fault of the SP.</p>
	C.3.1.2	<p>Does the USACE utilize BPO arrangements to insure lower costs and consistent platform acquisition for desktop, server and infrastructure hardware?</p>

Section	Paragraph	State Concern
	C.3.1.2	<p>This section requires the SP to use GFE. How does the Government intend to capture the costs of replacing obsolete equipment, disposal of equipment, technology refresh, technology insertion, etc.? There is a transition period, a base period and 4 option years. During this period, virtually the entire GFE listed in TE-3, and any HW/SW proposed by the SP, will have to be replaced because of end of life issues. How will the Government evaluate one offeror's proposal against the other if we are not asked to propose solutions and cost throughout the period of performance for the equipment. The Government should be interested in all solutions that significantly reduce the cost of ownership. For example, leasing equipment would significantly reduce the annual cost of operations and sustainment of the equipment. The Government doesn't have to deal with procurement, removal, upgrading, etc. of equipment because the SP would handle these issues</p>
	C.3.1.2	<p>What is the envisioned representation at the CCB? Who will be the voting members? Will CCB approval be required for routine upgrades such as COTS service pack installations?</p>
	C.3.1.2	<p>Wherever possible, the Government should get out of the equipment (i.e. hardware and software) ownership business. As part of a managed services solution, the SP should provide all required HW and SW as part of their service to the customer. This substantially reduces the TCO to the customer. This model is becoming widely used by government agencies today. When the government needs specific equipment, the SP can provide and handle product procurement as cost-reimbursement (i.e. reimburse the service provider with actual cost of equipment with appropriate profit and overhead). In some cases the cost of the additional equipment can be rolled into a monthly lease fee. The acquisition costs, maintenance and replacement (end of life disposal) can be handled best by the SP and reduces costs to the Government. The SP has the ability to consolidate existing licenses and product maintenance agreements allowing for optimized pricing to provide the lowest total cost to the government.</p>

Section	Paragraph	State Concern
	C.3.1.2	<p>This section states the Gov't will provide all the property listed in TE-3, and that the Gov't will procure all equipment. By compelling the SP to use GFE in all cases, the ability of a SP to provide a low cost solution is negated and the MEO team is provided with a substantial competitive advantage. The PWS is requiring new services that are not being provided today and for which equipment is not currently allocated. For example, enterprise net-centric services such as Portal, Directory, mail, database, search, collaboration, instant messaging, etc. are not provided in an enterprise environment. The solutions proposed by an SP may require specific SW and HW that don't currently exist. Additionally, much of the equipment in TE-3 is obsolete and cannot be used in modern solution sets that could substantially reduce the total cost of ownership to the Government. Requiring the SP to utilize this GFE artificially drives up the costs to the SP and to the Government</p>
	C.3.1.2	<p>Is it the intent of the second sentence to apply to the purchase of ALL equipment or just GFE? Does the Contracting Officer have complete discretion to deny a request or will language be added stating that he will not unreasonably withhold approval? "IMIT infrastructure" should be defined.</p>
	C.3.1.2	<p>C.3.1.2 Government-furnished Equipment – consider adding the right of Government to withdrawal any GFE during the performance of the contract.</p>
	C.3.1.2	<p>This section states the Gov't will provide all the property listed in TE-3, and that the Gov't will procure all equipment. By compelling the SP to use GFE in all cases, the ability of a SP to provide a low cost solution is negated and the MEO team is provided with a substantial competitive advantage. The PWS is requiring new services that are not being provided today and for which equipment is not currently allocated. For example, enterprise net-centric services such as Portal, Directory, mail, database, search, collaboration, instant messaging, etc. are not provided in an enterprise environment. The solutions proposed by an SP may require specific SW and HW that don't currently exist. Additionally, much of the equipment in TE-3 is obsolete and cannot be used in modern solution sets that could substantially reduce the total cost of ownership to the Government. Requiring the SP to utilize this GFE artificially drives up the costs to the SP and to the Government</p>

Section	Paragraph	State Concern
	C.3.1.2	The Government doesn't have to deal with procurement, removal, upgrading, etc. of equipment because the SP would handle these issues by providing a managed service solution measured by SLAs. If the Government requires the use of existing equipment, it may be impossible for a SP to sign up for SLA because the equipment may not adequately meet the required specs of the proposed solution. Again, this is providing a significantly competitive advantage to the MEO team, by preventing an industry Offeror from proposing innovative solutions for a managed service environment. Strongly Recommend that all life cycle product and services, which support the proposed solution, be priced by each offeror (including MEO)including procurement, install, refresh and disposal for the PoP
	C.3.1.2.1	How is liability for damage to Government property/equipment determined? What criteria are used for the determination? Is the SP liable for damage caused by a Government end user? May the SP propose alternative property management systems in lieu of APPMS?
	c.3.1.2.1	The PWS calls for SP inventory accountability only at the start and end of the contract. What about annual inventories of government equipment necessary to assure government resources are being used appropriately? Failure to account for inventory could lead to a systemic materiel weakness in Corps internal controls.
	c.3.1.2.1	The SP will not have direct access to APPMS for property management. This is a controlled system managed by LM. Recommend the necessary procedures for SP hand receipt control be dictated by LM and inserted here. Will the SP be allowed/required to sub-hand-receipt equipment back to offices using the equipment? Where are the management controls for property?
	C.3.1.2.1	The second paragraph specifies all GFE in TE-3 be inventoried, but TE-3 lists equipment with the word "excess" next to it. Does this mean it is surplus and if so why jointly inventory excess equipment? Additionally, why should we accept property that we do not need if allowed to approach the work differently? Here again, the PWS seems to be prescribing that contractors just duplicate the existing methodology.
	C.3.1.2.1	What are equipment custodians? It appears that the it's the government intent that the SP will sign for all GFE. If this is so, how will the SP account for the equipment in TE-3 that is not under the SP's control?

Section	Paragraph	State Concern
	C.3.1.2.1	PWS: Section C.3.1.2.1, bullet (c) The SP shall use the USACE property management system (currently APPMS) for inventory control. Regarding the architecture and associated platform of the USACE property management system. Request USACE identify any supported interfaces, API's, or file formats that would be compatible for extracting information.
	C.3.1.2.1	While this office did not originally submit hardware/software descriptions pertinent to CWMS, it now appears they should be included. A complete description of WCDS/CWMS hardware/software is provided, including sites of GOES DCPS. Again, this office recommends complete exclusion of the WCDS/CWMS from the competition; nevertheless hardware/software descriptions will be provided to minimize costs of a possible contract modification.
	C.3.1.2.1.c	Why is the SP limited to using what the current Government organization is using? SP should be free to propose innovative and efficient ways to manage property.
	c.3.1.2.2	If I read this correctly, the SP is providing requests to the government to replace equipment. Is this only during the transition period? It seems that the government would be requesting the SP to replace equipment. The Government should be making the judgment as to when equipment should be replaced. Recommend this be defines more clearly in order to level the playing field between perspective bidders and the Government.
	C.3.1.2.2	Does the Contracting Officer have complete discretion to deny a request or will language be added stating that he will not unreasonably withhold approval? Must each proposed individual purchase be approved or will the KO approve a plan for replacement at the commencement of contract performance covering all future
	C.3.1.2.3	Why does the SP provide repair expense if it is the Government's or other's negligence?
	C.3.1.2.3.2	Does the USACE track disposal costs of obsolete hardware? If so, are the costs consistent with similar organizations in government or private industry?
	C.3.1.2.4	Overly broad, unduly burdensome. The Government must assume responsibility for loss or damage due to its fault or negligence or that of its employees. This provision makes the SP liable even in the event of the Government's negligence!!!!!!!!!!!!!!
	C.3.1.3	Does this paragraph imply that records, files, documents, and work papers (regardless of media) provided by the Government or generated in support of this contract shall include digital photography, maps, drawings, videos, etc.?

Section	Paragraph	State Concern
	C.3.1.4	Since the SP will be responsible for maintaining and modifying Government-furnished software, does this extend to every-day shell-scripting and java/python scripting? Will we be required to request SP services for every on-the-fly modification? If we do modify scripts in, for example, a flood event, will the SP have grounds for financial redress due to loss of work?
	C.3.1.4	Are software licenses under Enterprise-wide consolidated
	C.3.1.4	Who will provide the directives to modify the GF software to the SP who will be responsible for maintaining the GF software?
	C.3.1.4	At what organizational level are software standards in place on the USACE user desktops?
	C.3.1.5	14.<tab> C.3.1.5 Government-furnished Consumable Materials – consider defining a list of example consumables – does this include pencils, paper, staples, floppy disks, writeable CDs, backup tapes, etc? What supplies does the SP have to provide at their own
	C.3.1.6	appears that it would fit better in C.4., SP responsibilities. However, if it stays where it is, the C.5. reference is incorrect and should be changed to C.4.
	C.3.1.6 –	Does this include the data collection network for Engineering Division data collection platforms (DCP)? Note: maintenance cost for this has not been captured.
	C.3.2.1	What will the government responsibilities be in the event of planned and unplanned outages? How will this effect the SP's Performance?
	C.3.2.2	GFE cell phones would be prevented from being taken off of Government Facilities per Section C.3. Suggest that these 2 sections be coordinated.
	C.3.2.2	Insert “including” between “..SP. electricity..” and delete the period after SP.
	C.3.3	This statement is ambiguous. The Army’s web site is available to government and private citizens. Publications and forms can be viewed. The same is true for Department of Defense publications and forms. Why would the service provider need to establish a forms and publications distribution subscription with the Government if currently available? And, if the service provider is responsible for furnishing additional required forms and publications – should this statement be interpreted that these additional materials are not located within the government?

Section	Paragraph	State Concern
	C.3-C.3.1.4	<p>C.3. SP Facilities and Equipment: We recommend that the SP be allowed to propose a solution that includes some its existing facilities and equipment as well as USACE assets. Benefit: The SP can provide the most effective and efficient solution when it has the flexibility to use the best assets available, whether they belong to the USACE or the SP. This may include established SP facilities that are very efficient in providing services remotely.</p> <p>C.3.1.2.1 Equipment Inventory Clarification: We recommend that this paragraph be clarified by stating that it applies only to GFE.</p> <p>C.3.1.2.3.1 HIGH VALUE ITEMS SP breakage liability: We recommend that this paragraph be clarified by stating that the SP will be liable only for damage caused by the SP that the SP could have reasonably prevented. Benefit: This clarification provides a reasonable definition of SP liability for breakage. Such a definition will reduce the SP's financial contingency requirement and reduce the overall cost of the contract to the USACE.</p> <p>3.1.4 Government-furnished software Comment: We concur with the approach to Government-furnished software. We believe that having the SP maintain, modify, and develop the Government-furnished software will allow the SP to provide additional effectiveness and cost savings for the USACE.</p>
	C.5.3.1.4	<p>Paragraph states that SP will support data collection platforms (DCPs). At CESPL as well as other Districts, DCPs are maintained by hydrologic/engineering technicians who are more intimately familiar with these devices and their requirements. The oversight of these devices should stay under the purview of these technicians. Furthermore, these devices were never enumerated and not included in any data call responses submitted by CESPL. If these devices DO become the responsibility of the SP, and enumeration is not addressed, this could result in future change orders.</p>
	C3.1.21.	<p>(If the operation of Water Control hardware, OS, & DCPs are included) This section states the equipment custodians and alternates shall account for Government furnished Equipment listed in Technical Exhibit TE-3. Since Water Control was not included in the original draft document this exhibit does not include our two workstations, DCPs and radios.</p>
C.4	C.4.3	<p>Will the government assume responsibility for items or services identified as a SP responsibility if the liability is due to the fault or negligence of a government employee?</p>

Section **Paragraph**
 c.5.4.2.1

State Concern

In previous sections of the PWS, specific AIS were referenced and yet when discussing passwords, UPASS is omitted and the document reads such that the SP will determine which password system to use or develop.

C.5

Suggest adding a summary of general contractor tasks that would enable a network-centric enterprise. For example: The USACE requires a comprehensive, integrated approach that will require the following tasks: 1. Analyze the existing architecture to design a recommended solution, 2. Recommend a preferred infrastructure to implement the proposed solution, 3. Recommend a phased migration and implementation plan, 4. Implement a recommended objective architecture including the following features, 5. Provide an enterprise infrastructure operated and maintained by a single organization to support a network-centric, knowledge-based force, 6. Consolidate all network management functions, 7. Provide service management to the Districts, 8. Centralize IT procurement to standardize the equipment, optimize cost savings via equipment leasing, and S/W maintenance, 9. Consolidate the help desk and implement network security,

Support of water control systems is not mentioned in the PWS. Currently, there is sys admin work being performed by IM personnel.

IASO staff are identified as SP requirements. AR 25-2 specifically states that this cannot be a contract position.

Helpdesk staff or analysts currently follow thru with an issue until it is resolved even if it means dealing with those corporate AISs that are excluded from the PWS. Who will be required to fully integrate the various components? That activity is not addressed but must be.

The PWS provides the "what" and the contractor proposals will provide the "how". Please make sure the awarded contract includes both parts, as many times the information used during source selections does not get incorporated in the awarded contract documents, i.e., the contractor makes all sorts of promises in the proposal to get the contract, then delivers something less than promised.

GIS Support. The service provider should not have a role in developing GIS policies and standards. This is a governmental function. This is an engineering/technical function and more appropriately performed by the end user. GIS standards are promulgated by the Information Technology Laboratory (ERDC-ITL)

Section Paragraph

State Concern

Please consider requesting three types of services thru the RFP/PWS.

The first type is the managed services portion. This includes all services which can be clearly defined to specific solution sets, such as help desk; data center operations; core web services such as Directory, single sign on, portal, database, mail, etc.; support, communications infrastructure support (WAN, LAN, MAN); all product and services that provides these solutions, etc. We have provided a matrix of services that identify each area of the PWS which fall under the managed service offering and by which an SP can bid a fixed monthly price. This type service can be clearly defined such that an offeror could bid a specific price for the managed service and establish recommended SLAs to measure performance.

The PWS is very long and complicated, so it appears it will be very difficult to do the contract administration with it in this form. How will the end users be able to use the services in the PWS in an easy fashion, without going through a COR or CO to deal with the contractor, and without having to learn every nuance of the PWS when they request a service. What documentation will be required to use this service, and how is it collected and checked by COR or CO before accepting it and paying for the services. Will the contract administration be invisible to most USACE employees or will there be a large and expensive training program needed for all the USACE employees to use this contract service? How will changes to the PWS be handled and in what time frame?

CAD Support. The service provider should not have a role in developing CAD policies and standards. This is a governmental function. This is an engineering/technical function and more appropriately performed by the end user. CAD standards are promulgated by the Information Technology Laboratory (ERDC-ITL)

New Business initiatives are identified each year which require IT support. IMOs have generally supported these activities without additional staff or funding. SP must be required to support as well as standard procedure.

The SP is required to provide operability to the 8 AISs not included in the PWS. Will each site be required to identify a POC for each AIS for technical communications or will the SP provide as many current IMOs do? Strongly suggest identifying processes or tools to measure coordination between SP and AISs.

Section	Paragraph	State Concern
		<p>The new organization must be held to standards that are at least similar to current conditions. For instance, response time for downloading emails with attachments of 5MB should be measured now and no matter how the system is modified, the performance should at least meet if not exceed current times. When any new corporate systems such as CEFMS or P2 was opened for use across the Corps the most significant issue has always been time required for each keystroke. Corps staff should not experience conditions such as these because providers change. Standards or measurements such as these could not be located in the PWS draft.</p> <p>Do (Contractor) selection factors include technical and management considerations as well as financial?</p> <p>Time required by Corps employees to utilize the standard tools (Outlook, corporate AISs, Groove, etc) should not expand. Efficiencies of user manpower must be considered. Any additional time required by users must be considered a cost to the Corps. No measurement or description of this requirement could be found.</p> <p>At Pittsburgh District we utilize IM for programming and scripting support in the GIS (ESRI and Intergraph)--user programming and Web mapping programming, CAD (MicroStation)---user and software support, and various in-house programs and scripting.</p>
	5.1	<p>There are occasional references to water control facilities and data collection platforms. There is currently a clear distinction in districts between the normal Information Management Systems and the Water Control Data Systems. These activities are maintained on separate computing systems. Recommend that the PWS be clarified to indicate that this does not include the management of Water Control Data Systems.</p>
	5.1.2	<p>There appears to some contradictory information. It first says that the govt will provide strategic and tactical direction, policy and guidance of ITIM program but then it says that the SP will develop strategic plans at all organizational levels. These types of statements appear several times (i.e. page 129 - Mailroom and District Management has the same type of statements. (C.5.5.2.2.1)</p>
	5.2.1.1	<p>The first sentence is unclear. It also appears to be in conflict with C.3.1.2 which states that nothing can be disposed of without authorization.</p>
	ALL	<p>The PWS scope is unclear and required functionality in some areas is not defined. This results in a package that is unbidable by potential contractors or the MEO.</p>

Section	Paragraph	State Concern
	C.5	The requirements would indicate that there are three types of services being requested. The first type is the managed services portion. This includes all services which can be clearly defined to specific solution sets, such as help desk; data center operations; core web services such as Directory, single sign on, portal, database, mail, etc.; support, communications infrastructure support (WAN, LAN, MAN); all product and services that provides these solutions, etc. We have provided a matrix of services that identify each area of the PWS which fall under the managed service offering and by which an SP can bid a fixed monthly price. This type service can be clearly defined such that an offeror could bid a specific price for the managed service and establish recommended SLAs to measure performance. The 2nd & 3rd type service are in the add itional info sec.
	C.5 Information	NOTE: TE 1 -- RS is missing for C.5. All descriptions of work in paragraph C.5 should be linked to a performance requirement summary to include: C.5.1.1.1, C.5.1.1.2, C.5.1.2.1
	C.5.1	The bulleted list shown in this section is similar to one shown on page 10 (C.1.3.1) except that telework and systems management are not shown on page 102. Is this intentional?
	C.5.1.1	Project management should be included as part of a managed services offering.
	C.5.1.1	GOTS & COTS Software Applications. End user workstation support, office automation, and end user support for specialized users should be considered as part of the managed services provided by the desktop management services (see service matrix). Project planning, acquisition packages, and integration support should be included as part of the Labor schedule of services. (See Service matrix) This requested service is providing FTE support to specific tasks that is not clearly defined in this section of the PWS. This effort should come from a labor schedule (provided by the SP) that lists labor categories and rates. If the task is known, this section of the PWS should define the task, the anticipated labor categories required, the location of where the work is to be performed, and the estimated annual hours by labor category.
	C.5.1.1.2	Committees, Boards, & Meetings. Statement appears very governmental. We may require the contractor to attend meetings along with us vis-à-vis attending on our behalf To maintain our technical credibility, we should be the official members of the board or committee and be accompanied by our contractor.
	C.5.1.1.3	We believe Policy Development is intrinsically governmental.

Section	Paragraph	State Concern
	C.5.1.11.1	Do not imply that the SP will be using CEFMS here, or anywhere else in this document. Advise on how to spec and what vendors are available is fine. Please clarify intent as the very beginning of this PWS. See also this PWS page 109, typical comment.
	C.5.1.12	Recommend the following addition: 5.1.12 Infrastructure Help Desk. Through the collection of infrastructure information relating to these areas, the Help Desk shall be able to reduce the interruptions in the main stream IT functional areas through addressing technical questions with staff and tools focused on customer interface. The strategic requirements for the Help Desk shall be implemented as the processes are clearly defined and approved. HW and SW shall be in place and scalable to accomplish this over time. The Help Desk shall be capable of:1. Problem identification in a proactive manner,2. Supporting multiple levels of end user issues ranging from quick response technical questions to detailed involvement in application questions,3. Responsible for opening, tracking and closing all problems identified to the Help Desk,4. Provide progress visibility and escalation notification based on metrics agreed to with vendors, end-users, and internal IT functional areas,
	C.5.1.12	This section needs to be expanded to address Help Desk support and desktop management. Recommend the following addition: 5.1.12 Infrastructure Help Desk. Managing the USACE infrastructure in a common manner across all regions and districts will have a significant impact on the reliability and maintainability and overall cost of operating the enterprise. The Help Desk shall assist with Fault, Configuration, Performance and Security issues. Help Desk support should be included as part of the managed services offering. (See Service matrix). The Help Desk shall provide the focal point for end-user information regarding infrastructure change, problem reporting and tracking, equipment relocation request, and technology assistance.
	C.5.1.12.1	Add to previously recommended 5.1.12.Add: 5.1.12.1 Call Center Support. The contractor shall provide the location, staffing, and infrastructure required to provide 24x7 Call Center support to all USACE users. This section should be included as part of the managed services offering. (See Service matrix). The contractor shall:1) Develop, provision, and maintain an automated Call Center service available to all USACE users on a 24x7 basis. 2) Develop and maintain a Call Center ticket capture, tracking, escalation routing, and reporting database (Remedy).3) Contribute to CONOPS statistics collection and reporting.4) Provide a manned Tier 1 Help Desk, available to all USACE users, on a 12x5 basis. Access to the Tier 1 Help Desk personnel will be made available via telephone (toll free) and electronic mail

Section	Paragraph	State Concern
	C.5.1.12.3	Add to previous 5.1.12; Add 5.1.12.3 Desktop Management. The contractor shall develop enterprise solutions to support desktop management activities across the USACE. Desktop management includes, but may not be limited to, desktop end-device (PC, Laptop) procurement, baseline configuration deployment and management, desktop software licensing and CALs, remote configuration and troubleshooting capabilities, inventory capture and management, and technology insertion / life cycle sustainment actions. The USACE wishes to manage desktop activities and service delivery from a centralized location, as much as current technologies will allow; as such, it is recognized that desktop management strategies and solutions will change with the technological possibilities. This section should be included as part of the managed services offering. (See Service matrix). Within the current technology capabilities, the contractor shall
	C.5.1.12.3	Cont. from prev comment: c. Develop and maintain a desktop device procurement process. Desired solution will be secure and web-enabled (https and ASP pages, or similar), package and present standard USACE purchasing agreements that present best value to the government, enforce minimum configuration standards for desktop components, allow for customer customization (within configuration limits), allow for customer inputted fund transfers (MIPR, PO, IMPAC Card, et al), allow for pinpoint shipment and delivery, and update inventory and purchasing databases. d. Assist in development, testing, and migration to thin client technologies and infrastructure. e. Contribute to CONOPS statistics collection and reporting. f. Ensure all documentation pursuant to DITSCAP accreditation is available upon request. g. Assist in Service Level Agreement (SLA) development and refinement.
	C.5.1.16	Needs clarification. This appears to mean remote telework sites. It should not address work at home (flex-place), nor TDY (road warrior) activities. Please clarify intent.

Section	Paragraph	State Concern
	C.5.1.2	Strategic planning management should be included as part of the Labor Schedule of services. This service is providing FTE support to specific tasks that are not clearly defined in the PWS. This effort should come from a labor schedule (provided by the SP) that lists labor categories and rates. If the task is known, the PWS should define the task, the anticipated labor categories required, the location of where work is to be performed, and the estimated annual hours by labor category. If the task is known, but not yet defined or not known, the PWS should state "that the SP shall assist the Government in defining the scope and preparing the task order, including the selection of agreed to labor categories with associated rates, prior to receiving authorization to start work on the task." The SP would then respond to the PWS with a description of how this work will be accomplished, i.e. what processes will be used, tools, etc.
	C.5.1.3	Suggest including consulting services as part of a Labor Schedule of services. This service is providing FTE support to specific tasks that are not clearly defined in the PWS. This effort should come from a labor schedule (provided by the SP) that lists labor categories and rates. If the task is known, the PWS should define the task, the anticipated labor categories required, the location of where the work is to be performed, and the estimated annual hours by labor category. If the task is known, but not yet defined or not known, the PWS should state "that the SP shall assist the Government in defining the scope and preparing the task order, including the selection of agreed to labor categories with associated rates, prior to receiving authorization to start work on the task." The SP would then respond to the PWS with a description of how this work will be accomplished, i.e. what processes will be used, tools, etc.
	C.5.1.3.2	what is meant by the SP shall generate purchase request(s)? Can non-government personnel perform?
	C.5.1.3.2.	Should it also state that technical approval for PR&Cs would be accomplished along with the review.
	C.5.1.3.4	"The SP shall stay abreast of new technologies and will recommend their use..." This statement is too open-ended. It should state study new technology -- as directed by the Corps. We suggest this be revised to state IT technology, not technical tools used by professions via the IT infrastructure.

Section	Paragraph	State Concern
	C.5.1.4	Suggest including capital planning and investment support as part of a Labor Schedule of services. This service is providing FTE support to specific tasks that are not clearly defined in the PWS. This effort should come from a labor schedule (provided by the SP) that lists labor categories and rates. If the task is known, the PWS should define the task, the anticipated labor categories required, the location of where the work is to be performed, and the estimated annual hours by labor category. If the task is known, but not yet defined or not known, the PWS should state "that the SP shall assist the Government in defining the scope and preparing the task order, including the selection of agreed to labor categories with associated rates, prior to receiving authorization to start work on the task." The SP would then respond to the PWS with a description of how this work will be accomplished, i.e. what processes will be used, tools, etc.
	C.5.1.5	Suggest that program and budget support should be included as part of a Labor Schedule of services. This service is providing FTE support to specific tasks that are not clearly defined in the PWS. This effort should come from a labor schedule (provided by the SP) that lists labor categories and rates. If the task is known, the PWS should define the task, the anticipated labor categories required, the location of where the work is to be performed, and the estimated annual hours by labor category. If the task is known, but not yet defined or not known, the PWS should state "that the SP shall assist the Government in defining the scope and preparing the task order, including the selection of agreed to labor categories with associated rates, prior to receiving authorization to start work on the task." The SP would then respond to the PWS with a description of how this work will be accomplished, i.e. what processes will be used, tools, etc.
	C.5.1.6.1	Suggest that architecture development should be included as part of a Labor Schedule of services. This service is providing FTE support to specific tasks that are not clearly defined in the PWS. This effort should come from a labor schedule (provided by the SP) that lists labor categories and rates. If the task is known, the PWS should define the task, the anticipated labor categories required, the location of where the work is to be performed, and the estimated annual hours by labor category. If the task is known, but not yet defined or not known, the PWS should state "that the SP shall assist the Government in defining the scope and preparing the task order, including the selection of agreed to labor categories with associated rates, prior to receiving authorization to start work on the task." The SP would then respond to the PWS with a description of how this work will be accomplished, i.e. what processes will be used, tools, etc.
	C.5.1.6.2 -	These sections should be included as part of a managed services offering.

Section	Paragraph	State Concern
	C.5.1.6.3-7	21.<tab>C.5.1.6.3-7 IMIT Asset Accountability – C.5.1.6.3 talks about the real property accountability in APPMS. However, no section talks about the configuration management of hardware (Asset Management program to track CPU, RAM, Hard Drive space, etc). C.5.1.6.7 Asset Redistribution talks about making IMIT asset redistribution recommendations but does not link it to an Asset Management program tracking configuration, life-cycle of equipment, etc. This section should also link to section C.5.4.9 Hard Drive Purging (Excessed Devices).
	C.5.1.7	Suggest that life-cycle management support be included as part of a managed services offering.
	C.5.1.8.3	IMIT COOP Test. Need that add that COOP Testing will not disrupt normal operations of the supported organizations.
	C.5.2.1	RS 37 GIS Data Interfaces. – Contracting of tasks not currently or directly associated with IMO function. We recommend deletion from the PWS.
	C.5.2.1	This opening super-paragraph controls the subparagraphs below. This sets up a conflict when technically upgrading our systems. Please remove this conflict in all paragraphs. Do insist on technical refreshment all the time, in all things IMIT.
	C.5.2.1	RS 37 GIS Data Interfaces. – Contracting of tasks not currently or directly associated with IMO function. We recommend deletion from the PWS.
	C.5.2.1	RS 36 GIS Tools Development. Statement requires multi-disciplinary skill to include knowledge of geodesy, cartography, and remote sensing, beyond “automation skills” GIS Professionals are fully capable of writing scripts, batch files, or utilities to accomplish routine analytical tasks. This requirement should have a certain dollar threshold for development or more detailed definition of scope of development for applicability to the PWS. This statement defines contracting via PWS of tasking that are not currently performed within IMO mission statement.
	C.5.2.1	RS 35 CADD and GIS Software Standards. – The need for the SP to recommend CAD and GIS end-user configurations is not apparent. These technologies have technical FTLs and established program leads that define end-user technology requirements.
	C.5.2.1	Automation Application Support. The requirement for all new AIS systems to be developed by the SP is not a manageable requirement. It should state that all AIS development with an estimated development cost greater than \$XX,XXX would be much more workable. (e.g. greater than \$50,000) We believe transitioning of maintenance of non-exempt AIS must be quantified to be biddable.

Section	Paragraph	State Concern
	C.5.2.1.1	GOTS & COTS Software Applications. Inclusion of CADD and GIS technologies is too open-ended. It should be at the direction of USACE, and only for infrastructure support. We, the technical/engineering offices -- need no help determining what software is needed to perform our functions. We have not paid for this support in the past. Inclusion of "scientific and engineering computation and modeling" is clearly not an IT function. The RFP is now specifying a requirement for engineers, architects, geographers, cartographers, physical scientists, geologists, and mathematicians to be included in this proposal. This is clearly a scope creep.
	C.5.2.1.1	Please provide a comprehensive list of USACE's current COTS and GOTS products.
	C.5.2.1.2	Suggest that support for AIS and custom software applications be included as part of a Labor Schedule of services. This service is providing FTE support to specific tasks that are not clearly defined in the PWS. This effort should come from a labor schedule (provided by the SP) that lists labor categories and rates. If the task is known, the PWS should define the task, the anticipated labor categories required, the location of where the work is to be performed, and the estimated annual hours by labor category. If the task is known, but not yet defined or not known, the PWS should state "that the SP shall assist the Government in defining the scope and preparing the task order, including the selection of agreed to labor categories with associated rates, prior to receiving authorization to start work on the task." The SP would then respond to the PWS with a description of how this work will be accomplished, i.e. what processes will be used, tools, etc.
	C.5.2.1.3	How much is "large amounts of data" and "mass data?" It seems that it would be nearly impossible to accurately establish a cost estimate to handle such unknown quantities of data.
	C.5.2.1.3	This is a typical contractual no-no. The SP can provide 0.1 persons to handle large amounts of data and win. The government would then have to negotiate a change order. Try to indicate what "large" is or delete this requirement.
	C.5.2.1.3	AIS Data Entry. This requirement is too open-ended. It requires entry of "large amounts" of data but offers no metric for quantity. It should state that the SP should needs to provide the capability to e.g. scan xx,xxx pages per month, key-in xxx,xxx words per month at a negotiated rate of \$XX.XX/page, \$XX.XX/megabyte...

Section	Paragraph	State Concern
	C.5.2.1.4	Suggest rewording from, "IMIT CADD and GIS support includes assistance with acquisition process,..." to "IMIT CADD and GIS support includes acquisition process assistance,...". That makes it clear, assuming this is the intent, that the SP does not provide assistance with the items after acquisition, but actually does the thing, like license mgmt, etc.
	C.5.2.1.4	Suggest rewording from, "IMIT CADD and GIS support includes assistance with acquisition process,..." to "IMIT CADD and GIS support includes acquisition process assistance,...". That makes it clear, assuming this is the intent, that the SP does not provide assistance with the items after acquisition, but actually does the thing, like license mgmt, etc.
	C.5.2.1.4	Here and throughout this PWS, end-user support cannot be overstated. The cite below in C.5.2.6. Help Desk. See C.5.1.12.is not enough to tie all Applications/Services to Help Desk. In each main super-paragraph, such as C.5.2 in this case, state that all the following will be end-user supported fully in the Help Desk function
	C.5.2.1.5	this section is a duplicate of C.5.2.1.4. Suggest deleting.
	C.5.2.10 – IMIT	C.5.2.10 – There is no performance requirements summary identified for unique automation requirements identified in TE-17.
	C.5.2.2	suggest adding a requirement for coordination with PAO since they are responsible for content on USACE web sites
	C.5.2.4	Paraphrasing, the SP shall submit acquisition packages. Acquisition packages include creating purchase requests. Acquisition package in C.5.2.4 includes PR&C, but C.5.2.5 does not. Why the difference?
	C.5.3.1.4	Recommend that PWS be revised to delete the requirement for SP to install, operate and maintain the data collection platforms (DCP). The DCP's are only one of the components of a water gaging station. If a problem occurred at a station, the Government would dispatch repair crews. The equipment could be repaired only to find out that the DCP is not functioning properly. We would then have to wait on the Service Provider to send out a repair crew. This would result in significant delay of receiving critical data during flood
	C.5.3.2.4.8	C.5.3.2.4.8- Cable Plant Infrastructure- Our Trades & Crafts workers have installed, maintained and troubleshot these cable systems for years! The way it normally works at the Powerhouses, Dams and Project Admin buildings is that the phone company maintains the systems up to our buildings and then our workers maintain everything inside! That has been and is our work!!

Section	Paragraph	State Concern
	C.5.3.3.1.2	C.5.3.3.1.2. Network Design. Last sentence- "The designs include equipment installation and removal, utilities, physical security, power and environmental management, and cabling infrastructure." The vast majority of this design work within the Powerhouses has been done over the years by our own Electronics workers!!
	C.5.3.3.2	C.5.3.3.2. Device and Service. The SP shall operate, maintain, install, upgrade, update, move, disconnect, troubleshoot, and manage Device and Service configuration of wired data services. Data equipment includes security systems and devices, data circuits, faxes, monitors and displays, input video devices, switches, routers, DSUs and CSUs, coder-decoders (CODECs), sensors, hubs, VPN concentrators, and VoIP. Mostly our work within the Powerhouses!!
	C.5.3.4.2	C.5.3.4.2. Video Services. The SP shall operate, maintain, configure, and test VTC, CATV, CCTV, alarms, and other video services operating in both classified and unclassified modes. Video services and support include VTCs that utilize IP, ISDN, fractional T-1, classified and unclassified point-to-point and bridging services; closed circuit television (CCTV); surveillance systems; streaming video; inside cable plant; outside cable plant; video capture and archive; and help desk and training. VTC services support includes VTC help desk services, maintenance, upgrades, and troubleshooting. The SP shall transport, set up, operate, break down and re-transport portable VTC equipment. The SP shall obtain and maintain the required system certifications for connecting to external networks. Again mostly our work within the Powerhouses! Our Electronics workers designed, installed and maintain most of the CCTV and especially the surveillance systems and alarm systems at the Projects!!
	C.5.3.4.3	suggest removal of this section since it is a duplicate of section C.5.3.4.1
	C.5.3.4.4.2	C.5.3.4.4.2. CCTV Equipment. The SP shall install, move, add, and change CCTV equipment. The SP shall upgrade CCTV equipment software, hardware, and firmware; perform preventative maintenance; troubleshoot; replace failed hardware components; an CCTV equipment. C.5.3.4.4.3. Surveillance Systems Equipment. The SP shall install, move, add, and change surveillance systems equipment. The SP shall upgrade surveillance systems equipment software, hardware, and firmware; perform preventative maintenance; troubleshoot; replace failed hardware components; and modify the configuration of teleconferencing equipment.
	C.5.3.4.4.3	C.5.3.4.4.3. Surveillance Systems Equipment. The SP shall install, move, add, and change surveillance systems equipment. The SP shall upgrade surveillance systems equipment software, hardware, and firmware; perform preventative maintenance; troubleshoot; replace failed hardware components;...

Section	Paragraph	State Concern
	C.5.4.1.12	C.5.4.1.13. Policy Guidance. The SP shall provide advice to USACE concerning IA Advice includes command inspections, Command Consolidated Guidance, E-Gov projects, USACE 2012, emergency operations, field force engineering, military operational orders, Federal Information Security Management Act, tele-engineering, water management, life-cycle management of AISs, USACE architecture, e-mail, telework, and studies.
	C.5.4.1.19	Coordination with Other Agencies. This function appears very governmental.
	C.5.4.1.2	RA 161 thru 165 Security Program Management - This function appears intrinsically governmental.
	C.5.4.1.8	RS 170 Development of MOAs and MOUs – This function appears intrinsically governmental.
	C.5.4.3	What is the average number of Accreditations in a year and what is the average number of systems associated with these accreditations? How many and where are the DAAs located?
	C.5.4.3.2.	How many SIPRnet connections are there? How many and where are the DAAs located? How many systems are associated with each connection?
	C.5.4.3.4.	How many IDS are there currently? Are they currently monitored at one location? If not how many locations? What vendor provides your IDS? Do they have a database to store all IDS data? How much historic data do the maintain in storage?
	C.5.4.6.	Does USACE currently have a system for pushing out patches? If so what software do they use to push out patches? Is this activity currently done from a central location?
	C.5.4.7.13	C.5.4.7.13. Physical Restricted Area Policy Enforcement. The SP shall develop and enforce access policy to IMIT restricted areas. These controls include signing in and escorting visitors and installing, maintaining, and updating mechanical or electronic access control mechanisms.
	C.5.4.7.5	Web Page Review & Compliance and Web Access. Contracts out government security requirements? Is this customary? We are giving the Service Provider the authority to limit our own operations dependant on their interpretation of government regulations.
	C.5.4.7.7 Web	There is no PRS for this paragraph in TE-1 to correspond with this PWS statement.
	C.5.4.8.3	Recommend including that SP will follow guidance provided by Army Information Assurance Best Business Practices (BBP)
	C.5.5.1.15	It is not clear whether the SP will be responsible for the day-to-day operation of the local Records Holding Areas.

Section	Paragraph	State Concern
	C.5.6.4	RS 301 to 305, as an example, the PWS does not identify the physical site of performance for tasks of this nature. Identifying the physical site will further define our requirements and removes uncertainty during the bidding process. It is unlikely that it needs to be performed at all sites.
	C.5.7.10.2	Technical Writing & Marketing Services. "Creation of marketing plans" and "writing technical articles" is clearly not an IT function. If, some IMO offices are doing this type of support, there are likely better COE offices to transfer this function, such as Public Affairs Offices or to an Outreach Position. This statement defines contracting via PWS of tasking that are not currently performed within IMO mission statement.
	TE 3	It is very difficult to match the numbering scheme in TE 3 with the para numbering in C.5. Recommend that if a C.5 para has more than one workload data element in TE 3, that an alpha character be used to depict that rather than a numeral which can be confused with a "missing" C.5 para number.
C.5.1	5.1.1.2	What is the mechanism to determine the type and level of personnel to be provided by the SP to perform this task? How is quality and value of input measured?
	5.1.10.2 & 5.4.1.5	16.<tab>Cross Functional Areas - There are several items that cross most, if not all, functional areas – such as the CEEIS Infrastructure, Quality, Metrics and Service levels, Configuration Management and Change Control, and Knowledge Management. These should be placed in a section just before the description of the functional areas covered by the PWS. a.<tab>Existing Infrastructure – should describe the existing CEEIS infrastructure that is in place and state that, at least initially, the SP is expected to admin and manage. This would include a discussion of the communications architecture, Active Directory architecture, and Email System architecture. This provides the foundation for all functional areas. b.<tab>Metrics and Service Levels– only section 5.1.10.2 and 5.4.1.5 refer to metrics. There should be a major section outside of all of the functional areas that discuss the minimum requirement metrics for the PWS and the need for the SP to implement industry best practices in this area
	5.1.15	Shouldn't the SP and not the CCB be responsible for developing a USACE-wide system management solution. Isn't that part of requirements of the PWS in C.1? System management was not listed as exempted.

Section	Paragraph	State Concern
	5.1.5	This section and related subsections appear to relate to the headquarters level budget and planning process but reflect little of the process at the District level. Since the Corps is project funded, this section must reflect the requirements to plan, budget and have distribute costs accurately down to the user and project level.
	5.1.6.2	Does the CCB identified also have the responsibility to review and approve infrastructure changes at the Regional, District and local levels?
	C 5.1.15	C 5.1.15 implies that the CCB will eliminate current and diverse systems in order to make IM/IT more efficient. Certain AIS, namely CWMS, has been evaluated considering nationalization, regionalization, and maintaining local systems with local systems found to be most capable of providing required functionality while also being the most economical configuration. The PWS implies that such decisions will be overshadowed by the SP agreement as directed by the CCB. The CCB membership is not yet established and focus only on IM/IT fails to recognize Corps of Engineers core functional requirements. The CCB cannot over-ride decisions made by other AIS decision makers and local Commands based upon local and regional requirements. The Corps of Engineers is not a "one-size-fits all" organization.
	C,5,1.1.,2	At all levels in USACE? If so, clarify. Frequency and type would also be good to list here or some min-max range. We have monthly IRMSC meetings at District level and quarterly DDE IT Council meetings at MSC level, as examples.
	c.1.6.9	This appears to limit the notification of SP staff to the Transition period – what is expected in the contract after the transition period. What notification of personnel is required after full implementation of the instant contract?
	C.5.1	Paragraph describes general IMIT responsibilities for both Government and SP. It closes by stating “The SP shall execute the IMIT program. The IMIT program includes:”, and then proceeds to list both Government and SP functions immediately below. Listing these functions together is confusing when taken in context with the above statement in quotes.
	C.5.1	8. . PWS(2nd Draft):C.5.1 – This section seems to layout the outline of IM and IT without any apparent reference to computers other than in terms that are at the same time too vague and too particular. Subsequent subsections go on to provide detail on sections and comments not mentioned in the bullet points at the start. SECTION C.5 is in many ways the heart of the PWS; its clarity is therefore essential.

Section	Paragraph	State Concern
	C.5.1	May the offerors propose automation, consolidation, centralization or standardization approaches which increase quality and reduce cost?
	C.5.1. –	1. General comment: Add standards for unique mission requirements in all areas, e.g., communications, information assurance, records management, printing and publications, etc.. 2. Add bullet: support of unique mission requirements: Once bullet is added, insert somewhere in C.5.3 – C.5.7 a paragraph descriptor like C.5.2.10 and ensure that appropriate
	c.5.1.1.3	Define which part of “The Government” will provide policy development approval to/for the SP. How much local authority will there be?
	c.5.1.10	This is the only area to address controls necessary to provide Commanders at all levels with the annual statement of assurances that resources are being used appropriately, effectively, and efficiently. However, the PWS does not currently provide mechanisms for Commanders to insure previously internal controls are followed by the SP. Further, what enforcement mechanisms are in place for Commanders or their representatives to correct or improve SP controls based on audit results? Will the Contracting Officer take responsibility for assuring all IMIT resources are being used and managed appropriately? If local Commanders must still take responsibility, they must be provided the authority to guide SP actions and enforce controls.
	C.5.1.10	Suggest that support for management controls be included as part of a managed services offering.
	c.5.1.10.1	Paragraph C.5.1.10.1. Suggest changing this paragraph to read as follows: "The SP shall prepare responses to management reviews and implement required corrective actions timely. Reviews may be internal (by SP personnel), or internal or external audit/inspection groups. They may include audits, inspections, surveys, studies, and internal control checklists (to include those in the GAO Federal Information System Controls Audit Manual (FISCAM)).
	C.5.1.10.2	Somewhere, the PWS needs to define what response time is. this is a very subjective term. For example, having 10 minutes to respond to the customer could mean calling them up and telling them you are aware of their problem, or it could mean actually starting work on the problem within 10 minutes. This is a big difference.
	C.5.1.10.2	23.<tab>C.5.1.10.2 IMIT Metric Measurements – should refer to appropriate TE citing specific metrics required by the PWS and encourage SP to implement industry best practices in this area.

Section	Paragraph	State Concern
	C.5.1.11	Suggest that acquisition support be included as part of a Labor Schedule of services. This service is providing FTE support to specific tasks that are not clearly defined in the PWS. This effort should come from a labor schedule (provided by the SP) that lists labor categories and rates. If the task is known, the PWS should define the task, the anticipated labor categories required, the location of where the work is to be performed, and the estimated annual hours by labor category. If the task is known, but not yet defined or not known, the PWS should state "that the SP shall assist the Government in defining the scope and preparing the task order, including the selection of agreed to labor categories with associated rates, prior to receiving authorization to start work on the task." The SP would then respond to the PWS with a description of how this work will be accomplished, i.e. what processes will be used, tools, etc.
	C.5.1.11	What are the roles and limitations of the SP in processing customer requests and development of the SOW? Will this include ordering for the customer and purchasing technical consulting and embedded IT?
	C.5.1.11	What are the roles and limitations of the SP in processing customer requests and development of the SOW? Will this include ordering for the customer and purchasing technical consulting and embedded IT?
	c.5.1.11	These paragraphs reference PR&Cs. It is not clear, are these all PR&Cs or just those for IT purchases? Recommend clarifying.
	C.5.1.11.1	Is it the intent of the PWS that the SP will do the actual purchasing in response to service orders?
	c.5.1.12	Recommend defining where the help desk physically will be located. Will there be one for each district? In the private sector, outsourcing to foreign countries in the interest of obtaining lower labor rates is a controversial subject. The image of the Federal Government is affected if a contractor adversely affects American jobs by outsourcing Government IT services. In construction we have "buy American" acts; are there similar guidelines for Government IT
	C.5.1.12	24.<tab>C.5.1.12 End User Support and Services – this section needs to be extensively expanded to include what service levels are to be met, what tracking and reporting requirements are required for the PWS, etc. The TE's that tie in workload and metrics should be linked here as well.
	c.5.1.12	It is not clear that communications in the statement includes voice, forms that are a part of the records management, or passwords that are a part of Information assurance
	c.5.1.12	Technical support should include copiers, telephones, voicemail, radio, communication equipment, VI equipment, AV equipment, and all other ITIM equipment user by the customer.

Section	Paragraph	State Concern
	C.5.1.12	Will the helpdesk be allowed to use remote control tools in helping users solve problems?
	C.5.1.12	End User Support – this entire section and sub sections need to be moved to Automation services – confusing that it is right here under the general mgmt and support headings. And it is referenced in the Automation section.
	C.5.1.12	6. PWS(2nd Draft): C.5.1.12. States help desk support for end users and AISs – does this mean help desk support for all the AISs? Would the helpdesk support calls about the applications (i.e. usage, problems)? Right now most of that support is provided by the AIS proponent.
	C.5.1.12.	It is not clear whether help desk support includes support for CADD and GIS software.
	C.5.1.12.1	This paragraph needs to state that an automated workorder/workloading system needs to be used. It must also minimally define what a work-order/work-loading system must include. The paragraph also needs to state that problem resolutions must also be documented within the trouble call record. Regarding work-order/work-loading systems, does the Government or the SP decide which system to use, and if different systems at different geographical locations are allowable, or if the same solution will be used Corp-wide?
	C.5.1.12.1	What tool is specifically used in the Help Desk infrastructure to manage trouble tickets? What are the specific communication channels over which trouble tickets are received (phone, e-mail, etc.)? What is the required response time to close a ticket?
	C.5.1.12.1	This should also include sending and receiving customer satisfaction surveys, etc.
	C.5.1.12.1	What tool is specifically used in the Help Desk infrastructure to manage trouble tickets? What are the specific communication channels over which trouble tickets are received (phone, e-mail, etc.)? What is the required response time to close a ticket?
	C.5.1.12.1	Service requests could also apply to radios, telephones, audio-visual equipment, conference room equipment, and other IMIT issues.
	C.5.1.12.1	Are there metrics applied to Service Requests?
	C.5.1.12.2	The last sentence provide for SP's technical support for "all existing software and AISs." Consider deleting the word "existing".
	C.5.1.12.2	Will the remote locations requiring help desk support have an on-site help desk team in case a ticket cannot be resolved over the phone or via e-mail? If so, how is this team staffed?

Section	Paragraph	State Concern
	C.5.1.12.2	Recommend appending "and other IMIT requirements" to the end of the last sentence.
	C.5.1.12.2	Suggest adding: 5.1.12.2 Service Levels • Help desk available 7x24 • Help desk status and/or solution within 24 hours• Average response time will be no greater than 45 seconds 95% of the time. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The abandon rate will be no greater than 9%, 95% of the time. • All voice mails and e-mails are answered within 60 minutes 95% of the time and within 2 hours 100%. • All rickets assigned to help desk are resolved within 24 hrs, 95% of the time.
	C.5.1.12.2	big area not addressed here is maintenance support for homeland security systems and electronics systems to include PA systems and alarm systems all of which are IM/IT services being provided by various corps districts.
	c.5.1.12.3	In reading other parts of this PWS it appears the Government is to "hand receipt" all IT hardware and software to the SP. This paragraph indicates that the Government will maintain vendor service contracts. Consider revising to have the SP maintain these contracts since that is function no provided by USACE IM personnel.
	C.5.1.15	What are the major characteristics of the legacy systems requiring technical support prior to production cutover of the USACE-wide enterprise solution? How many legacy systems exist and how disparate are they?
	C.5.1.16	Recommend defining the term "operational services". Does this include connectivity i.e., does high-speed access need to be provided?
	c.5.1.16	This section states that teleworkers must bring equipment to the site if it needs repair. While that seems an overall reasonable position, it does not take 1) take into account that some local union agreements may provide for IT people to go to alternate worksites to repair teleworkers' equipment and 2) consider the fact that many teleworkers are in the program due to serious health conditions that do not allow them to move around a lot, let alone bring equipment in. Suggest something be included that will allow the SP to go to the alternate worksite when the employee is unable to bring the equipment to the SP and when a union contract provides otherwise.
	C.5.1.16	The statement that "the SP will provide IMIT operational services for teleworkers at the same level available to workers located in a USACE office" is not supportable. Communications services are limited by the workers home area infrastructure and the restrictions on the government to pay to improve them to "office" level.

Section	Paragraph	State Concern
	C.5.1.16	Telework Support would require the SP to provide DSL quality communications support to any teleworker, no matter where they are located. This could prove extremely expensive to the enterprise as many employees do not live in areas with high speed communications support, and could require satellite communications to meet the requirement. Was this the governments intent?
	C.5.1.16	S.P. should provide support services to teleworkers at a level no lower than workers at USACE offices. The way this is worded would allow an S.P. to degrade service to workers at a USACE facility to match lesser service possible because of operational difficulties in supporting teleworkers.
	C.5.1.16	The level of service for Telework is more extensive than current policy requires. Will USACE modify its Telework policy to conform to the PWS requirements?
	C.5.1.2.1	Please describe how the SP is to develop and/or maintain strategic plans, if the government is to provide strategic policy and guidance as this conflicts with C.5.1.
	c.5.1.2.2	Recommend adding sentence "Copies shall be furnished to COTR and KO".
	C.5.1.3	Para 5.1.3 allows the Government to hire its own consultant. The scope of work of these proposed consultants should be defined to avoid duplication of work and costs. Please define "consulting services" and describe the specific advisory and assistance services that will be contracted as related to the SP's functions under the instant SOW.
	C.5.1.3.2	What is the definition of embedded USACE IMIT compliance? Please define the role of the SP in the generation of Purchase Requests. Will the SP generate and review all requests and/or will they review requests that have been generated by the functional elements?
	C.5.1.3.4	Under what environments and for what purposes will the studies, tests, and investigations be executed? Need to have defined the type of requirements that will be addressed for new technology.
	C.5.1.3.4	Please define the role of the COTR. Will the COTR have authority to approve new technology?

Section	Paragraph	State Concern
	C.5.1.4.	Suggested replacement for paragraph C.5.1.4 C.5.1.4. Capital Planning and Investment Control Support. The Government will retain approval authority of the results of the CPIC process. The SP will execute the CPIC process including the select, manage, and evaluate phases. The select phase creates a portfolio of IT investments that maximizes the business value, and assesses and manages the risks of the investments by prioritizing and selecting investments. The manage phase continuously measures ongoing investments against their projected cost, schedule, and performance goals, and takes action to continue, modify, or cancel the investment. The evaluate phase measures actual business performance against goals to be achieved from the IT investments. Activities in support of these phases include: respond to IMIT data calls, prepare IMIT initiative portfolio documentation, compute return on investment (ROI), prepare business case and feasibility studies, and prepare and present info
	c.5.1.4.1	Define a time frame for SP response to different level calls.
	C.5.1.4.1.	9. PWS(2nd Draft): C.5.1.4.1. IMIT Requirement Data Call. "The SP shall respond to IMIT data calls. The data calls shall include upward reporting documents, Information Technology Investment Portfolio System (ITIPS) submissions, hardware and software acquisitions, implement the IMIT investment decisions, and software licensing at all affected organizational levels." What does this mean?
	c.5.1.4.4	Expand this to show that the SP will provide both information and decision briefings. Change the title and content of the paragraph.
	C.5.1.5	The SP should not be responsible for developing and maintaining IM budgets.....more appropriate for SP to "assist".
	C.5.1.5.3	Please define the scope, limitations and expectations of the PPBES and OMB Exhibit 300 entries that the SP will provide.
	C.5.1.6.2	2. PWS(2nd Draft): C.5.1.6.2. At what level does the CCB approve? The reference to "all changes to the USACE-wide IMIT infrastructure" could mean the CCB would have to approve every single patch, workstation or system change.
	C.5.1.6.2	This should also get expanded to include local and regional configuration management and steering committees, boards, other than just CEEIS.
	C.5.1.6.2	Government oversight at the level of detail described in this paragraph will preclude innovation and efficiency on the part of the SP. The government should have a "Requirements Approval Board" that reviews and approves enterprise IMIT business requirements (and associated funding) before those requirements are passed to the SP. The government should identify the requirements, the SP should decide the most efficient way of meeting those requirements.

Section	Paragraph	State Concern
	C.5.1.6.2	IMIT Asset Accountability <tab>the SP must account for property, and comply with property control hand receipt regulations for any property which the SP comes into possession, regardless if it is permanent or temporary. Ie. Property control hand receipts must be completed for remove a IT assets from an office, to/from
	C.5.1.6.2.1	3. PWS(2nd Draft): C.5.1.6.2.1. Should define when an ECP is needed and when the CCB has to approve. Are there to be other levels of ECP approvals? Does the CCB have to approve every ECP or can a lower organization / group approve some ECPs?
	C.5.1.6.2.2	In order to test proposed changes to the baseline prior to presentation of the ECP to the CCB, does the SP need to request permission from the CCB prior to conducting the test? If the proposed ECP entails a significant purchase, what is the mechanism to procure the first article for test prior to presenting the ECP to the CCB for approval?
	C.5.1.6.2.2	4. PWS(2nd Draft): C.5.1.6.2.2. Is the government going to provide resources for testing all ECPs prior to submission for approval? This could be very expensive to implement.
	C.5.1.6.3	Is it the intent of the PWS that the Government will do the actual purchasing of all property? At what point will the Government assume full responsibility for items to be disposed of?
	C.5.1.6.3	What are the standards, criteria, and process the Government will use to establish and dispose of property? Are the requirements the same for all types of property? If the SP maintains the asset records will the process be for the government to transfer the information concerning establishment and disposal of property to the SP?
	C.5.1.7	Does the USACE plan to manage IT requirements vertically or horizontally across programs, projects and institutional requirements?
	c.5.1.8	SP efforts must be in cooperation with local commands, EOC offices, and District Security offices. An IMIT COOP cannot be developed, maintained, or tested in a void.
	C.5.1.8	Will the Government provide the additional hardware and software required for the COOP implementation? Does a failover site already exist? Is the failover site considered to be a hot-site backup to ensure no loss in continuity of operations or is it just a warm site?
	C.5.1.8	5. PWS(2nd Draft): C.5.1.8. What degree of COOP is required? COOP could mean recovery to a quarterly backup or it could mean recovery to within minutes of the failure. Definition and scope are necessary here.
	C.5.1.8	Suggest that support for contingency planning be included as part of a managed services offering.

Section	Paragraph	State Concern
	C.5.1.8.3	When and how often should the coop be tested?
	C.5.1.8.3	IMIT COOP Test - "The SP shall test the IMIT COOP" add "annually or as required" as end of sentence.
	C.5.1.9	22.<tab>C.5.1.9 Training for USACE Workforce – consider adding that SP should promote use of mandatory AKO computer-based training courses. When AKO CBT’s are not sufficient, then SP is expected to do what is listed in C.5.1.9.2.
	C.5.1.9	The SP can not be responsible for identifying training needs. The supervisor or manager can identify training needs, and the SP can provide guidance for the manager, and then prepare, and conduct the training.
	C.5.1.9	Please clarify if the training will be conducted by the SP or the Government through Smartforce.
	C.5.1.9	Suggest that support for training for USACE Workforce should be included as part of a Labor Schedule of services. This service is providing FTE support to specific tasks that are not clearly defined in the PWS. This effort should come from a labor schedule (provided by the SP) that lists labor categories and rates. If the task is known, the PWS should define the task, the anticipated labor categories required, the location of where the work is to be performed, and the estimated annual hours by labor category. If the task is known, but not yet defined or not known, the PWS should state "that the SP shall assist the Government in defining the scope and preparing the task order, including the selection of agreed to labor categories with associated rates, prior to receiving authorization to start work on the task." The SP would then respond to the PWS with a description of how this work will be accomplished, i.e. what processes will be used, tools, etc.
	C.5.1.9	Unclear how training needs are determined. Must the SP provide any and all training that IMIT PM requests? Can I ask them to provide P2 training even if P2 is not at supported AIS?
	C.5.1.9. Training	For clarification, the training responsibility included in the PWS is IM/IT training, not training in general. The first sentence in this paragraph does not specify what type of training even though the second sentence says IMIT training.
	C.5.1.9.1	Is the SP required to conduct all hands training or is the training defined as “train-the-trainer”?
	C.5.1.9.1	Training Courses: I could find no mention regarding how many courses should be offered per week/month/year or with what frequency classes should be offered. Also, where are these courses to be delivered? Onsite? Offsite? Are Districts required to maintain an IM training room?
	C.5.1.9.2	Is a User’s Manual explicitly required as part of the training?

Section	Paragraph	State Concern
	C.5.1-C.5.1.16	<p>C.5.1 Addition: We recommend that USACE add the following to the bulleted list of services included in the IMIT program: o<tab>Information assurance o<tab>Software design, development, testing , maintenance and operations</p> <p>C.5.1.2 Strategic Planning and Management. Clarification request: Please specify which organizations will be involved in the strategic planning process.</p> <p>C.5.1.3 consulting services Clarification request: Please confirm that all the consulting services in C.5.1.3 will be priced and awarded as separate task orders when needed. C.5.1.3.3</p> <p>Service Agreements (page 103) Recommendation: We recommend that the USACE include SLAs such as the ones below. While we have not recommended specific values for the SLAs, we recommend that the USACE make the numeric values for the SLAs consistent with commercial best practices. This will ensure that the USACE has the same high-quality, robust IT/IM as commercial firms. Such high levels of service will enable the kind of transformation envisioned in USACE 2012. Business SLAs</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Batch processing complete by a specified time each day. • On-line services available during specified times each day. • On-line availability – xx.x% Technical SLAs • Help Desk Call Response Time • Help Desk Abandonment Rate • CICS Response Time • Problem Resolution Time • On-Line Test Availability- xx% • Host Response Time - <x Seconds for xx% of transactions • Security Monitoring <p>6.5.1.4.1 IMIT Required Data Call: Recommendation: We recommend that the PWS specify routine data calls. Any data calls over and above those specified will be provided as separately priced task orders if required. Providing information on the routine data calls will allow the SP to provide the best overall price to the USACE. C.5.1.9 Clarification: Please clarify the scope of the USACE training requirements.</p> <p>C.5.1.11 Clarification: Please clarify the scope of Acquisition Support. C</p>

Section	Paragraph	State Concern
	C.5.3.1.4	<p>Comments on the A-76 and WCDS Work The proposal to include the WCDS Data acquisition into the A-76 plan will not only hamper the timeliness of dissemination of critical data to the engineers and scientists that require this information for their day to day operations within the USACE but will also diminish the technical expertise acquired within the last twenty-years of the integrating the data collection system to the process of conducting this type of engineering activity. The real time access to this type of critical data will also affect third party customers who use this data in their everyday tasks. Currently the proposed plan does not clearly define the tasks required to ensure the proper operation of the data acquisition. Engineering skills and an understanding of the currently highly evolving technological advances are required to maintain and operate our current system. Currently we rely on individuals who have the technical expertise of both technology and engineering to accomplish many of the tasks involved in the operations of Water Control. Currently CWMS has been exempt from the A-76 task, but the CWMS package is not an all in one system that can be used without knowledge of the aforementioned activities. The users of the CWMS package require administrative privileges to tie the DCP data to the software. The modeling aspects require an understanding of how to use GIS to create models for hydrologic and hydraulic studies. Also, an understanding of the DSS data system is required to operate the CWMS package. One of the most useful aspects of WCDS is the ability to control an ever changing dynamic web server. The ability to post hourly data of different types has been very beneficial to the public and other local and federal government agencies. Agencies that have lost this capability have been disappointed by the responsiveness of the contractor to make changes to the web. Dan Hernandez, Hydraulic Engineer, PhD, P.E. 918-669-7506 <tab></p>
	C5.2.1.1	<p>7. PWS(2nd Draft): C5.2.1.1. Description seems to be only a workstation viewpoint. Mention is made of GOTS and COTS for workstations and "specialized users", no mention is made of GOTS and COTS on the server level. COTS and GOTS software applications for servers include, but are not limited to, Database Management, Financial Management, Mapping, Web Server, Contract Management, Compilers, E-business, Secure access, Storage Management, Backup, COOP (replication, cluster, vault), Process Monitoring, Project Management, Report Management, Performance Monitoring, Security Monitoring, Collaboration tools etc... The actual numbers of server GOTS and COTS packages may be smaller but the support level required can be much higher than for workstation packages.</p>
C.5.2		

Section Paragraph

State Concern

SP will be responsible for ensuring that all Web-based information follows current Federal, DA, and Corps of Engineers Operational Security (OPSEC) requirements.

The SP will be subject to review and approval by the CCB for any changes to the network however, does the system include local servers to support GIS activities. When a new server is needed for local activities, who will be making the decisions to support and in what capacity?

I see no provision to ensure that e-mail and other necessary file are transferred to a responsible party when someone leaves a District or site. This is a larger process that IM has a definite role in.

The A76 IT/IM initiative was originally understood to target IT/IM positions and functions with specific exclusions for other functional elements such as Water Control. Section C.1.5 states that the SP shall abide by the provisions and regulations set forth in the PWS. Some of the regulations pertaining to water control functions are obscured in Technical Exhibits. The regulations for water control activities, especially ER1110-2-249 for the Corps Water Management System, and its synonymous predecessor the Water Control Data System, must be included in the main body of the PWS. According to ER 1110-2-249, systems and equipment used for water control must remain within the chain of command under the MSC/District Water Control Manager. Therefore, positions and functions related to operating and maintaining CWMS/WCDS systems and equipment are NOT and CANNOT be under the purview of the SP. IT/IM positions in direct support of water control are also excluded from the PWS. The H&H CoP leader in Headquarters is currently in the process of developing a data call to identify those, if any, IT positions (Water Control mission duties being performed by IT personnel) that are in direct support of the Water Control Mission of the Districts. This data call will be sent to the field within the next month and the information will be used to determine which, if any, IT positions must be excluded from the PWS.

Web support is occasionally provided by a local sponsor or contractor for reasonable or no cost. Will these be allowed? Will the SP monitor for regulatory requirements and enable connectivity to

We currently have stand alone computers used for various non-network activities. How will these be supported if the IT is primarily through network connections?

Section Paragraph

State Concern

The inclusion of Water Control equipment and functions in the PWS introduces an area that has not been adequately defined. By example, use of the CWMS AIS (The Corps Water Management System) in the PWS and particularly in TE-11, fails to recognize that Corps management uses CWMS in representing the entire Corps' water management function which entails significantly more than the software developed by the Hydrologic Engineering Center. Much of the water management function and daily operation of equipment, systems and software require knowledge of water resource management beyond basic IT/IM capabilities. A limited subset of those functionalities MAY be available by specialized service contractors, but each office has specific requirements not amenable to a nation-wide IT/IM contract. Each water control office shall retain the control to determine needs and capabilities for contracting specific water control functions on a case-by-case basis. Such contracts, if any, shall utilize support providers possessing specific capabilities peculiar to the hydraulics, hydrology and water control CoP. Those capabilities are not even mentioned in the PWS.

Add: C.5.2.2.17 Technology Refreshment. As part of the monthly service charge, the SP will offer technology refreshment of hardware and software. This technology refresh should occur in accordance with Table 1 below from the time the item is placed into operation. Technology refresh will be authorized by the Government. The Government will not be charged for technology refresh until refresh is directed by the Government. The SP may propose alternative well-justified alternative refresh schedules. The SP shall propose a process for managing technology change. The equipment identified shall be provided by the SP, at the direction of the Government. The SP will provide the personnel required to implement the refresh at the direction of the Government by selecting FTE from the labor schedule. The SP shall assist the Government in defining the scope and preparing the task order, including the selection of agreed to labor categories with associated rates, prior to receiving authorization to start work on the task. Equipment Type Frequency of Refreshment *Desktop Computers-Every 3 Years; *Server Computers - Every 3 Years;* Network Devices-Every 3 Years;* Storage Devices - Every 5 Years

Section	Paragraph	State Concern
	1	<p>The current draft bid documents do not reflect the complexity of the Tulsa District Water Control Data System (WCDS). The WCDS is a legacy Application System. We were only asked to supply a listing of software and hardware. The interaction of the programs as documented by data-flow diagrams were not requested. Nor did they request the engineering basis of the programs. An accurate bid cannot be made based on the current bid documents. It is foreseeable that once the winning contractor realizes the depth and difficulty of operating the Tulsa District WCDS they will scream for contract amendments. Water control is an inherently government activity. Finding qualified persons in the marketplace with a depth of experience in both hydraulic engineering and computer systems and software will be difficult. A contractor would likely have to have a two-person team (programmer and engineer) working together to accomplish as much as one of the current WCDS administrators. The current draft PWS exempts CWMS development from competition. I strongly recommend that CWMS operations as well as development and operations of any legacy WCDS systems be exempt.</p>
	5.2.1	<p>Under Section 5.2.1 APPLICATION SUPPORT and SERVICES; please add “Water Control Data Systems (WCDS) Support and Services” to read as follows: “The SP shall act in compliance with ER 1110-2-249 to provide WCDS Site Manager services to include the installation, operation, and maintenance of the onsite WCDS hardware, operating systems, network, and supporting facilities.</p>
	5.2.1.4	<p>The reference to removal and disposal appears to be in conflict with C.3.1.2.</p>
	5.2.2	<p>12. PWS(2nd Draft): 5.2.2. Currently many web sites are designed / developed by the AIS proponent, not USACE IM/IT.</p>
	5.2.4	<p>Is there not an issue with SP access to our Financial Systems for creation of their own contracts, large or medium or small? Should not the local COTR be the ONLY one doing this? Paragraph C.5.2.5 has a better handle on this requirement. Suggest all Automation paragraphs use the same language or place above in C.5.2 and mandate this for all subordinate paragraphs. Should this suggestion be acceptable, please ensure all similar IMIT paragraphs are consistent. IMHO no SP should be in CEFMS.</p>
	5.2.5	<p>This section should include requirements to monitor storage capacity, usage trends, recommend and maintain end user storage policies. This section should have requirements similar to those in C5.3.3 and its subparagraphs.</p>

Section	Paragraph	State Concern
	C 5.2.1	This section states that the SP shall maintain current and legacy data, operating systems, and applications systems. Para. C 5.1.15 implies that the CCB will eliminate current and diverse systems in order to make IM/IT more efficient. In both sections the SP should be directed to maintain diverse systems deployed at each office as necessary to provide mission capability. The CCB membership is not yet established and focus only on IM/IT fails to recognize Corps of Engineers core functional requirements. The CCB cannot over-ride decisions made by other AIS decision makers and local Commands based upon local and regional requirements. The Corps of Engineers is not a "one-size-fits all" organization.
	C.2.5	COnt to add from previous comments on C.5.2.5. t. Host general network services (e.g., Database services, COOP services, Data Warehousing services, Security services, etc.) that are not specifically tied to functional applications, but that may be shared by many (or all). Operate and support these services from the data center. u. Actively track application utilization, capture and archive application traffic data, perform trend analysis and forecasting; provide results via a web-accessible reporting system made available for all authorized users. v. All costs associated with the implementation and on-going operation of the stated services will be priced and billed on a monthly basis, except where otherwise specifically identified and agreed to.
	C.5.1.12.2	Paragraph states SP support "includes maintenance of [...] existing software and AISs." A considerable proportion of CESPL's Water Control software is locally developed. This local development was identified by programming language, lines of code, etc. in response to the PWS data call. This information is not evident in the current PWS draft. Also, it is widely known that many District's Water Control entities utilize non-standard software, and that too appears not to be identified in this draft. It would seem that deriving a reliable and realistic estimate to support unidentified software would be extremely difficult to achieve.
	C.5.2	Although the CWMS AIS is mentioned briefly in some places, the overall Water Control Data System is not mentioned at all. This system has special management issues as defined in ER 1110-2-249 that should be specifically addressed. I have always thought, due to the special nature of this mission, that it should have been excluded from this competition, however since that is not the case, it needs to be defined much more completely.

Section Paragraph

C.5.2

State Concern

Recommend Section 5.2 be re-titled Infrastructure Systems Management. Suggest adding: The SP will develop plans to integrate, consolidate, migrate, or otherwise host USACE applications and systems in one or more data centers. The SP shall recommend where these data centers should be located. The Gov. reserves the right to provide these data centers as GFE. This transition from decentralized application hosting, network support, and systems support to centralized hosting will occur over time by system and application. Centralization is anticipated to entail HW and SW replacement/upgrades, and will likely serve as opportune times to implement technology insertions and enhancements. The SP shall develop a recommendation on which business model to use (buy, lease, or provide service). All costs associated with the implementation and ongoing operation of the stated services will be priced and billed on a monthly basis, except where otherwise specifically identified and agreed to.

C.5.2

As stated, "the SP will participate in and contribute to the change control process of the USACE CCB". Will this be as a voting member??

Section	Paragraph	State Concern
	C.5.2.1	<p>Here's a list of applications that we (CEEIS) support that could / should be listed in PWS section C.5.2.1, "Application Support and Services", where there is discussion as to what is to be performed, but the individual items aren't listed. I noticed that in addition to "Application Support and Services", section C.5.2.2 is "Web Support and Services", so maybe items 3 and 6 should be listed there. There are additional application support done by the Windows folks, and none of that is listed here. The applications supported at the CEEIS Enterprise level are as follows: 1) Oracle Database support, versions 7 through 10. 2) Oracle Financial Application support, for the P2 application. 3) Oracle Projects support, for the P2 application. 4) Oracle web (farm) support, for various applications. 5) Oracle Application Server support, for various applications. 6) Sybase database support. 7) Standard Procurement System (SPS) support. 8) ESRI support, for the user interface to GIS data for the ENGLink application. 9) Apache web support, for the non-Oracle web user interface. 10) CA Unicenter support, for the P2 Helpdesk utility. 11) Chartworks support, for the ENGLink application. 12) CorpMaps support, for GIS map functions. 13) Application interface for the various COE Applications DBAs. 14) UNIX Scripting for and interface with the UNIX SAs and DBAs. 15) Big Brother support, for CEEIS internal availability monitoring. 16) Oracallator support, for collection of CEEIS server statistics. 17) SSL certificate activities. 18) CEEIS internal and COE wide web page support and content management. 19) WebLogic COTS support, for the P2 application. 20) Primavision COTS support, for the P2 application. 21) OP3 support, for middleware COTS for the P2 application. In section C.5.2.5, "Server Support and Services", there is no mention of the OS and versions. I</p>
	C.5.2.1	<p>Paragraph states "SP shall maintain current and legacy data, operating systems, and application systems." These legacy data, O/S, and application systems are not identified nor enumerated.</p>
	C.5.2.1.	<p>Do "corporate databases" include geospatial databases (e.g. ESRI ArcSDE geodatabases)? Do "web services" include geospatial web services (e.g. ESRI ArcIMS map services)? Is the SP responsible for developing, integrating and maintaining geospatial databases and web services?</p>
	C.5.2.1.1	<p>About one-half way down in the paragraph the term "desktop VTCs" is used. Recommend this be changed to "VTCs". There are VTCs that are installed and not traditional "desktop" VTCs.</p>

Section	Paragraph	State Concern
	c.5.2.1.1	Integration of COTS should include voice-video-data convergence.
	C.5.2.1.2	It is not clear whether development and deployment of customized GIS tools and interfaces (e.g. using ESRI ArcObjects) are included.
	C.5.2.1.2	This section describes the SP requirements and responsibilities for AIS. Comment: Since CWMS is considered an AIS does this apply to CWMS? There is no statement in this section to exempt CWMS. Do we assume the statement in the introduction, which exempted the CWMS, excludes CWMS.
	C.5.2.1.2 –	Request consistent description of responsibility for service provider listed in C.1 – Introduction, page 4; paragraph C.5.2.1.2; and TE-11, page 2, regarding operation, maintenance, sustainability, and development of AISs. Among these three sections, it is not clear whether or not the service provider is required to support AISs.
	C.5.2.1.3	Is the intent that all data entry functions are to be performed by the SP? This statement will have a significant impact on many non-2200 series personnel throughout many districts.
	C.5.2.1.3	Support for AIS data entry should be included as part of a Labor Schedule of services. This service is providing FTE support to specific tasks that are not clearly defined in the PWS. This effort should come from a labor schedule (provided by the SP) that lists labor categories and rates. If the task is known, the PWS should define the task, the anticipated labor categories required, the location of where the work is to be performed, and the estimated annual hours by labor category. If the task is known, but not yet defined or not known, the PWS should state "that the SP shall assist the Government in defining the scope and preparing the task order, including the selection of agreed to labor categories with associated rates, prior to receiving authorization to start work on the task." The SP would then respond to the PWS with a description of how this work will be accomplished, i.e. what processes will be used, tools, etc.
	C.5.2.1.3	Is data cleansing included? If so, does the USACE plan to provide subject matter experts (SMEs) to assist SP in this effort?
	C.5.2.1.3.	It is not clear whether this paragraph includes tasks such as populating a district-level enterprise geospatial data warehouse. Such an endeavor could potentially include a large volume of spatial data format conversion, coordinate system reprojection, compression, tile mosaicking, etc.
	C.5.2.1.3.	AIS Data Entry. Comment: There is no specific exclusionary statement for CWMS in this section. CWMS was listed as an exempt system in the introduction. Can we assume that CWMS is an exempt AIS for data entry?

Section	Paragraph	State Concern
	C.5.2.1.3.	<p>I work with data everyday, part of my job as a hydrologist, is to gather, convert, and transform data from one electronic medium to another. My job requires that I do this; am I to understand now, that the IT/IM SP will now be performing technical functions as hydrologists? “The SP shall import large amounts of data...?”</p> <p>Is it to be implied from this language that the SP will not be importing small amounts of data? If so, what and who is to provide the definitions of “amounts of data”, whether they’re large or small? “Data to be entered includes manual entry of mass data submitted by customers...”. What about data that I might develop; technically, I’d be a customer to the SP? Who is to enter THAT data?</p>
	C.5.2.1.4	<p>25.<tab>C.5.2.1.4 CADD, GIS System Support – This section still remains unclear where the line is between SP provided system support and government provided functional support. Is the SP responsible for just the network and system admin associated with CADD and GIS? Who provides “How to” and other related help support (i.e., how to draw a line in CADD)? Recommend distinction between the network and system admin to be provided by SP and support of the actual CADD and GIS applications be provided by government functional proponent.</p>
	C.5.2.1.4	<p>This paragraph describes what both CADD and GIS support are but only requires the SP to support CADD. First sentence should be modified to include GIS.</p>
	C.5.2.1.4	<p>Revise first sentence. FROM "The SP shall provide IMIT CADD support. IMIT CADD and GIS support includes assistance" TO "The SP shall assist IMIT CADD and GIS programs. IMIT CADD and GIS program assistance will include"</p>
	C.5.2.1.4	<p>In the sentence "IMIT CADD and GIS support includes assistance with acquisition process; licensing management;" The meaning is unclear. Believe the intent is "includes acquisition process assistance; licensing management;"</p>
	C.5.2.1.4	<p>Disagree that SP collaborates with functional managers in USACE on CADD policies and standards. All IT policies and standards are set by CIO and should be coordinated with COTR or KO not functional managers. PWS is saying that CADD and GIS can create their own policies and standards outside of CIO oversight.</p>
	C.5.2.1.4	<p>Will HEC or local field sites still have control of CWMS/GIS integration?</p>

Section	Paragraph	State Concern
	C.5.2.1.4	<p>Support for CADD and GIS should be included as part of a Labor Schedule of services. This service is providing FTE support to specific tasks that are not clearly defined in the PWS. This effort should come from a labor schedule (provided by the SP) that lists labor categories and rates. If the task is known, the PWS should define the task, the anticipated labor categories required, the location of where the work is to be performed, and the estimated annual hours by labor category. If the task is known, but not yet defined or not known, the PWS should state "that the SP shall assist the Government in defining the scope and preparing the task order, including the selection of agreed to labor categories with associated rates, prior to receiving authorization to start work on the task." The SP would then respond to the PWS with a description of how this work will be accomplished, i.e. what processes will be used, tools, etc.</p>
	C.5.2.1.4.	<p>The first sentence should be changed from "The SP shall provide IMIT CADD support" to "The SP shall provide IMIT CADD and GIS support". The second sentence states that "IMIT CADD and GIS support includes assistance with [emphasis added] acquisition process, ..." This is at odds with the language in paragraph C.5.2.1.2, which states that "AIS support includes planning, design, security, development, integration, testing, implementation, acquisition, installation, documentation, upgrades, customization, maintenance, troubleshooting, removal, disposal, and replacement." Does this mean that CADD and GIS software support is to be treated differently from support of other software? If not, I recommend dropping the phrase "assistance with". Or does the phrase "assistance with" apply only to the acquisition process and not the other tasks such as license management, installation, upgrading, etc.? This point requires clarification. In the second last sentence, the phrase "CADD policies and standards" should be changed to "CADD and GIS policies and standards".</p>
	C.5.2.1.5	<p>Support for GIS should be included as part of the Labor Schedule of services. This service is providing FTE support to specific tasks that are not clearly defined in the PWS. This effort should come from a labor schedule (provided by the SP) that lists labor categories and rates. If the task is known, the PWS should define the task, the anticipated labor categories required, the location of where the work is to be performed, and the estimated annual hours by labor category. If the task is known, but not yet defined or not known, the PWS should state "that the SP shall assist the Government in defining the scope and preparing the task order, including the selection of agreed to labor categories with associated rates, prior to receiving authorization to start work on the task." The SP would then respond to the PWS with a description of how this work will be accomplished, i.e. what processes will be used, tools, etc.</p>

Section	Paragraph	State Concern
	C.5.2.1.5.	With the minor changes I recommended for paragraph C.5.2.1.4, paragraph C.5.2.1.5 can be eliminated completely.
	C.5.2.10	Please provide additional information for TE-17. Please define acronyms and further define mission requirements.
	C.5.2.10	Please identify the IT requirements associated with unique missions listed in TE-17. If offerors are expected to propose IT support solutions for these unique missions, additional description of the mission requirements and workloads will be required.
	C.5.2.10 – IMIT	1. Only automation services are identified here. Each mission area, i.e., communications, etc., should be identified in their PWS sections. 2. Change the first sentence to read, “The SP shall provide all IM/IT automation services for unique IMIT mission requirements identified in TE-17.” 3. NOTE: There should be a similar comment like this in every mission area.
	C.5.2.10 – IMIT	1. Only automation services are identified here. Each mission area, i.e., communications, etc., should be identified in their PWS sections. 2. Change the first sentence to read, “The SP shall provide all IM/IT automation services for unique IMIT mission requirements identified in TE-17.” 3. NOTE: There should be a similar comment like this in every mission area.
	C.5.2.2	Will other offices still have the ability to develop, publish, and maintain their own office web pages on the Internet as is currently allowed in many Districts?
	c.5.2.2	The development of web based application and their direct tie to databases is never mentioned. The convergence of web based interface development with Database backends needs to be reflected in the PWS
	C.5.2.2	Will regular users still be able to create web pages and web applications or does everything have to go through the SP.
	C.5.2.2	Recommend "administering access restrictions" be included in this paragraph. This could include passwords for specific pages or setting permissions.
	C.5.2.2	Absolutely no attempt made to quantify the number/types of web servers, web pages or otherwise delineate the requirements of this section. As a provider of information for the original PWS data call, I know that server information, numbers of static pages, number of dynamic pages and myriad other relevant data was submitted. Where is it???

Section	Paragraph	State Concern
	C.5.2.2	Recommend adding new C.5.2.2 - Core Enterprise Services to replace the current 5.2.2 Web Support and services. The contractor will provide an enterprise infrastructure with a robust, scalable portal that provides a single point of entry to the various applications and content valuable to the enterprise. Accept where noted in section 5.2.2, these sections should be included as part of the managed services offering. (See Service matrix). Initial core services provided by the enterprise includes:* Enterprise portal providing a single point of entry to disseminate Sensitive But Unclassified information in a controlled USACE-wide environment via document/knowledge object repository with document check-in/out, email notifications, and permission based access to specific document sites.* User authentication via Lightweight Directory Access Protocol (LDAP) username/password.* Single Sign On for over "TBD" applications* Directory services and white pages for over 39,000 users
	C.5.2.2	Can the SP centralize all web services, if they are not already? Can web services be performed remotely?
	C.5.2.2	C.5.2.2 Web Support and Services – need to add that SP needs to align and incorporate concepts in E-Gov, Web Council, and federal regulations like Section 508 compliance.
	C.5.2.2	Insert new 5.2.2 Core Enterprise Services, here. See comments on Core Enterprise service. Change C 5.2.2 web services and support to read C.5.2.2.13 Web support services and reorder this para under the new 5.2.2 Core Enterprise services. See comments for new 5.2.2 Core Enterprise Service
	C.5.2.2.	Under Web Support and Services, add Web Content Services SP will provide web content service including taxonomy maintenance, broken link and link suitability checking, metadata, and policy compliance reviews.
	C.5.2.2.	Are geospatial web services (e.g. ESRI ArcIMS map services) included?
	C.5.2.2.1	Add: C.5.2.2.1 Electronic Mail Electronic mail server and support infrastructure will be sufficiently robust to ensure the required service levels, and will be engineered and configured to accommodate future expansion, if required. Periodic backups of both primary and secondary message stores will be stored at secure off-site facilities. Service Levels. Support based on a user population of 39,000 users; 150MB mailbox size on primary message store, unlimited storage in secondary storage (configured with automatic archival procedures); 10GB Public Folders; PKI/CAC digital signature and encryption; 99.9% accessible; 24x7 availability; 1-hour restoration.

Section	Paragraph	State Concern
	C.5.2.2.10	Add: C.5.2.2.10 Automated Server Deployment. Recommend and provide an automated server deployment function that will provision software infrastructure (i.e. operating systems, middleware, etc.) to servers located at the primary site and the alternate sites and have the ability to support other multiple locations from a central point.
	C.5.2.2.11	Add: C.5.2.2.11 Automated Code and Content Deployment. Recommend and provide a be web-based and automate the processes of uploading and deploying new application code and content throughout the enterprise and facilitate the role-back of code and software when necessary.
	C.5.2.2.12	Add: C.5.2.2.12 Automated Patch Management. The solution should automate the deployment of operating system, application, and security patches across the deployed environment to mitigate risk.
	C.5.2.2.14	Web server support and administration should be included as part of the managed services offering. (See Service matrix). Content management and the personnel who maintain the web page content should be part of the District support package. The SP should understand that each District is different in terms of the number of web pages maintained. Consequently additional personnel may need to be provided to maintain the content of the web pages maintained by a given District. As such additional personnel shall be provided at the direction of the Government by selecting FTE from the labor schedule. The SP shall assist the Government in defining the scope and preparing the task order, including the selection of agreed to labor categories with associated rates, prior to receiving authorization to start work on the task.

Section	Paragraph	State Concern
	C.5.2.2.14	<p>Add: C.5.2.2.14 Web Development and Support. Web development includes developing and publishing web pages; web collaboration; facilitating end user development and publication technologies; and providing web planning, designing, scripting, integrating, testing, documenting, and training services. This section is requesting support that should be included as part of the Labor Schedule of services. (See Service matrix) This requested service is providing FTE support to specific tasks that are not clearly defined in this section of the PWS. This effort should come from a labor schedule (provided by the SP) that lists labor categories and rates. If the task is known, this section of the PWS should define the task, the anticipated labor categories required, the location of where the work is to be performed, and the estimated annual hours by labor category. If the task is known, but not yet defined or not known, the PWS should state "that the SP shall assist the Government in defining the scope and preparing the task order, including the selection of agreed to labor categories with associated rates, prior to receiving authorization to start work on the task." The SP would then respond to the PWS with a description of how this work will be accomplished, i.e. what processes will be used, tools, etc.</p>
	C.5.2.2.15	<p>Add: C.5.2.2.15. Configuration Expansion. The SP shall propose and separately price on a per unit per month basis, the ability to expand the delivered or existing configurations of the Primary Site and the Alternate Sites by adding any of the then-current objective architecture components, in any desired quantity, add additional software licenses and support agreements as required to expand the delivered or existing configuration to meet the hardware expansion, and provide the USACE the ability to add fully operational data storage at anytime during the base or option years of the contract.</p>
	C.5.2.2.16	<p>Add: C.5.2.2.16 Data Backup. The SP will be responsible for providing a data backup capability that will support the initial data configuration and be incrementally expandable to meet the objective data storage capabilities. This service should be included as part of the managed services offering. (See Service matrix)</p>

Section	Paragraph	State Concern
	C.5.2.2.18	<p>Add: C.5.2.2.18 Technology Enhancement/Upgrades. The SP will propose, as necessary or at the request of USACE, technology enhancement/upgrades of hardware and software in conjunction with the architecture assessment . These enhancements/upgrades will be offered in the form of engineering change proposals to the objective USACE configuration and priced monthly. The SP shall propose a process for managing technology change. The equipment identified shall be provided by the SP, at the direction of the Government. The SP will provide the personnel required to implement the refresh at the direction of the Government by selecting FTE from the labor schedule. The SP shall assist the Government in defining the scope and preparing the task order, including the selection of agreed to labor categories with associated rates, prior to receiving authorization to start work on the task. All costs associated with the implementation and on-going operation of the stated services will be priced and billed on a monthly basis, except where otherwise specifically identified and agreed to.</p>
	C.5.2.2.19	<p>Add: C.5.2.2.19 Data Center Infrastructure. The SP may be directed to develop, equip, and initiate operations of one or more data centers, on a reimbursable basis. This service should be included as part of the managed services offering. (See Service matrix). At Government direction, the SP shall: a. Purchase, configure, and deploy the LAN infrastructure (Gigabit Ethernet switches, load balancing switches, server clusters, etc.) necessary to begin installation and migration of USACE applications and services to the data center with prior dollar amounts approved by the Government. b. Purchase, configure, and deploy all servers, storage, peripherals, operations workstations, and related connectivity hardware, system software, database software, and utilities necessary to provide all data center services as specified in the data center plans and not otherwise provided for in this statement of work with prior dollar amounts approved by the Government. c. Purchase, configure, and install all software, licensing, Client Access Licenses (CALs) and other special automation items required to operate the data center and not otherwise provided for in this statement of work; ensure USACE compliance with all applicable software licensing contracts, regulations, and statutes with prior dollar amounts approved by the Government. d. Purchase hardware maintenance support plans, software support plans, and COTS software vendor assistance as required by the Government to support the equipment and software procured by the contractor under this statement of work with prior dollar amounts approved by the Government. e. All costs associated with the implementation and on-going operation of the stated services will be priced and billed on a monthly basis, except where otherwise specifically identified and agreed to.</p>

Section	Paragraph	State Concern
	C.5.2.2.2	<p>Add: C.5.2.2.2 Attached Storage Procure, install, Implement and sustain a data storage solution. The Storage Area Network (SAN) arrays, or something similar, will be expandable with additional storage arrays. Includes periodic technology insertion and refreshment to sustain currency with industry norms, and is integrated with and supports future desktop solutions and configurations. General Requirements. Web-accessible file services will be available to all USACE users 24x7, and accessible to the levels as specified by the storage solution File server and support infrastructure will be sufficiently robust to ensure the required service levels, and will be engineered and configured to accommodate future expansion, if required. Periodic backups will be stored at secure off-site facilities. Implement shared organizational and personal file services in conjunction with published USACE documentation.</p>
	C.5.2.2.20	<p>Add: C.5.2.2.20 Data Center Documentation. For all Data Center operations contribute to Concept of Operations (CONOPS) development, and statistics collection and reporting. Ensure all documentation pursuant to DITSCAP accreditation is available upon request. Assist in Service Level Agreement (SLA) development and refinement. Measure operations and activities pursuant to this Task, and provide metrics suitable for use in SLA-managed operations.</p>

Section	Paragraph	State Concern
	C.5.2.2.21	<p>Add: 5.2.2.21 Continuity Of Operations Planning (COOP). The SP shall provide for continuous operations and data accessibility for all data center hosted applications and systems. The SP shall provide hardware, associated operating system software, application software, maintenance support, software license renewal, and technical support necessary for the Primary Data Center to be replicated and mirrored at an alternate site as a service. This service should be included as part of the managed services offering. (See Service matrix) In particular, the contractor shall: a. Develop disaster recovery processes for each class of application – Mission Essential, Mission Enhancement, and Other. Processes shall include, at a minimum, data recovery, system recovery, system mirroring (if applicable), automatic fail over (if applicable), and manual operations procedures. b. Publish and maintain COOP plans for all USACE Data Center facilities, enterprise applications and services, and supporting infrastructures. c. Maintain on-line data store (JBOD or SATA) for all backups within the past month; maintain near-line data store (DLT ‘Juke-Box’) for all backups within past year. d. Maintain off-site archival for all backups in non-volatile media formats. e. Conduct exercises and tests of backup, fail over, and recovery processes f. Ensure all documentation pursuant to DITSCAP accreditation is available upon request. g. Assist in Service Level Agreement (SLA) development and refinement. h. Measure operations and activities pursuant to this Task, and provide metrics suitable for use in SLA-managed operations. All costs associated with the implementation and on-going operation of the stated services will be priced and billed on a monthly basis.</p>

Section **Paragraph**
C.5.2.2.22

State Concern

Add : 5.2.2.22 Architecture. Upon approval, the SP shall provide planning, development, documentation, and implementation tracking in support of the USACE IT architecture. Many of these activities support the USACE staff directly, with only peripheral support to data center operations. This architecture must be synchronized with the Department of Defense Global Information Grid architecture and other higher echelon standards while choosing options within that guidance more specifically beneficial to USACE mission requirements. The architecture will be used pervasively for all future application and system development and includes operational, systems, and technical views. This section is requesting support that should be included as part of the Labor Schedule of services. (See Service matrix) This requested service is providing FTE support to specific tasks that is not clearly defined in this section of the PWS. This effort should come from a labor schedule that should be provided by the SP, which lists the numerous labor categories with rates attached. If the task is known, this section of the PWS should define the task, the anticipated labor categories required, the location of where the work is to be performed, and the estimated annual hrs by labor category. The SP can then propose against the task. If the task is known, but not yet defined or not known, the PWS should state "that the SP shall assist the Government in defining the scope and preparing the task order, including the selection of agreed to labor categories with associated rates, prior to receiving authorization to start work on the task. All costs associated with the implementation and on-going operation of the stated services will be priced and billed on a monthly basis, except where otherwise specifically identified and agreed to. This part of the service should be included as part of the managed services offering. (See Service matrix) The SP shall:

Section	Paragraph	State Concern
	C.5.2.2.22	<p>Cont. from previous sec C.5.2.2.22 comments; m. Procure, configure, and install hardware and software systems to enable implementation of an USACE architecture repository with prior dollar amounts approved by the Government. n. Model and document existing and target architectures at the system and technical levels; maintain architecture artifacts and data in the electronic repository. Provide decision support regarding architecture issues based on data in the architecture repository. o. Plan future architectures, infrastructure investments, and migration projects to keep the USACE synchronized with DoD and USACE architectures, to maintain appropriate levels of interoperability, to keep technologically current, and ultimately to achieve lowest reasonable long term cost of providing required services. p. Evaluate existing and planned IT implementations for adherence to USACE architecture standards and impact of architecture changes on USACE networks and users. q. The contractor shall propose a staffing plan, detailing required skills, job descriptions, staffing levels, and work schedule for to perform on-going architectural assessments, product evaluations, technology insertion/refreshment recommendations and other tasks identified above. r. All costs associated with the implementation and on-going operation of the stated services will be priced and billed on a monthly basis, except where otherwise specifically identified and agreed to.</p>

Section	Paragraph	State Concern
	C.5.2.2.23	<p>Add: 5.2.2.23 Integration and Testing. The SP shall establish and operate an integration test lab to model and test changes to the USACE baseline configuration. The test lab will be used to test configuration changes, product evaluations, and technology insertions. The USACE requires two tiers of test and evaluation – modeling and simulation of proposed changes utilizing the OPNET toolset, and actual load testing of software and hardware configurations in a simulated operational environment. This service should be included as part of the managed services offering. (See Service matrix). The SP shall:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Design, procure product, install and implement a test lab environment that faithfully simulates the USACE info structure environment. b. Develop test scripts, scenarios, and acceptance criteria for each proposed configuration change. c. Conduct tests; capture, document, and publish test results. d. Develop OPNET models, scenarios, and acceptability thresholds for each proposed configuration change. e. Execute OPNET models; capture, document, and publish modeling results. f. Publish recommendations and findings for all tests, modeling simulations, and assessments. g. Integrate the testing operation with advanced software development methodologies implementing industry management control standards such as the SEI CMM Level 4 (or higher) or ISO 9000 (or higher). h. Ensure all documentation pursuant to DITSCAP accreditation is available upon request. i. Assist in Service Level Agreement (SLA) development and refinement. j. Measure operations and activities pursuant to this Task, and provide metrics suitable for use in SLA-managed operations. k. All costs associated with the implementation and on-going operation of the stated services will be priced and billed on a monthly basis, except where otherwise specifically identified and agreed to.
	C.5.2.2.3	<p>Add: C.5.2.2.3 Personal Home Directories. Web-accessible file services will be available to all USACE users 24x7, and accessible to the following levels – Organizational shared folders 99.99% and Personal home directories 99.5%. File server and support infrastructure will be sufficiently robust to ensure the required service levels, and will be engineered and configured to accommodate future expansion, if required. Periodic backups will be stored at secure off-site facilities Service Levels. Supports an estimated 39,000 users; 500MB per user; Active Directory linkage for authorization and authentication; 99.5% accessible; 24x7 availability; 6 hour restoration.</p>

Section	Paragraph	State Concern
	C.5.2.2.4	<p>Add: C.5.2.2.4 Unified Messaging Procure, install, and configure in USACE data centers enterprise-class infrastructure to support unified messaging services for all authorized USACE users. Implement a unified messaging capability throughout the USACE, tying together voice mail, email, pager, cell phone, and wireless and PDA technologies in conjunction with published USACE documentation. This service will support organizational initiatives to support a mobile, telecommuting workforce. Service Levels. Measured in terms of message delivery or availability, and message accuracy. Message delivery will be assured within ten minutes receipt within the unified messaging system, 98% of the time. Messages shall be assured to be free of substantive errors 99.9% of the time. The Solution must be compatible with legacy messaging capabilities (Exchange, voice mail from multiple vendors, Blackberry, etc.).</p>
	C.5.2.2.6	<p>Add: C.5.2.2.6 Service Level Management (SLM) Solution Recommend, provide, integrate, install, maintain and refresh, in accordance with a routine and described frequency, a Service Level Management (SLM) solution, to include the ability to monitor and report on end user experience. The Service Level Management solution must allow the USACE to measure system availability, quality of service provided, overall system performance, and other service level agreements and performance metrics of the Enterprise (including the primary Data Center and alternate sites).</p>
	C.5.2.2.7	<p>Add: C.5.2.2.7 Systems Remote Management (SRM) Solution Recommend, provide, integrate, install, maintain and refresh, in accordance with a routine and described frequency, a Systems Remote Management (SRM) solution. The purpose of the remote management software is to allow the Primary Site and Alternate sites, when required, to operate in a “lights-dim” -- minimum on site staffing -- manner. The proposed solution should allow for optimized staffing, allowing operations of all sites from a virtual location. The Proposed solution should provide a means for managing operational activities across disparate, distributed environments. The solution allows users to have the visibility and control needed to effectively manage their complex operations infrastructure. The proposed solution must include all hardware and operating system software required. The Remote System Management capability along with a Service Level Management solution will be used to reduce staffing requirements.</p>

Section	Paragraph	State Concern
	C.5.2.2.8	Add: C.5.2.2.8 Systems Configuration Management (SCM) Solution Recommend, provide, integrate, install, maintain and refresh, in accordance with a routine and described frequency, a comprehensive Systems Configuration Management (SCM) solution. The automated configuration management capability and procedures should include all required hardware, operating systems, and application software and provide the ability to electronically track system configuration between the primary site and the alternate sites.
	C.5.2.2.9	Add: C.5.2.2.9 Automated Enterprise Management Capability Recommend, provide, integrate, install, and maintain an Automated Enterprise Management solution that will, at a minimum, provide the capability to manage system software/hardware configurations, perform configuration audits, manage software distribution, and electronically replicate system configuration and provisioning between the primary site and the alternate sites in order for one site to take full operational control in the event the other site fails.
	C.5.2.3	8. PWS(2nd Draft): C.5.2.3 Should mention be made that the databases involve multiple types of RDBMS software? They include, but are not limited to, ORACLE, SYBASE, MSSQL, MYSQL and ACCESS.
	C.5.2.3	Absolutely no attempt made to quantify the number/types of databases covered by this section. As a provider of information for the original PWS data call, I know that number/types of databases, number of indexes, criticality, etc. were provided. Why isn't that information included?
	C.5.2.3	At the Detroit District H&H personnel are responsible for various in-house programs and scripting. If a SP took over this function, we may lose the ability to get updates to programming errors and changes in a timely manner. This could affect data dissemination, especially on the web. Having up-to-date and correct data is essential to our mission. The SP would be responsible for maintaining our in-house computer programs and scripts.
	C.5.2.3	What database technology requires administration (Oracle, Sybase, etc.)?
	C.5.2.3	Will HEC or local field sites still have control of CWMS Oracle administration? Can local Water Management offices no longer write specialized scripts to retrieve data but must depend on the SP? What about emergency flood support?

Section	Paragraph	State Concern
	C.5.2.3	Recommend adding to Database Support and Services paragraph: Recommend and provide a proven solution that replicates Oracle databases maintained at the Primary Site and the Alternate Sites on a real-time basis. The solution will provide a high-speed, high-performance Oracle database replication product that enables users to replicate large volumes of data and database activities over local and wide area networks. The Oracle databases that are replicated will be fully accessible by the applications that utilize them. The end state capability should provide two operational facilities capable of active-active replication between both sites. The security, integrity, and confidentiality of the data must be ensured during replication between the sites. This service should be included as part of a managed services offering.
	C.5.2.3.	Are geospatial databases (e.g. ESRI ArcSDE geodatabases) included?
	C.5.2.4	What standard benchmark or acquisition specification is used to determine changing technology versus user experienced value as the desktop industry evolves?
	C.5.2.4	Please define who the SP shall submit acquisition packages to.
	C.5.2.4	Office Automation Support and Services. Need a definition of an “acquisition package”. Also referenced in other areas.
	C.5.2.4	Is there a reduction in on-hand inventory being experienced or planned during this contract?
	C.5.2.4	Does the USACE “waterfall” desktop hardware from one user to another as new desktop hardware is introduced to the user community? If so, how are these costs recognized?
	C.5.2.4	This section is covered under the recommended changes listed in section 5.1 and 5.2 above. Recommend this section be deleted.
	C.5.2.4	How much hardware inventory is required to be on-hand to support the current equipment base?
	C.5.2.4	This section is covered under the recommended changes listed in section 5.1 and 5.2 above. Recommend this section be deleted.
	C.5.2.4	What is the average age of USACE desktops?

Section	Paragraph	State Concern
	C.5.2.4.-C.5.2.9	<p>C.5.2.4 Comment: We concur with the Government’s requirement for the SP to provide life-cycle management. This benefits the USACE by ensuring that the SP maximizes Total Ownership Cost over the life of the equipment. C.5.2.5 ...</p> <p>Clarification: Please provide detailed information on server configuration, core applications, operations, maintenance, upgrades, and procedures for configuration management of the USACE applications. C.5.2.7 Clarification: Please specify the current architectures and technologies. C.5.2.8 Clarification: Please provide an estimate of the percentage of total IT/IM activity under this program that will be classified. Please confirm that this classified requirement can be consolidated into a small number of sites and that the Government will provide the limited number of classified facilities required. Benefit: Separating the classified requirement from the unclassified requirement and consolidating it into a small number of facilities will reduce the high-cost classified environments and provide the most cost-effective overall solution for the USACE. C.5.2.9 Clarification: Since the demand for IMIT Facility Support and Services is not quantified, please confirm that they will be priced and awarded as additional services when required.</p>
	C.5.2.5	<p>Please ensure that all IMIT services are as clear as this statement below. Assume that the SP cannot enter into contracts with other vendors for the government unless the COR directs by letter on a case-by-case basis.</p>
	C.5.2.5	<p>Is network administration, including firewalls, required from the SP in addition to server administration? If not, how is the network administered? What is the network technology presently being used?</p>
	C.5.2.5	<p>Paragraph C.1 stated that CWMS AIS is exempt. This section states that the SP will “plan, design, submit acquisition packages, and administer server hardware and software” on all Corps servers. I interpret this to mean all WCDS/CWMS field servers. Is this</p>

Section	Paragraph	State Concern
	C.5.2.5	<p>C.5.2.5 Server Support and Services. Recommend adding the following at the end of the paragraph: Operations Support. The SP shall provide data center operational support services to provide continuous, reliable network services. Support will be provided 24x7; support will include, but not be limited to, hardware/software installation and maintenance, systems administration and operations, database administration and operations, troubleshooting and problem resolution, and assistance in providing technical and physical security.</p> <p>This service should be included as part of the managed services offering. (See Service matrix) The SP shall: a. Provide manpower in accordance with approved staffing plans, required skills, job descriptions, and work schedules. b. Provide systems administration (maintain operating system, configuration, and proper operating capacities) for Data Center hosted applications and systems. c. Provide systems operations (run assigned jobs, mount media, monitor operations) for Data Center hosted applications and systems. d. Provide database administration (maintain configuration and proper operating capacities (i.e., tuning) for database management systems) for Data Center hosted databases. e. Provide database operations (run assigned jobs, mount media, monitor operations for database management systems) for data center hosted databases. f. Develop and maintain a systems Inventory for each data center, including hardware and software components, peripheral devices, operational processes, and other resources for each Data Center hosted application or system. . Develop and maintain a systems availability reporting mechanism for each Data Center including operational status of each major data center component, application, system, and operation.</p>
	C.5.2.5	<p>27.<tab>C.5.2.5 Server Support and Services – need to add SP should consult with customers, gather customer requirements, conduct capacity planning, perform network optimization and tuning (different than maintenance reference), and meet certification and accreditation requirements (also might link to section C.5.4.3).</p>
	C.5.2.5	<p>Currently Detroit H&H personnel make sure that our servers follow Corps and Army security guidelines, by patching them in a timely manner. These personnel also update the CWMS, U-PASS, and Oracle programs. If a SP took over this function, we may lose the ability to have tight rein/control over our servers.</p>

Section	Paragraph	State Concern
	C.5.2.5.	<p>Administration is to include...integration; installation; deployment; documentation; backup; software upgrades; customization, etc...! This is insane; very, very dangerous and irresponsible. IT/IM personnel will not have the capability to represent all the specific detail in the technical requirements of functional units such as Reservoir Operations, Hydrology, Hydraulics, GeoTech, etc...How is it possible that this is not recognized? Efficiency in responding to emergencies when a critical gage somewhere in California stops reporting; there's a power failure at a flood control project; a gate malfunctions will literally be nonexistent.</p> <p>This PSW conflicts directly with the Corps current focus of streamlining the processes. Handing over such broad scoping authority for literally every digital service conceivable will only create barriers in efficiency. This PSW is not very well thought out.</p>
	C.5.2.5.	Does server administration include the installation, integration, customization, testing, maintenance and troubleshooting of GIS server-side software such as ESRI ArcSDE and ArcIMS?
	C.5.2.5. Server	Type-o correction only: "CADD, GIS, and other" There are two commas.
	C.5.2.6	<p>The help desk serves as the organization's face and impression to the customer. The level of support requirements, the level of helpdesk placement required (District-Region-National) needs to be well addressed and defined, as well as requiring all portions of the help desk be physically located within the United States. If none of this is addressed, you are setting yourself up for low-skilled call loggers potentially from other countries that will pass a large percentage of calls off to next level support. A relatively high first contact resolution rate must exist to properly support USACE mission requirements, which would require more highly skilled technicians in those roles. C.5.2.6 refers bidders to C.1.5.12 to find information regarding the help desk section of the PWS. That paragraph only addresses technical support, and does not specifically address the need for a central help desk (help line) to call or contact for any technical assistance. I feel much more work needs to be done with detailing the help desk service requirements.</p>
	C.5.2.6	Suggest Help Desk be all inclusive of every product and service provided in this PWS. Not a subordinate paragraph anywhere in this PWS. Any IMIT system should have Help-Desk gurus. Should also delineate the local Help Desk chores versus what the SP might want to Centralize. As written in this PWS, the SP can provide one Help Desk, location unknown.
	c.5.2.7	There is no mention of handling or managing email for Blackberry or two way wireless email devices (TWWED).

Section	Paragraph	State Concern
	C.5.2.7	28.<tab>C.5.2.7 Electronic Message Support and Services – implies the SP has to provide a USACE-wide email system. Shouldn't this reference the Exchange Email system we already have and will be supplying? This, along with the existing Microsoft AD CEEIS infrastructure is in place. SP needs to support and manage this, at least initially.
	C.5.2.7	This paragraph should specifically require the SP to support the current USACE classified and unclassified electronic messaging systems. Recommend we not entertain proposals for replacing the current email system due to the cost of user training and of converting archived messages, personal folders, calendars, contacts and other features of the existing email system other formats.
	C.5.2.7	Is use of existing electronic message systems (Microsoft Exchange/Outlook) expected, implied, required, or mandated? May offerors propose alternatives?
	C.5.2.7.1	Will the SP be required to provide the full, currently required, level of messaging services listed in this paragraph at each Corps site?
	C.5.2.8.	Duties also include secure fax receipt/transmittal, secure phone (re-key, inventory, training), and classified office application programs and media.
	C.5.2.8.2	To "administer classified IMIT devices" the SP will need to abide by all the provisions of AR380-40 which prohibit the use of contractors as COMSEC custodians. This issue must be addressed in the contract review.
	C5.2.2	It is often necessary for Detroit District H&H personnel to update various content on our web pages and servers. Losing this ability to a SP would have a negative impact because updates may not be made in a timely fashion. The Great Lakes data we post on the web is viewed by a wide audience. Correct and up-to-date information is
	C5.2.3	10. PWS(2nd Draft):C5.2.3 Database Support and Services needs to include tuning, corruption correction, customer support, training, configuration, monitoring, and patching. Should probably also include a list of Corps standard DBMSs, i.e. vendor-supported versions of Oracle, Sybase, and MS SQL Server. Should also mention which run on UNIX and which on Windows at the Corps.
	te-11	We have an application running from the CEFMS tables. The application is named DATAMART and is web-based. The application is on a server in the Memphis District but is used Division Wide and report out data for all District and the Division office. It is maintained by the Memphis District (IM and RM offices)
	C.5.3	

Section Paragraph

State Concern

I see no reference to secretarial services. Are these services to be included?

PWS: Does the scope of communications networks the SP will be required to operate and maintain include not only the CEEIS Enterprise Network but also independent Corps networks existent at the Division and District level?

There is no way that the maintenance of the DCP (Data collection Platform, goes transmitters) can be properly bid with the existing information provided in the document. All sites are not equal. Most DCP's are joint used by other federal agencies, the NWS, USGS, and NOAA. Maintenance of the DCP requires at least three years of on the job experience. Any reference to DCP, Goes transmitters, and wireless communication of water management data should be deleted from the entire package.

Operation of the Data Collection Platform (DCP)/Goes transmitter is an integral part of the Stream gage. The DCP is the backbone of the entire stream gage. Maintenance is currently performed by Hydrologic Technicians and is not a part of Information Management.

The maintenance is performed by Corps Technicians, and USGS technicians. The cost of the DCP maintenance is lumped into the total cost of the gage maintenance. At many sites this maintenance is cost shared with the USGS and other USGS cooperators. At some sites the entire cost of the COE DCP maintenance is born by the USGS and its cooperators. It reads as if we're rewording the contract and not voicing concern about the direction of contracting "joint" equipment and service. These sites, and equipment, are cooperative in nature and the information is operational, statistical, public critical, and life saving. During critical events and seasons, this information is as important as the NEXRAD is to NOAA, Radar to the FAA traffic controllers, and traffic information to local police during floods, etc. What are they thinking? Real time decisions are made based upon the information from the DCP. These decisions can impact loss of life and property. Technician that repair the DCP transmitters are first responders during times of floods. Data from these units is used by the NWS (National Weather Service) to give flood warnings. Response must be immediate and responder must make decisions that could impact loss of life and property. WCDS (Water Control Data System) including DCP's, Goes transmitter should be entirely exempt from this bid package. Any reference to DCP, Goes transmitters, and wireless communication of water management data should be deleted from the entire package.

5.3.2.4.7

At what level of detail will CDR be reported? District, section, phone? This needs to be defined.

Section	Paragraph	State Concern
	5.5.4.4.5	Is the SP responsible for providing a VTC equipment operator to set up, connect, assist, and clean-up for each VTC?
	C..5.3.1.4	This is the only reference I can find on data collection platforms (DCP). Is the intent to exclude wired DCPs, or DCP's that do not rely on wireless services?
	C..5.3.1.4	SPK currently has an existing contract to service and maintain approximately 130 DCP's. In addition, many other Districts use the USGS via a cooperative program to maintain streamgaging sites throughout the country. Is the intent to have the SP take over this function?
	C.5.2.7.2	There is no mention of SDREN in the classified messaging. We have some SDREN connections and will be getting more.
	C.5.3	Does this mean that the SP is the only entity allowed to operate VTC equipment? Currently SPK has a seasonal VTC with the NWS, CNRFC and the Department of Water Resources. Having the SP operate this equipment will require an additional (and unnecessary) person involved.
	C.5.3	Paragraph states: "The SP shall coordinate infrastructure sharing between local, state, and federal agencies as well as other entities. Shared infrastructure includes systems, administrative sites, equipment, power systems, lightning protection, and grounding. Coordination includes communication with other federal departments and agencies and implementation and management of the infrastructure.". Workload data that corresponds with shared infrastructures is not included in TE 02 (workload) or TE 04 (facilities).
	C.5.3	This para. and related TEs lack sufficient detail. In order for industry to provide aggressive pricing solution on wired voice and data networks, recommend that the Gov. provide site specific detailed information to include NPA/NXX and site association with approp. CoE districts and divisions. Recommend including the following para.: The SP shall integrate, consolidate, and migrate the existing CEEIS WAN to an IP-based networking solution. The network will be an IP-based network shared by Gov. agencies and other authorized users. The SP will identify all telecomm. requirements and external (Internet, NIPRNet, direct connections, etc.) connections, and develop bandwidth requirement estimates. The SP will recommend and, upon approval of the USACE, implement an optimized telecomm infrastructure to support the objective architecture and delivery of stated services.
	C.5.3	The SP will operate and maintain communications systems. Who will provide these systems? If these systems are provided by GSA, will GSA allow the SP to maintain GSA systems?

Section	Paragraph	State Concern
	C.5.3	<p>Replace “temporary field structures, and water control facilities” with “and temporary field structures”. Water Control is a unique mission with equipment and facilities that is exclusively used for real-time water and flood control to provide the information necessary to operate COE projects as required by the approved project Water Control Manual, Drought Contingency Plan, and Emergency Plan, and to provide for hydroelectric power, a historical record, meet environmental requirements, and prevent loss of property and life. This equipment and facilities are maintained, operated, and used by Engineers and Scientists not by IM personnel. If this equipment or facilities are included in this solicitation the potential for contract modification claims is nearly certain as a result of the cost and complexity of this additional work, and the SP may have to assume liability for loss of property and persons if they fail to provide information necessary for making critical decisions as required by Water Managers.</p>
	C.5.3.	<p>Unless the staffing requirements are dictating that there are hydrologic and hydraulic engineers, and GIS specialists on the IM/IT workforce; there will be an inadequate understanding of the level and detail of coordinated “infrastructure sharing” required.</p>
	C.5.3.	<p>I cannot believe the authors of this PWS have any idea of the scope of what they’re proposing. Maintaining the “USACE-wide diversified and distributed communications systems” with respect to desktop computers, cellular services, wireless networks, video, radio, etc...that are utilized in our common day-to-day communications is one thing; however, assuming responsibility for maintaining the network of USACE hydro meteorological gages, DCP’s, security surveillance equipment, remote gate operations, and other mission critical equipment is unreasonable. As a Senior Water Resource Specialist, I must be able to respond quickly to flood situations. The guise of the PWS removes that ability, takes away control that I need to perform my job, and in my opinion places the millions of dollars worth of property and human lives downstream of all the flood control projects at risk and in harms way.</p>
	C.5.3.	<p>C.1.3.3 and C.5.3 are exactly the same. “The government will provide strategic and tactical direction, policy, guidance, and program management for USACE communications.” I don’t think this PSW is reasonable; I also believe that the government should have provided its direction and guidance in the drafting of this PSW.</p>

Section	Paragraph	State Concern
	C.5.3.1	Recommend adding more details to this paragraph. It contains reference to classified wireless voice and data, yet doesn't explain and provide specific requirements for classified support, polices and standards. Limits the Government to a single wireless technology such as GSM. Suggest the Government provide the specific requirements for classified wireless voice and data services.
	C.5.3.1.4	Data collection platforms (DCP) are often located in areas requiring helicopter or horseback access. Since the DCP are attached to sensors that measure environmental data, and those sensors are not included, servicing a site will require using both SP and Corps personnel with specialized training. In addition, many of these sites require at least quarterly maintenance. The cost of duplicate personnel on these service visits is likely to result in significantly higher costs and do nothing to improve performance. Furthermore, these gaging sites are required under the authorizing legislation for most federally funded flood control projects. Finally, the inclusion of DCP's extends the scope of the PWS into areas traditionally covered by hydraulic engineers, hydrologists, and hydrologic technicians, and is likely to affect over 100 FTEs not originally included in the Preliminary Planning Report scope (Information Management... May 2004)
	C.5.3.1.4	The Corps stream-gauging program would be impacted. The PWS proposes that the SP install, program, and maintain Data Collection Platforms (DCPs). Currently the role of personnel performing these tasks is not limited to the care of DCPs, but includes non-IT related stream-gauging support: maintenance of mechanical equipment, cleaning of intakes to wells, and taking field measurements of streams. Implementation of this proposal would lead to additional personnel performing tasks that were previously consolidated - this does not appear to be efficient or cost effective. Additionally, Corps districts have cooperative agreements with other federal and state agencies for maintenance and data sharing; stakeholders should be included in the process.

Section	Paragraph	State Concern
	C.5.3.1.4	<p>My concerns regard The Corps of Engineers Water Management System (CWMS) and associated data acquisition equipment such as DCP's, GOES satellite transmitters and receivers, and hydro-met sensors, etc., being included as part of the bid package to be maintained by the IT Service Provider. The operation and maintenance of this equipment has always been a responsibility of the engineering and technical staff of the water management section in Rock Island District (MVR). The water management data acquisition function in the Corps of Engineers is very unique and is considered to be "mission critical". Any loss of data can have potentially catastrophic impacts on project operations, since this data is a crucial component in the project operation decision process. Therefore, experienced hydrologic technicians and engineers that are knowledgeable about the components of the system as well data interpretation, for the most part, have the sole responsibility for the operation and maintenance</p>
	C.5.3.1.4	<p>Section C.5.3.1.4 of the 2nd Draft PWS indicates that the Service Provider (SP) is expected to install and maintain GOES Data Collection Platforms (DCPs). Typically this function is preformed by hydrologic technicians whose duties include not only DCP maintenance but also installation and maintenance of hydro-meteorologic sensors, gage house maintenance, and stream-flow measurements. It would not be cost effective to have the SP do DCP functions and not all the other duties required to ensure accurate and timely hydro-meteorologic data transmission. Additionally, Engineering Regulation 1110-2-249 requires that this function be managed by the WCDS Data Acquisition Manager. GOES Data Collection Platforms should be exempted from the PWS.</p>
	C.5.3.1.4	<p>Assignment of installation, operation, and maintenance of data collection platforms (DCPs) is not assigned to the IM/IT function in a majority of Districts. This task is a significant addition to the IM/IT function. The number of DCPs owned and operated by some Districts is substantial and inclusion of this task will significantly impact FTE allocation between the Water Management and IM/IT</p>
	C.5.3.1.4	<p>This section concerns our DCPs. There would be a very steep learning curve if a SP took over this function. Most contractors have no experience in maintaining and operating DCPs. This work has generally been performed by in-house scientists, engineers and technicians. Tight controls are needed in the maintenance and monitoring of the DCPs and their data. Insufficient vigilant maintenance and monitoring could result in life threatening conditions and property damage during high water and flood events.</p>

Section	Paragraph	State Concern
	C.5.3.1.4.	<p>A great portion of these tasks are critical to the five mission areas of the Corps of Engineers. I do not believe, in any instance, that passing these task to an A/E will provide any added efficiency. In fact, related to the Corps Water Resources Mission, the scope of this PSW will only stifle or ability to respond in a quick and efficient manner. The scope of this PSW is far, far too broad. IT/IM professionals cannot be expected to takeover the digital world. We all live in a digital world. Twenty-years ago, IT/IM specialists may have been needed to perform every tiny little function when it came to computer technology...the twenty-first century is different. Most of us have grown-up in the digital age and are completely comfortable with the technologies. There is NO need for an all encompassing IT/IM army to check the messages on my phone; its data; and it's digital, will they be receiving, processing, and storing that data for us.</p>
	C.5.3.1.4.	<p>(If the operation of Water Control hardware, OS, & DCPs are included) To bid this package the SP will need to know the number of DCPs, their location and how difficult they will be to service. The cost of the DCP maintenance is lumped into the total cost of the gage maintenance by USGS. At some sites this maintenance is cost shared with the USGS and other USGS cooperators. At some sites the entire cost of the COE DCP maintenance is born by the USGS. DCPs in the past have lasted for many years well beyond the manufacturers desire to fix or provide replacement parts. In the past the USGS has called upon their staff to repair or acquire the necessary parts to fix the platform if possible. How will the SP get the equipment fixed? It may be hard to meet the thirty day repair requirement. Back up DCPs are now purchased to replace the out of order units to keep the site active until the original unit is fixed.</p>

Section	Paragraph	State Concern
	C.5.3.1.4. Devices	Delete “data collection platforms (DCPs), global positioning system (GPS) devices such as geosynchronous orbiting environmental satellite and geostationary operational environmental satellite (GOES) reception and transmission devices, “. Also change “and mission-unique wireless sensors and gauges” to “and wireless sensors and gauges”. This the only place in the PWS that either DCP or GPS devises are mentioned. These devices are exclusively Water Control mission essential equipment used for real-time water and flood control to provide the information necessary to operate COE projects as required by the approved project Water Control Manual, Drought Contingency Plan, and Emergency Plan, and to provide for hydroelectric power, a historical record, meet environmental requirements, and prevent loss of property and life. They are maintained, operated, and used by Engineers and Scientists not by IM personnel. By including this equipment in this solicitation the potential for contract modification claims is nearly certain as a result of the cost and complexity of this additional work, and the SP may have to assume liability for loss of property and persons if they fail to provide information necessary for making critical decisions as required by Water Managers.
	C.5.3.2.1	There is no mention to our current WAN infrastructure at both the enterprise CEEIS level, and district to Field Sites. I have not seen where the SP is responsible to managing the existing IT infrastructure during transition.
	C.5.3.2.3	It is unclear to me that the SP does the actual billing break-out to the customers. It says they review the bills, but nothing more regarding billing. One could then infer that this is a CGO function.
	C.5.3.2.3	The SP can not perform services as the DAR (Designated Agency Representative) for the ordering/reconfiguration of FTS services.
	C.5.3.2.4	At the beginning of the last sentence, the word operations should come immediately after voice systems.
	C.5.3.2.4.1	I believe that certain voice circuits are required to be coordinated through Ft. Huachuca. If so, please ensure this is added to the appropriate section(s).
	C.5.3.2.4.3	How do the SP and COR/COTR determine frequency of training? This is typical PWS language. Needs clarification. Does the local office sign a petition of 50% user base, or 5 trouble tickets same issue per month, or semi-annually regardless? Some concrete metric for all systems IMIT training needs to be clearly stated.
	C.5.3.2.4.5	I believe the paragraph should also state the SP is responsible for scheduling as well.

Section	Paragraph	State Concern
	C.5.3.2.4.8	“The SP shall install, maintain, troubleshoot, and upgrade outside and inside cable plant.” I read this to mean that the SP will perform upgrades of CAT 3 to CAT 5e or CAT 6. This could put the contractor on the hook for millions of dollars of wiring upgrades. Who pays for the Upgrade?
	C.5.3.2.4.8	C.5.3.2.4.8- Cable Plant Infrastructure- Our Powerplant Electronics Mechanics have installed, maintained and troubleshot these cable systems for years! The way it normally works at the Powerhouses, Dams and Project Admin buildings is that the phone company maintains the systems up to our buildings and then our workers maintain everything inside! Through Congressional action, power plant work has been determined to be inherently governmental and not subject to contract.
	C.5.3.2.4.8	In commercially rented space, this function will not be performed. In those cases, the PWS should state the SP will coordinate these actions with the facilities manager.
	C.5.3.2.4.8	Please clarify: Is this allowed at government owned facilities such as GSA managed buildings?
	C.5.3.2.8 Radio	1. Change second sentence in the PWS C.5.3.5.2.8 to read, "The SP shall accomplish upgrades, performance preventative maintenance, troubleshoot, replace failed components, modify configurations of radio and microwave towers, painting of towers, and repair of tower lighting alarm systems". 2. Change sentence in the PWS C.5.3.5.2.8. to read, "The SP shall ensure that personnel are certified for tower climbing, tower rescue, first aid, and CPR".
	C.5.3.3	In commercially rented space, installation might not be allowed by the facility. In those cases, the PWS should state the SP will coordinate these actions with the facilities manager.
	C.5.3.3	How does the USACE ensure interoperability of network services?
	C.5.3.3	Neither Section C.5.3, Communications, nor TE-1, Performance requirements, appears to include any response time or network latency metrics. This might allow a bidder to implement an infrastructure design that would not provide reasonable response times for end users. For example, all Exchange servers could be located at a single physical site, allowing easier management, clustering, etc., but when an Outlook client user retrieves a message with a large attachment, it could take several minutes. There should be a requirement that any changes to the network infrastructure, placement of servers, etc., must not increase response times or latency. Without such a requirement and/or specific response time metrics, the Corps might have no recourse except to substantially increase bandwidth across the CEEIS network at our own expense.

Section	Paragraph	State Concern
	C.5.3.3	Add: Network IP convergence. CEEIS will provide IP convergence with traffic differentiation. The voice, data and video services shall operate over shared access network bandwidth and common internal system resources to fully leverage the statistical multiplexing of traffic that is afforded by the Multiple Services Converged Network architecture. The full bandwidth of the system shall be available to support a distribution of users with some requiring short term, peak rate services such as File Transfer Protocol (FTP) or high resolution still video transmission, and others requiring lower rate, longer duration services such as packet zed voice, VoIP.
	C.5.3.3	I have not been able to find in any of the documents where it states that data services maintenance and/or redesign/redeployment be done after normal operating hours where appropriate.
	C.5.3.3	C.5.3.3 Last sentence- "The SP shall install, maintain, upgrade, and troubleshoot inside and outside cable in support of wired data services." Through Congressional action, it has been determined this work inside the power plant is inherently governmental and not subject to contract.
	C.5.3.3.1	This section should have monitoring for bandwidth usage, and management similar to para C.5.3.3.2.4
	C.5.3.3.1.2	C.5.3.3.1.2. Network Design. Last sentence- "The designs include equipment installation and removal, utilities, physical security, power and environmental management, and cabling infrastructure." The vast majority of this design work within the Powerhouses has been done over the years by our own Electronics Mechanics. Through Congressional action, work inside the powerplants has been determined to be inherently governmental and not subject to contract.
	C.5.3.3.2	The Corp does not have a DOIM by title. They currently have a DIM/CIM structure. DIM/CIM, or the words Senior IM Official should also be used in this paragraph.
	C.5.3.3.2	C.5.3.3.2. Device and Service. The SP shall operate, maintain, install, upgrade, update, move, disconnect, troubleshoot, and manage Device and Service configuration of wired data services. Data equipment includes security systems and devices, data circuits, faxes, monitors and displays, input video devices, switches, routers, DSUs and CSUs, coder-decoders (CODECs), sensors, hubs, VPN concentrators, and VoIP. Powerplant electronics mechanics perform most of this work within the Powerhouse. Through Congressional action, it has been determined this work is inherently governmental and not subject to contract.

Section	Paragraph	State Concern
	C.5.3.3.2.4	“The SP shall monitor and report performance statistics on UISACE network circuits” Does this include circuits from the District Office to the field offices?
	C.5.3.3.2.4	Need to add sections stressing the “Proactive monitoring of data circuits, routers, switches, phone systems, and other systems and equipment” to speed corrective actions and significantly limit/reduce downtime. Part of this is referenced in C.5.3.3.2.4 Network Monitoring (p. 96) – however proactive and reducing downtime not stressed. SP should know about problem before end user does and be taking corrective action.
	C.5.3.3.2.5	Where are the "required network systems components for deployments in emergencies" located in the PWS. I found no reference to these systems.
	C.5.3.3.2.5	I think the paragraph needs to address what geographical level these equipment caches need to be maintained. This goes to speed of deployment in an emergency response operation.
	C.5.3.3.2.5	need to include participation in DTOS-RRV exercises and need to ensure RRV IM/IT equipment is operational prior to deployment.
	C.5.3.3.2.5	The SP shall maintain required network systems components for deployment in emergencies. The Technical Exhibits do not include corresponding past workload data or workload estimates for this requirement.
	C.5.3.4	The paragraph should also include troubleshooting as a requirement.
	C.5.3.4	The scheduling of VTC conference rooms seems to be a Logistics Management Office issue. Scheduling of equipment is an IM function but rooms is not.
	C.5.3.4	C.5.3.4 Clarification: Please provide information on the types and quantities of video conferencing and video services.
	C.5.3.4.2	Satellite should be added to this section.

Section	Paragraph	State Concern
	C.5.3.4.2	C.5.3.4.2. Video Services. The SP shall operate, maintain, configure, and test VTC, CATV, CCTV, alarms, and other video services operating in both classified and unclassified modes. Video services and support include VTCs that utilize IP, ISDN, fractional T-1, classified and unclassified point-to-point and bridging services; closed circuit television (CCTV); surveillance systems; streaming video; inside cable plant; outside cable plant; video capture and archive; and help desk and training. VTC services support includes VTC help desk services, maintenance, upgrades, and troubleshooting. The SP shall transport, set up, operate, break down and re-transport portable VTC equipment. The SP shall obtain and maintain the required system certifications for connecting to external networks. Again mostly of this work performed in the powerplant is completed by the electronics mechanics. We generally do not design these systems / networks, but installed and maintain most of the CCTV.
	C.5.3.4.4	The lead in for this rather long sentence is deceptive, see below. It could mean all VTC is only acted upon at SP request. I do not think that is the intent. Reword to clarify what appears to be a desire for the SP to provide holistic system support to the CoE.
	C.5.3.4.4.1	As in training and other SP services, frequency is unspecified. A min to max should be stated either for all ITIM systems/applications support, and/or delineated for rapidly changing environments such as wireless technologies.
	C.5.3.4.4.2	C.5.3.4.4.2. CCTV Equipment. The SP shall install, move, add, and change CCTV equipment. The SP shall upgrade CCTV equipment software, hardware, and firmware; perform preventative maintenance; troubleshoot; replace failed hardware components; an CCTV equipment. C.5.3.4.4.3. Surveillance Systems Equipment. The SP shall install, move, add, and change surveillance systems equipment. The SP shall upgrade surveillance systems equipment software, hardware, and firmware; perform preventative maintenance; troubleshoot; replace failed hardware components; and modify the configuration of teleconferencing equipment. This is the work of the power plant electronics mechanics and by Congressional action has been determined to be inherently governmental and not subject to contract.

Section	Paragraph	State Concern
	C.5.3.4.4.3	C.5.3.4.4.3. Surveillance Systems Equipment. The SP shall install, move, add, and change surveillance systems equipment. The SP shall upgrade surveillance systems equipment software, hardware, and firmware; perform preventative maintenance; troubleshoot; replace failed hardware components;... This is the work of the power plant electronics mechanics. I believe it is of a critical nature to do with National Security that we, as federal employees, take care of this equipment at our Projects. By Congressional action, work inside the power plants has been determined to be inherently governmental and not subject to contract.
	C.5.3.4.4.4	The scheduling, set-up, operation, and monitoring of streaming sessions should also be listed as a function of the SP, the same as for VTCs.
	C.5.3.5.1	This paragraph addresses the CPIC process related to radio project management. The CPIC process is now called Capital Planning and Investment Management (CPIM). See AR 25-1, page 23, paragraph 3-3.b.(1) and page 92, Glossary, Section 1, Abbreviations. That said, CPIM applies to all IMIT investments, not just radios. CPIM should probably be added to a more general section of the PWS, like C.5.1.1 or C.5.1.5.
	C.5.3.5.2.5	If this item includes NOAAport, LRGS, and DOMSAT, then will HEC or local field sites still have control of real-time data acquisition? Besides costs, there could be mission impacts due to lost flexibility to respond in an emergency.
	C.5.3.5.2.8	Some radio and microwave towers are located in remote areas and some are located in more public areas. There are grounds maintenance responsibilities that should be included in radio tower maintenance. This could include weed management, trimming trees or brush, mowing lawns and repairing fences. While this could be moved to the planned LM A-76 competition, it is so unique to radio and microwave tower support that I believe it should be included in the IMIT PWS. In at least one district, this function is currently
C.5.4	6	Paragraph should be included to include AVTR database maintenance and IAVA/IAVB compliance reporting.
	C 5.4.1.19	Must add US Geological Survey (USGS) to the list of required agency coordination for Water Management/CWMS systems.

Section	Paragraph	State Concern
	C 5.4.6	Must add: Compliance initiatives must be coordinated through respective AIS functional manager(s) prior to implementation. For example, the CWMS AIS functional manager, Darryl Davis (HEC), will have to certify that OS and/or Oracle patches are compatible with current CWMS software prior to their installation by the SP. In this case, CWMS software deficiencies must be modified by the material developer (not the SP) before patch installation.
	C.5.4	Requirements for the SP to provide IASO & SA services are stated. However, there's no provision as to who will provide IAM services - the SP or the Government. Also, will there be one IAM at HQUSACE, or one in each region, or one at each District?
	C.5.4	Edit: There is an underscore between the paragraph number and the heading that should be removed.
	C.5.4	SP personnel may or may not be prohibited by AR25-2 from performing SA and IASO services depending on their civil service status, and assignment level.
	C.5.4	Paragraph says SP will be responsible for performing "information assurance security officer (IASO) services". Per AR25-2, the Installation IASO position may only be filled by a Government employee. You can have multiple IASOs at an installation, but only one Installation IASO per Installation. By DoD definition and HQUSACE usage and operations, each District should have an Installation IASO. The text should be modified to "information assurance security officer (IASO) services other than that of the installation IASO".
	C.5.4	Par. C.5.4, Information Assurance, states that "The SP shall provide... information assurance security officer (IASO) services." This violates AR 25-2, 3-2.f, which states, "A contractor may not fill MSC, installation, or post IASO positions if created." IASO duties should be designated as inherently governmental.
	C.5.4	29.<tab>C.5.4 Information Assurance – didn't see a section addressing user security policy on workstations – i.e. the Microsoft Windows Security Policy/settings that define what rights users have on their local workstations.
	C.5.4	incorporate into paragraph: The SP shall plan and perform AVTR database management, including asset and software configuration management, template management and training reporting, as well as information assurance vulnerability alert (IAVA) reporting and compliance.
	C.5.4	Should preparing and submitting a DITSCAP be mentioned here?

Section	Paragraph	State Concern
	C.5.4.	2. PWS(2nd Draft): C.5.4. – Not sure where this would go. Personnel with an appointment as an IASO are required to be certified through the online IASO course and to maintain certification through either re-taking the IASO online course or attending an IA Workshop every 18-24 months
	c.5.4.1.13	Add "Internal Control Checklist and other official datacalls" to the end.
	C.5.4.1.17	3. PWS(2nd Draft): C.5.4.1.17 IA Security Audits, Inspections, and Investigations. Include DITSCAP required auditing and scanning with the use of approved scanning tools such as Harris STAT, DISA STIG and Retina. Scanning is required by Executive Order to validate IAVA compliance and to monitor for non-compliant connections to the network.
	C.5.4.1.17	The second sentence lists a number of audits and inspections. It lists FISMA, but does not indicated whether this is an audit, inspection or some other action.
	C.5.4.1.17-C.5.4.4	C.5.4.1.17 Clarification: Please confirm that the security audits, inspections, and investigations are limited to SP-owned facilities and SP operated facilities within the scope of services operated under this PWS. Please indicate whether or not this includes security checks at the desktop level? C.5.4.1.18 Clarification: Please specify how long audit information must be retained. C.5.4.1.19 Clarification: Please confirm that the Government CGO is the focal point for interface to other Government Agencies. The SP will carry out the required actions on behalf of Government PM. C.5.4.2 Clarification: Please provide details of current implementation and the as-is environment. C.5.4.3 Certification and Accreditation Please describe workload patterns and volumes of this type of activity. C.5.4.3.4 Clarification: Please provide additional information on the DITSCAP requirement, if any, for SP owned facilities. C.5.4.4 Clarification: Please provide more detailing information on the current PKI implementation.
	C.5.4.1.18	It would seem that the SP should enable, monitor and maintain audit trails on PC's as appropriate.
	c.5.4.1.19	Replace "...and government agencies who are our customers..." with "...public and private organizations and individuals"... IA issues are coordinated over a broader range than is listed here.
	C.5.4.1.19	Why is the SP only required to coordinate IA issues with DA, DoD and other government agencies who are our customers? Why not share with any entity as required?

Section	Paragraph	State Concern
	C.5.4.1.19	This para seems to refer to, among other things, the procurement of COMSEC material/services (CSLA, AKMS, NSA, etc.) As one of several Districts who have the Air Force as their COMSEC Custodian, perhaps AF, ANG, USAR, Navy, or whatever, should be listed (although these agencies could be considered "DoD," DA and DoD are listed separately)
	C.5.4.1.19	This paragraph includes a reference to NETCOM. NETCOM stands for "Network Enterprise Technology Command" not simply "Network Command" according to the 2002 plan which formed NETCOM. The Headquarters Department of the Army senior leadership approved an Information Management course of action that formed Network Enterprise Technology Command/9th Army Signal Command (NETCOM). NETCOM consists of NETCOM HQ, NETCOM National Capital Region, NETCOM Regional Units, and 9th Army Signal Major Subordinate Commands. The Information Management realignment and redesignation of Army Signal Command to NETCOM was effective 1 October 2002.
	C.5.4.1.19.	If the operation of Water Control hardware, OS, & DCPs are included) The US Geological Survey should be added.
	C.5.4.1.21	Add "NSA" -- NSA must approve of all COMSEC equipment
	C.5.4.1.4	Whose is/are the IAM referred to and where are they located?
	C.5.4.1.5	30.<tab>C.5.4.1.5 Metrics and Milestones – only other section that has any talk of metrics is C.5.1.10.2. There should be a major section outside of all of the functional areas that discuss the minimum requirement metrics for the PWS and the need for the SP to implement industry best practices in this area, and to further implementing and fine tuning metrics for continuous improvement.
	C.5.4.1.6	1. PWS(2nd Draft): C.5.4.1.6 Information Security (INFOSEC) Training. There is no mention of other required training for privileged access users (System Administrators and Network Managers). Within 6 months of being hired all personnel who will have privileged access are required to successfully complete an online IASO course (Management and Technical modules) and attend an Army 2-week in residence SA/NM class. The IASO is responsible for coordinating and registering attendees for the 2-week class.
	c.5.4.1.7	Add “SP will insure that all IA designated personnel will achieve certification and maintain it and will take refresher training as required by regulation and policy”.
	C.5.4.1.8	Is the SP responsible for (re)negotiating MOU's etc, or do they just perform a record keeping function?

Section	Paragraph	State Concern
	c.5.4.1.9	Replace “accessible to end users” with “loaded on USACE computers”. As long as access to the Web or email exists, the requirement as written is an impossibility.
	C.5.4.10	Do the off-site storage locations for backup data already exist? If not, will the Government or SP secure these facilities?
	C.5.4.10	35.<tab>C.5.4.10 System Backup – need to include a section on requirements for backing up workstations (PCs and Laptops). Lots of critical data are stored there! It shouldn’t be left up to the end user to protect this data.
	C.5.4.10	The PWS does not define the frequency of backups required, or at least what the government considers minimal data loss. Minimal is a subjective term. I think this paragraph needs this extra detail to help assure data is maintained.
	C.5.4.11.	PWS: [Ref. C.5.4.11. Gateways. The SP shall design, install, configure, operate, and maintain USACE gateways. Gateways include Internet, NIPRnet, SIPRnet, approved agencies or offices, and internal site-to-site network connections.] Please explain what functionality is intended by the term "gateway" in this requirement.
	C.5.4.2. UserID	Should we not include "Management and Assignment of Electronic Signature Cards (for CEFMS)"?
	C.5.4.2.1	31.<tab>C.5.4.2.1 User IDs and Password Management – Need to stress that IDs and passwords are created and managed according to AR25-2.
	C.5.4.2.1	Any system of the SP choosing will be furnished by this statement, see below. If that is ok with DoD/Army policy and regulations, which change frequently, then a connection to those superordinate UserIDs systems needs to be included under C.5.4.2
	c.5.4.2.2	Replace “shall issue” with “shall issue/manage”—more accurate. Replace “appropriate use policies” with acceptable use policies”.—That’s the Army’s terminology as codified in regulation and directive. Do not capitalize INFOSEC. INFOSEC was a specific CD course originally mandated by USACE OPOD 99-01, and to my understanding is no longer required. Writing “infosec” would be more accurate. In this particular paragraph, “introductory training would be most applicable.
	C.5.4.2.2.	4. PWS(2nd Draft): C.5.4.2.2. UserIDs and Passwords. Change to read: The SP shall ensure that end users have successfully completed annual INFOSEC and Separation of Duties training.
	C.5.4.2.3	Add the following IM personnel to those requiring security clearances: COMSEC Responsible Officer, Classified Documents Custodian.

Section	Paragraph	State Concern
	C.5.4.2.6	It is stated that the SP shall issue special accounts to users requiring elevated rights and privileges. Who decides who requires elevated rights and privileges? Does this mean that non-SP personnel can have root access to certain systems as they do now?
	c.5.4.2.8	Do not capitalize INFOSEC. INFOSEC was a specific CD course originally mandated by USACE OPORD 99-01, and to my understanding is no longer required. Writing "infosec", which refers to the general type of training, would be more accurate.
	C.5.4.3	32.<tab>C.5.4.3 Certification and Accreditation – DITSCAP not mentioned in section C.5.4.3.1 and is not specifically mention until section C.5.4.3.4 in reference to an IA tool (DITSCAP preparation). Need to tie the sections together and make reference in the initial paragraph.
	C.5.4.3.1	Should the PWS specifically cite DITSCAP preparation and submission as a requirement in this paragraph?
	C.5.4.3.1	For site certification and Accreditation it is unclear what is considered a site. Is this a district, region or entire USACE. Will DAA be at the district level or one for the entire Corps.
	C.5.4.3.5	Does the PWS need to include what a COOP must contain at a minimum?
	C.5.4.3.5	33.<tab>C.5.4.3.5 Continuity of Operations (COOP) – seems out of place in the Certification and Accreditation section.
	C.5.4.3.5.	If the operation of Water Control hardware, OS, & DCPs are included) Water Control COOPS will be coordinated with Water Management at the initial start of the contract period and each time the coop is tested to assure the plan is operating as required.
	c.5.4.4.3	The Army currently handles deployment and maintenance of the DEERS/RAPIDS CAC stations. How would the SP take on this responsibility if it belongs to Army.
	c.5.4.4.3	Replace "...SP shall deploy and maintain..." with 'SP shall arrange for deployment and maintenance of'—The CAC station and its operation are not always part of the IT operation. In some cases it's in LM or HR. Also if you have a full blown issuance workstation you must provide support to all types of CAC cards from anywhere, not just employees of the installation.
	c.5.4.4.3	add "IAVTs, SARs, CTOs, etc..." before "notices"

Section	Paragraph	State Concern
	C.5.4.4.4	Recommend that this paragraph include more details to properly deploy information assurance mechanisms. Recommend the Government be more specific and provide further clarification as to which elements of the standards and specifications apply. Currently this lack of specificity makes it difficult to interpret what portions of the standards and specifications are pertinent to the Government's requirements.
	C.5.4.5	There seems to be a real lack of detail in the COMSEC Security Services section. Suggest an SME review and ensure that all necessary items have been captured.
	C.5.4.5	Paragraph states the SP will provide COMSEC services. It needs to state clearly that the COMSEC custodian shall not be a contractor in accordance with TB 380-41, para 2.7.1b.
	C.5.4.5	Communications Security (COMSEC) Services. "The SP shall provide COMSEC services at each level of command." What is "each level of command"? Are services provided by other agencies or organizations in field offices?
	C.5.4.5	can SP, non-government, perform COMSEC inspections?
	C.5.4.6.3.	5. PWS(2nd Draft): C.5.4.6.3. IAVA Notice Compliance Should this include: through the DA Asset and Vulnerabilities Tracking Resource (A&VTR)?
	C.5.4.6.4	Do we need to state how many annually need to be performed?
	C.5.4.6.5	Do we need to mention workstations as a separate device from either computers and servers?
	c.5.4.7.1	What are we scanning for? IAVA compliance? Penetration? Virus? Adware? Spyware? P2P? If the latter three, the scan must be at least weekly, per regulation.
	C.5.4.7.10.	PWS:[Ref. C.5.4.7.10. Antivirus Systems. The SP shall install, configure, and maintain DA approved antivirus systems on all USACE IMIT devices.] What antivirus system(s) are currently DA approved?
	C.5.4.7.12	I see no mention of site-to-site VPN.
	C.5.4.7.12	This paragraph singles out VPN concentrators and VPN clients as the only technology. Recommend that the Government does not limit solutions to those that require only VPN concentrators and VPN clients. Removing this constraint will allow industry to provide other technological alternatives that could be more cost effective and secure solutions for the Government. Recommend the Government add additional references and requirements for acceptable VPN services to this paragraph or remove the client-only reference.

Section	Paragraph	State Concern
	C.5.4.7.13	C.5.4.7.13. Physical Restricted Area Policy Enforcement. The SP shall develop and enforce access policy to IMIT restricted areas. These controls include signing in and escorting visitors and installing, maintaining, and updating mechanical or electronic access control mechanisms. Beyond reason in a time when we are working to improve our power plant security systems, you are considering allowing a contractor not only maintain these systems, but give them control over who should enter the facilities. These places have fences, cameras, bolted doors and sensors for a reason, to keep people out. Someone has decided that these facilities are a critical security items, and you are willing to give control to the low bidder. Unbelievable!!
	c.5.4.7.16	Add "and DoD and DA regulation and policy". –As written, if the CCB and IAM don't specifically tell the SP what's required or if there is a policy change higher up that they missed, the SP isn't bound by official wireless policies. SP should be responsible for complying with DA/DoD direction on this issue.
	C.5.4.7.18	I see no mention of content blocking.
	c.5.4.7.19	Change "perform authorized" to "perform DA authorized". Only DA can authorize intrusion testing, not the local DAA, installation commander, HQUSACE or anyone but DA.
	C.5.4.7.5	A couple of comments: Web page review and Section 508 compliance I don't view as an information assurance function. Section 508 compliance should probably be moved to C.5.2.2. Then, I think the reference is misstated. Section 508 is a section of the Workforce Investment Act of 1998, codified as Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act.
	C.5.4.7.5, 7.6. 7.7	No comment on the paragraphs per se, except that they don't belong in the IA section, but somewhere else.
	C.5.4.7.6	Edit: Recommend changing "an FOIA" to "a FOIA".
	C.5.4.7.6	Vague. Not definitized. How is an offeror to bid this? (Price Schedule) Not related to Network Security and Monitoring.
	C.5.4.7.8,	There is no PRS for this paragraph in TE-1 to correspond with this PWS statement.
	C.5.4.8	With the advent of Spyware showing up on computer systems, should the also be specifically listed as a security incident requiring sanitization?
	c.5.4.8.1	At the end, after "IAM", add "and/or Comsec Custodian as applicable". Comsec reports don't go to the IAM but to the Comsec Custodian with the IAM being copied, but not reported to.

Section	Paragraph	State Concern
	C.5.4.8.1	When a COMSEC incident occurs, reports must be immediately sent to the COMSEC custodian.
	c.5.4.9	After "DoD control", add "IAW DA regulations". There are certain requirements s that must be met in the purging of even unclassified storage media. DA's requirements are more restrictive than DoD's
	C.5.4.9	I am not sure that "purge" is the proper term for wiping hard drives. There are DA/DoD regulations governing the process.
	C.5.4.9	34.<tab>C.5.4.9 Hard Drive Purging (Excessed Devices) – needs to refer to specific reg such as DOD Directive (D) 8500.1 and AR25-2 for proper sanitation/wiping/purging of hard drives.
	C.5.4.9	I strongly recommend that the level of purging required be listed here, or cite the standard. There are many levels of purging, and some are not effective, leaving the data easily recoverable.
	C5.4.7.5	Compliance with Sec 508 is listed under IA, but is not an IA issue. Should be listed elsewhere.
C.5.5		
	C.5.5	At the end of the first sentence, it would be more clear to add "in accordance with all DOD, DA and USACE Records Management Policies."
	C.5.5	36.<tab>C.5.5 Records Management – needs to have a sub-section referencing Electronic Document Management. Other than a inadequate reference in C.5.2.7, no real reference in the PWS. Like Knowledge Management, there needs to be a section addressing the need to research, recommend, and manage an EDMS.
	C.5.5.1.10	Does the SP perform these functions based upon their interpretation of the regulations, or should it state it needs to be done in coordination with the Office of Council?
	C.5.5.1.10	Add "and make recommendations" after "The SP shall provide guidance and instruction"
	C.5.5.1.10,	In relation to Temporary Records. RS 257: Is it intended that these records be given the same life cycle management reviews and inspections as paper records, above? It is not explicit in the T.E.
	C.5.5.1.12	Add "and make recommendations" after "The SP shall survey and appraise"
	C.5.5.1.12	Eliminate the extraneous period after "records."
	C.5.5.1.13	As identified within Technical Exhibit titled: (Records Management Records Retention and Disposition Schedule Development RS 255) should the C5.5.13 read 5.5.1.13?

Section	Paragraph	State Concern
	C.5.5.1.14	Is this paragraph saying that there will be one Records Management Program with an assigned records manager at each USACE Division, District, Center, and FOA to complete the requirements identified within this paragraph? These requirements will be extremely difficult to fulfill in a timely manner and perhaps some will not be completed if there is not a dedicated records manager at each location.
	C.5.5.1.14	Some districts use commercial facilities, not NARA, for long term storage of records. If it applies, recommend "or other records storage activity or facility" be added to the end of the second
	C.5.5.1.15	Is there a statutory requirement for how long permanent records must be stored?
	C.5.5.1.15	Does the JWOD exemption only apply to records storage? If it includes all the activities listed in TE-18, provision must also be included elsewhere.
	C.5.5.1.16	Missing the requirement to maintain and produce a district history.
	C.5.5.1.17	This item is not included in Technical Exhibit 1, however, classified records are managed using the same Army records information management system as is used for unclassified records with the exception of maintaining classified records in a secured room or secured safe.
	C.5.5.1.2	Edit" There appears to be a tab or extra spaces between the paragraph number and the heading. There appears to be a period after the word "records" that should be a comma.
	C.5.5.1.3	Does this paragraph related directly to RS248 in T.E. 1, establishing a frequency to ensure the reviews and updates are being accomplished?
	C.5.5.1.4	The prescribing directive is explicit on reviews and inspections once every 3 years; neither this paragraph nor T.E. 1, RS 253 make reference to every 3 years. Is the 3-year requirement to be included in this measure?
	C.5.5.1.4	Does the PWS need to state timeframes or frequencies required for the records inspections?
	C.5.5.1.6	Edit: Recommend changing "Army records information management system" to "Army Records Information Management System (ARMIS)".
	C.5.5.1.6	In the sentence, "The SP shall utilize the Army records information management system and...", Records Information Management System should be capitalized, representing the name of the automated information system ARIMS.

Section	Paragraph	State Concern
	C.5.5.1.6	This sentence is incomplete: "The SP shall verify the requirement that officially appointed records management program staff are registered users at appropriate levels." The staff should be registered ARIMS users, not just registered users.
	C.5.5.1.6	Last sentence: The SP shall develop, implement, update, and maintain official records lists. Is the intent of this statement to require that the "SP will approve official records lists developed and updated by records management staff within current file areas."? Or, will the SP be required to complete separate official records lists for each office assigned a current file area?
	C.5.5.1.6	In the first sentence, it refers to "the Army records information management system". This should be "the Army Records Information Management System (ARIMS). Also, in this paragraph, in the last sentence, it says "The SP shall develop, implement, update...". It should read "The SP shall advise records coordinators in the development, implementation, update and maintenance of official records lists."
	C.5.5.1.7	Last sentence: The SP shall ensure that file drawers and file folders are correctly labeled." Is this statement intended to exclude other records containers, such as binders, boxes, and any similar containers used to manage records?
	C.5.5.1.7	The first sentence should read "The SP shall provide oversight in the designation of current filing areas (CFA) for each functional area..."
	C.5.5.1.8	Is there a requirement for the electronic records management system to be DoD 5015 compliant?
	C.5.5.1.8	Is there a requirement for workflow in the electronic records management system?
	C.5.5.1.9	Add "flash drives" to list of storage devices and magnetic media. Also, have added in sentence: "... and provide guidance and instruction and make recommendations on their preservation and maintenance."
	C.5.5.11	Add "and make recommendations" after "The SP shall survey and appraise"
	C.5.5.2	The paragraph should state the minimal frequency of training required.
	C.5.5.2.1	I needed to add something to a previous comment: In this paragraph, it refers to delivering freight. I am not sure about other Districts, but in SPK, we do not deliver freight. In SPK, this is a Logistics Management function.
	C.5.5.2.1	SP must train staff in identifying and handling procedures for hazards mail and packages.

Section	Paragraph	State Concern
	C.5.5.2.1.	In this paragraph, it refers to delivering freight. I am not sure about other Districts, but in SPK, we do not deliver freight.
	C.5.5.2.3	In some districts, LM performs some of the functions listed. Some clarification needs to be provided by adding some wording to reflect this. Another approach would be to include package handling (UPS, USPS, FEDEX, etc.) in the IM competition and freight handling (trucking) in the LM competition and be done with it. One telephone call to the LM preliminary planning team might resolve this.
	C.5.5.2.3	Does not address that when the user requests Express Mail Service that the SP must comply even if it more costly. Also, that Express Mail must be tracked both out of the organization and into the organization. Express Mail must be delivered to addressee with 1
	C.5.5.2.3	There are installations where mail handling and other services are performed by CASU's. How will these link to the service provider.
	C.5.5.2.3	I needed to add something to my previous comment: In SPK, we do not mail out freight. Also, there is nothing about the maintenance of Bulletin Boards, which our mailroom accomplishes.
	C.5.5.2.3	In SPK we do not mail out freight. Also, there is nothing about the maintenance of Bulletin Boards.
	C.5.5.2.3 –	PRS 272 standard is not identified in the PWS for scanning, screening, or for security to inspect suspicious packages. One of the two needs to be reconciled.
	C.5.5.6	Did not see anything in the Mailroom section that talked about keeping track of suspense dates for congressional responses, or other request with deadlines.
	C.5.5.7. Privacy	Shouldn't we include a paragraph such as "Ensure that data maintained within information systems adhere to Privacy Act
	C.5.5.7.3	This paragraph implies that the SP will work with a single USACE Privacy Act Officer. It should be more general. Each division and district has an appointed Privacy Act Officer.
	C.5.5.8	It is unclear whether or not the SP is to appoint a MICO's or whether MICO's will be a CGO employees.
	C.5.5.8.2	In the Program Implementation (Internal). Technical Exhibit 1 title: (Records Management MIC Program Implementation (Internal) RS 284) within the Standard column should the "MIC" read "MICO"?
C.5.6		Please provide estimated number of printing requests per month. Understand that the quantity produced varies with individual job requirements, but just trying to get an idea of the volume.

Section	Paragraph	State Concern
	2.1	1) Pubs Managers have to order pubs from various agencies. 2) Notifying co-workers of new pubs, changed pubs, obsolete pubs and rescinded pubs. 3) Researching various pubs. 4) Verifying that publications are posted in approved media.
	2.2	It shouldn't just say periodic reviews of pubs. It should say Army mandated periodic reviews of pubs.
	3.1	1) Before a form can be created, a lot of research has to be done to ensure that a higher-echelon form is not available that could serve the same purpose. 2) A supporting publication must be written for a form before the form can be made official. 3) How about troubleshooting databases? All of the Forms Managers I know do that. 4) Ordering forms from various agencies. 5) Keeping an inventory of paper forms. 6) Maintaining a secured inventory of accountable forms. 7) Notifying co-workers of new forms, changed forms, obsolete forms and rescinded forms. 8) Researching various forms.
	3.2	1) It shouldn't just say periodic reviews of forms. It should say Army mandated periodic reviews of forms. 2) Forms Managers have to maintain a current inventory of forms by other agencies
	C.5.6.1	Please describe where the printing services are currently performed for printing and reproduction services, publications management, forms management and copier program management. Are printing services distributed throughout the districts?
	C.5.6.1	Please describe the system for providing print services (i.e. networked, standalone, etc.).
	C.5.6.1, RS-293	Here at Seattle District we do not process any of our service requests through DAPS. Our service requests are processed through the Reprographics Section, and assigned by the Printing Specialist to GPO, one of GPO's approved vendors, or a local vendor on a list maintained by the Reprographics Section. Suggest this statement not be specific to DAPS, but address coordination with DAPS, GPO, GPO's approved, and other selected vendors. I feel that that statement should be broader than it currently is.
	C.5.6.2	The prescribing directive provides requirements to manage and control developed publications to include publication review every 18 months. Question: It is not apparent within the Technical Exhibits titled: (Printing and Publications: Printing Services an Support RS296, RS297, RS298, and RS299) that the SP will be required to manage agency's publications as the Army directs. Why are these Army requirements not identified within any of these technical

Section	Paragraph	State Concern
	C.5.6.2.	(If the operation of Water Control hardware, OS, & DCPs are included) Stream gauge data today is published by the USGS. These publications have been put out for years and are partially funded through the Cooperative Program. If the USGS is not involved with our program; the effort to continue the current publication of these data and its accountability will need to be considered.
	C.5.6.3	The prescribing directory indicates that an annual review of forms to include an index of forms, accountable and sensitive forms will be completed. Question: It is not apparent that the SP will be required to complete annual reviews of agency's forms in any of the Technical Exhibits titled: (Printing and Publications: Printing Services an Support RS296, RS297, RS298, and RS299). Why will the SP not be required to manage forms as directed in the Army
	C.5.6.3.1	The SP should coordinate not only with proponents but also higher authority as required.
	C.5.6.4.2	Will SP be required to actually provide copier support in a performance based mode.
	c.6.3	Where are all the local and regional reports we put together all the time. Especially management control checklists, IA Assessments, Command Management Reviews, all of the CEFMS local reports, etc.
C.5.7		at the end of this statement please add... "that comply with current USACE graphic standards. Re Last Sentence - What type of certification will be required by photographers?
	C.5.7	Does USACE require that Visual Information (VI) staff be present at each of the 8 division and 41 district USACE facilities subject to this A-76 competition?
	C.5.7	To streamline staffing and effectively manage equipment, HW and SW costs, will the USACE allow the VI staff to work out of a SP facility and allow the staff to work with USACE customers remotely with occasional need to meet with the USACE customer at a division or district site? This arrangement would apply to providing audiovisual, photography, videography, graphics, multimedia, computer animation, technical illustration, desktop publishing and technical editing and writing.
	C.5.7	Will the SP and Govt. be able to set minimum notification deadlines for USACE to request services to allow for proper staffing, equipment transport and travel arrangements?
	C.5.7	How much notification will the VI staff receive for assignments by USACE?

Section	Paragraph	State Concern
	C.5.7	Will the USACE provide estimates of the number of products and services requested on average monthly basis? Will the USACE provide this breakdown by the 8 divisions and 41 districts that are subject to this A-76 competition? Products and services would include production of audiovisual, photography, videography, graphics, multimedia, computer animation, technical illustration, desktop publishing, and technical editing and writing.
	C.5.7	Will VI staff be required to work part-time at USACE divisions and facilities?
	C.5.7	To streamline staffing and effectively manage equipment, hardware and software costs, will the USACE allow the VI staff to work out of a SP facility and dispatch staff, as needed, to a division or district for on-site support? We understand that on-site support would be required for some audiovisual, photography or videography
	C.5.7	There is no characterization of the type of quality of service we expect. Citing the USACE graphic standards manual is not sufficient. Please insert: "All products and services provided by VI will comply with the current professional industry standards for graphics, desktop publishing, photography, videography, video production, multi-media production and Audio/Visual services and Video Teleconferencing service.
	C.5.7	Will VI staff be required to work full-time at USACE divisions and facilities?
	C.5.7	I see no provision in the PWS for the creation of plaques, custom framing, photo metal plaques and other similar items that are routinely presented to dignitaries and other guests.
	C.5.7	The sentence that ends with, "that comply with current USACE graphic standards," needs to be further explained. Please add the sentence below in the additional info.
	C.5.7	Addition to last sentence in first paragraph. Should read "... and technical or substantive editing..." Addition to first sentence in second paragraph. Should read "...obtain final reviews/approvals..."
	C.5.7..5	The paragraph should also include the words "and exhibits" directly behind the words "and retransport of equipment".
	C.5.7.10.1	Suggest adding: "Style guides designated for use will be consulted."
	C.5.7.10.1.2	The paragraph should also state "and coordinate with Public Affairs regarding the approval for release of content".
	C.5.7.10.2	Edit: This paragraph provides an example. It is the only example provided in the PWS. Recommend the example be deleted or examples be provided in all other paragraphs where such clarifications would aid prospective bidders.

Section	Paragraph	State Concern
	C.5.7.10.2	Project managers and engineers are typically involved in Outreach Service and that is an effective way of doing business. These individuals are knowledgeable in the District's capabilities and add significant value to the Corps. Technical report writing duties envisioned for the SP must be clarified to exclude project report writing. It would not be prudent to assign that task to a 3rd party.
	C.5.7.10.2	Are things like project reports, Water Control Manuals etc, or conference presentations exclusively performed by the SP?
	C.5.7.10.3	Is this Work Order Control unique to VI services, or can it used be for all service type requests? Suggest one work order system for the SP in all things PWS, Corps wide.
	C.5.7.10.3.	WORK ORDER CONTROL -- What replaces DA 3903-R (Visual Information Work Order), since this was rescinded per AR 25-1 (June 2004)? Does VIAMS, referenced in AR 25-1, Chapter 7? If so, from where is this accessed? If not, does SP provide/create a mechanism or use a COTS to perform this? Would its utilization be at the local, regional or enterprise level?
	C.5.7.2.1	The paragraph should include at both on-site and remote locations, and should also state as a function participating in pre-event site surveys when required.
	C.5.7.2.1	There is no characterization of the type of quality of service we expect. Citing the USACE graphic standards manual is not sufficient. Please insert: "The SP will provide professional grade audiovisual services, using state of the art equipment and providing a level of service and technology comparable to what can be obtained on the open market."
	C.5.7.2.1	Audiovisual Services. Not clear if SP is responsible for setting up and supporting remote locations (hotels, public meeting sites, etc)?
	C.5.7.2.2	Will photography and videography be required in low-light and no-light situations?
	C.5.7.2.2	VI staff is responsible for providing graphic productions; what products does the USACE consider to be graphic productions?
	C.5.7.2.2	The PWS should also state the SP will sometimes be required to live and operate with primitive accommodations. The paragraph should also state that Arial photography and videography will be required.
	C.5.7.2.2	May the VI staff be centrally located at a SP location, then deployed as needed?
	C.5.7.2.3	Does the SP staff, responsible for installing the equipment mentioned in this section, need to possess security clearances? If so, what level of clearance is required?

Section	Paragraph	State Concern
	C.5.7.2.3	The paragraph should also state the installation or coordination of the installation of required infrastructure if required.
	C.5.7.2.3	Does this restrict the ability of Corps employees to take pictures for work purposes? Can they download photos to a computer?
	C.5.7.3.1	Correction to second sentence. Delete the word "film" after "high-speed"
	C.5.7.3.1	This section cites film-based photography, but I see no provision for how/who develops the film.
	C.5.7.3.1	Current operations in support of R&D include digital high-speed photography as well as film; such photography includes operation of NAC and Phantom cameras of several generations. Photographers provide related support (setting lines, batteries, generators) as directed by the project manager.
	C.5.7.3.1	There is no characterization of the type of quality of service we expect. Citing the USACE graphic standards manual is not sufficient. Please insert: "The SP will provide professional photographic services, using state of the art equipment and providing a level of service and technology comparable to what can be obtained on the open market."
	C.5.7.3.2	Some support items listed here are photographic, rather than videographic, such as portrait, official military service records, and passports. DA photos required by military personnel are not included in this paragraph, but would have been included with the items listed that need to be moved to photography.
	C.5.7.3.2	There is no characterization of the type of quality of service we expect. Citing the USACE graphic standards manual is not sufficient. Please insert: The SP will provide classified and unclassified professional grade videographic services, using state of the art equipment and providing broadcast industry level of service and technology and finished product.
	C.5.7.3.2	I see no provision for photographing of disasters (floods, hurricanes, etc) as well as post disaster project failures/impacts.
	C.5.7.3.2	Correction to second sentence. Delete the word "film" after "high-speed"
	C.5.7.3.3	Need to somehow mention that some video productions are required to be PBS movie quality productions.
	C.5.7.3.3	There is no characterization of the type of quality of service we expect. Citing the USACE graphic standards manual is not sufficient. Please insert: "The SP will provide professional grade video production services, using state of the art equipment and providing broadcast industry level of service and technology and finished product." The rest of that section looks good.

Section	Paragraph	State Concern
	C.5.7.3.4	What is the Digital Visual Library (DVL)? Is this an existing archive? Is USACE soliciting a digital asset management system for remote research and asset distribution as part of this A-76 competition?
	C.5.7.3.4.	Delete the second sentence as it is redundant. The same info is more clearly stated in the third sentence.
	C.5.7.4	All VI files need to be named using a standard convention and stored in a logical manner on the network in such a way to ensure and promote sharing amongst USACE office as and easy future retrieval.
	C.5.7.4	I see no provision that USACE owns all intellectual property developed in association with Visual Information but also for the entire contract.
	C.5.7.4.1	Does this prevent Corps employees from performing this function?
	C.5.7.4.1	There is no characterization of the type of quality of service we expect. Citing the USACE graphic standards manual is not sufficient. Please insert: "The SP will provide professional grade graphics, charts and briefing material products, using state of the art equipment to produce products that meet desktop publishing industry standards in terms of level of quality, overall utility and functionality." The rest of that section looks good.
	C.5.7.4.1	Change 1st sentence to read: "The SP shall create graphic media that include charts, covers, presentations, viewgraphs, artwork, posters, transmissives, signs, vinyl signage/decals, certificates, awards, exhibits, and interior or exterior site concepts and designs."
	C.5.7.4.1 Graphic	Concern is that the PWS captures the following capabilities: 1. Capability to develop visitor center-level quality exhibits and exhibit systems from scratch (planning wood, staining wood, carpentry, graphics) 2. The level of artistic expertise (exhibit quality artists) 3. Complete web design to include Flash and other multimedia formats
	C.5.7.4.2	Change first sentence to read: "The SP shall produce multimedia products including electronic presentations..."
	C.5.7.4.2	Addition to first sentence in first paragraph. Should read "...motion picture film, audio tape, CDs, DVDs, interactive DVDs, and other digital media."
	C.5.7.4.5	MVN does not agree that 3-D computer animation services belong in this PWS. We develop 3D digital terrain models from hydrographic, bathymetric, lidar, and conventional survey data as part of our engineering analysis. These animations are a derivative of our engineering analysis. These types of animations are not IM/IT functions.

Section	Paragraph	State Concern
	C.5.7.4.5	There must be nothing that prohibits Engineering from developing its own Computer Facilities 3-D animation to preclude potential cross-over of job duties, such as Architects and draftpersons.
	C.5.7.4.6	MVN requests that ‘technical illustration and drafting services’ statement be defined more clearly in the PWS. This statement appears to be related to the graphical artwork referenced in the paragraphs above it, but the statement taken alone may be subject to different interpretations. Drafting services performed as part of an Engineering Design or Contract document are not IM or IT functions. For example, the use and development of engineering drawings is integral to formulating engineering analysis, preparing report drawings, and completing plans and specifications.
	C.5.7.8	There is no characterization of the type of quality of service we expect. Citing the USACE graphic standards manual is not sufficient. Please insert: "The SP will provide professional grade graphics, charts and briefing material products, using state of the art equipment to produce products that meet desktop publishing industry standards in terms of level of quality, overall utility and functionality." The rest of that section looks good.
	C.5.7.8	There is no characterization of the type of quality of service we expect. Citing the USACE graphic standards manual is not sufficient. Please insert: "The SP will provide professional grade graphics, charts and briefing material products, using state of the art equipment to produce products that meet desktop publishing industry standards in terms of level of quality, overall utility and functionality." The rest of that section looks good.
	C.5.7.8	Add a new first sentence to the second paragraph. "The SP shall prepare a digital file from hard copy. The digital file may include OCR (optical character recognition) searchable image text or formatted text and graphics. The SP shall provide a high-quality printer's
	C.5.7.8	The sentence “The SP shall provide a copy of the final electronic files to the customer using the USACE standard software” should be modified to “USACE standard word processing software or designated acceptable layout or photo software for GPO printing.” Such software would include Adobe Acrobat (pdf), postscript files, PhotoShop files.
	C.5.7.8	Addition to last sentence in first paragraph. Should read "...including text, tables, linked illustrations, and voice transcriptions)..."
	C.5.7.8	Files should be stored in a logical manner on the network to ensure and promote sharing amongst USACE offices and easy future
	C.5.7.8	“The SP shall prepare publications for posting to web sites.” Suggest adding “in pdf, html, xml, or other designated acceptable

Section	Paragraph	State Concern
	Paragraph 2 in	After first sentence of paragraph two under C.5.7 . . . sentence ends "with current USACE graphic standards." . . . insert the following sentence . . . "All products shall also comply with the current professional industry standards for graphics, desktop publishing, photography, videography, video production, multimedia production, and multimedia facility design and equipment."
	second paragraph	After the sentence that ends "that comply with current USACE Graphic Standards" it should read that "All products shall also comply with the current professional industry standards for graphics productions, multimedia production, and multimedia facility design and equipment." This way we know we're getting quality work done for the price that we're paying.

C.6

CEMVS-ED requests the following Engineer Regulations be included: ER 500-1-1, Emergency Employment of Army and Other Resources-Civil Emergency Management Program ER 1110-2-248, Requirements for Water Data Transmissions Using GOES/DCS ER 1110-2-249, Management of Water Control Data Systems ER 1110-2-1455, Cooperative Streamgaging Program ER 1110-2-8155, Hydrometeorological Data Management and Archiving

PWS: The link provided to access publications related to the performance of the Corps IM/IT Mission (<https://corpsinfo.usace.army.mil/ci/itref/index.html>) does not appear to be valid or accessible from the Internet.

E.<tab>We request the following Engineer Regulations be included in section C.6 References, Regulations, and Reports of the PWS: ER 500-1-1, Emergency Employment of Army and Other Resources-Civil Emergency Management Program ER 1110-2-248, Requirements for Water Data Transmissions Using GOES/DCS ER 1110-2-249, Management of Water Control Data Systems ER 1110-2-1455, Cooperative Streamgaging Program ER 1110-2-8155, Hydrometeorological Data Management and Archiving

Recommend ER 37-2-10 and other resource management references be added because the SP is being asked to perform budget and accounting functions. Consult with the RM community to identify a comprehensive list or appropriate regulations.

Section	Paragraph	State Concern
		To access Publications related to the Performance of the Corps IM/IT Mission, cut and paste web address below into your web browser. https://corpsinfo.usace.army.mil/ci/itref/index.html
		The web site listed above is only accessible within the Corps of Engineers. People from outside the CEEIS network will not be able to get to that page. Since you have direct links to the regulations that you list, you probably don't need the reference to the website, or we could mirror that site on the USACE public website.
C.6		ER 1110-2-249 Management of Water Control Data Systems (31 Aug 94) is not included on the list. This ER will have a major impact on how the SP interacts with the Water Control Mission and thus needs to be included.
C.6		Will the following forms be included in future versions of Section C.6: DA Fm 335-R, Application for Approval of Management Information Requirement, AR 335-15, (M); DA Form 1085-R, Management Information Requirement & ADP Product Review Schedule, AR 335-15, (M); and DA Form 1086-R, Periodic Review of Management Information Requirements – Preparing Agency Response and Recommendations, AR 335-15?
C.6.1		This paragraph references, for mandatory use, numerous regulations (i.e. ER 25-1-101 and ER 25-1-74) that are obsolete and no longer followed. Also, clarify how regulations can be considered "Advisory"; a regulation is a regulation.
C.6.1.1		2)<tab>Section C.1.5. GENERAL REQUIREMENTS of the 2nd Draft PWS states, "The SP shall abide by the provisions and regulations set forth in this PWS". However, ER-1110-2-249, "Management of Water Control Data Systems" is buried in TE-7, under the CEMVS section. This important Engineering Regulation needs to be moved forward into Section C.6.1.1. ER-1110-2-249 outlines how a District's Water Control Data System (WCDS) is managed and operated. This document details the responsibilities and duties of the WCDS System Administrator, WCDS System Manager, WCDS Site Manager, and Data Acquisition Manager. Of these four WCDS positions, it is clear that this PWS should only be looking at the position of WCDS Site Manager as a candidate for SP participation. The WCDS Site Manager's duties and responsibilities include the installation, operation, and maintenance of the onsite WCDS hardware, operating systems, network, and supporting facilities. Please add ER-1110-2-249 to Section C.6.1.1.

Section	Paragraph	State Concern						
	c.6.1.1	<p>Paragraph C.6.1.1. Add the following:</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Effective/ Mandatory or Date</th> <th>Publish TYPE</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>NUMBER</td> <td>Regulation Title or Reference Name</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Jan 99</td> <td>GAO/AIMD 12.19.6 Federal Information System Controls M Audit Manual (FISCAM)</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Effective/ Mandatory or Date	Publish TYPE	NUMBER	Regulation Title or Reference Name	Jan 99	GAO/AIMD 12.19.6 Federal Information System Controls M Audit Manual (FISCAM)
Effective/ Mandatory or Date	Publish TYPE							
NUMBER	Regulation Title or Reference Name							
Jan 99	GAO/AIMD 12.19.6 Federal Information System Controls M Audit Manual (FISCAM)							
	C.6.1.1.	Add OMB Circular A-11 sections 53 and 300 Preparation, Submission and Execution of the Budget http://www.whitehouse.gov/omb/circulars/a11/04toc.html						
	C.6.1.2	Need to add references to support Geospatial Data & System EM 1110-1-1000 USACE Photogrammetric Mapping<tab>31-Mar-93 EM 1110-1-1002 USACE Survey Markers and Monumentations<tab>14-Sep-90 <tab> EM 1110-1-1003 USACE NAVSTAR Global Positioning System Surveying<tab>01-Jul-03 <tab> EM 1110-1-1004 USACE Geodetic and Control Surveying<tab>01-Jun-02 <tab> EM 1110-1-1005<tab>USACE<tab>Topographic Surveying<tab>31-Aug-94 EM 1110-1-2909<tab>USACE<tab>Geospatial Data and Systems<tab>01-Aug-96 <tab>01-Jul-98 EM 1110-2-1003<tab>USACE<tab>Hydrographic Surveying<tab>31-Oct-94 EM 1110-2-1009<tab>USACE<tab>Engineering and Design - Structural Deformation Surveying<tab>01-Jun-02 <tab> EM 1110-2-2907<tab>USACE<tab>Remote Sensing<tab>01-Oct-03 <tab> ER 1110-1-1001<tab>USACE<tab>Standard Survey Disc<tab>01-Feb-92 ER 1110-1-8156<tab>USACE<tab>Policies, Guidance, and Requirements for Geospatial Data and Systems<tab>01-Aug-96 ER 715-1-21<tab>USACE<tab>Electronic Contract Solicitations<tab>01-Oct-03 <tab>						
	C.6.1.2	ERDC/ITL TR-01-6<tab>A/E/C CADD Standard September 2001						
	C.6.1.2	ER 1130-1-445 Corps of Engineers Digital Project Notebook is missing from both the Draft PWS and from the web site https://corpsinfo.usace.army.mil/ci/itref/index.html . It should be added to the web site and to the Draft PWS in paragraph 6.1.2 Automation. As a Mandatory reference.						
	C.6.1.2	Executive Order 12906, Coordinating geographic data Acquisition and access: The National Spatial Data Infrastructure, is identified on the web site https://corpsinfo.usace.army.mil/ci/itref/index.html as a Publication Related to the Performance of the Corps IM/IT Mission, but it is missing from the Draft PWS. It should be added to paragraph 6.1.2 Automation. As a Mandatory reference.						

Section	Paragraph	State Concern
	C.6.1.2	ER 1110-1-8156 is listed in the Draft PWS document, but is missing from the web site https://corpsinfo.usace.army.mil/ci/itref/index.html
	C.6.1.2.	Add DoD Memo: Web Site Administration Policies & Procedures November 25, 1998 http://www.dod.mil/webmasters/policy/dod_web_policy_12071998_with_amendments_and_corrections.html
	C.6.1.4.	PWS:"[Ref. C.6.1.4. Information Assurance, AR 25-2 and DODI 8500.2] Q1. What waivers are in place to any of the mandatory IA and IA-enabled product acquisition requirements (e.g., Common Criteria evaluations cited in DODI 8500.2)? Q2. If an IA/IA-enabled product is ""DA approved"" can it be assumed to be an acceptable acquisition for USACE, even when it does not meet DODI 8500.2 requirements or have a formal waiver? Q3. Will currently existing IA waivers apply to products/tools to be proposed by SP bidders? Q4. Does the USACE intend for all IA products/tools proposed by SP bidders to conform to these regulations (except for any applicable existing waivers).
	C.6.1.5.	30-Jun-99 DA MEM O "25-1-51 (ER 25-1-74) Guidance For Preparation and Processing of USACE Command Publications within HQUSACE M" The top line on the page gives a number that doesn't match the title and the link goes to a publication that doesn't match either the number or the title.
	C.6.1.7	AR 115-11 Geospatial Information and Services is incorrectly listed under Visual Information guidance. Within the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Geospatial Information and Services is defined by EP 715-1-7 as an Architect/Engineer (A/E) Service, with additional policy categorized under file number 1110 Engineering and Design. The impact of geospatial information and services to this A76 is more appropriately identified under the heading of paragraph 6.1.2 Automation.
	C.6.2.6.	FORMS - Printing and Publications -- GPO 2511 (Print Order) was missing. Reference is DA Pam 25-40. My understanding is this is mandatory per GPO. It may be a good idea to add this to the list. Also, SPA (Simplified Purchase Agreement) Work Order should be listed under this, as my regional GPO office (St. Louis) requires this form for print orders under the SPA program. That office devised its own Excel form for our district to use, with no specific form number identified. The SPA form is currently listed under C.6.2.7. Visual Information. Unless the plan is to use the SPA form for VI, it appears this was erroneously placed there.

Section	Paragraph	State Concern
	C.6.2.7.	FORMS - Visual Information -- Is "SPA Work Order" placed here intentionally? If not, what forms are to be utilized for VI? As noted for C.5.7.10.3., will VIAMS? And what about others referenced in AR 25-1, Chapter 7 (VI)?
	C.6.3.7.	REPORTS - Visual Information -- This is referenced in C.5.7.9. What mechanisms would be used - those noted in AR 25-1, Chapter 7 (VI)? Or something else?
	C6.1.2	If the Corps Water Management System and the legacy Water Control Data Systems are included in the PWS, the SP must comply with regulations governing use, installation, operation, and maintenance of those systems in their entirety. The following regulations must be included for mandatory compliance in Section C6.1.2 ER 1110-2-249 Management of Water Control Data Systems ER 1110-2-248 Requirements for water data transmission using GOES/DCS ER 1110-2-8155 Hydrometeorological Data Management and Archiving ER 1110-2-1455 Cooperative Stream Gaging Program

Other

1. CWMS and the Water Control Data System (WCDS) are not equivalent. CWMS is only a small portion of the WCDS and CWMS is not ready to implement. 2. According to ER 1110-2-249 the WCDS is under the Chief of Hydrology and Hydraulics Branch, not IM. 3. WCDS must be excluded from this contract. Not doing so will have adverse effects on the flood control operations at Corps reservoirs.

It seems there is a Corps service that is, in my opinion, insufficiently represented in the PWS. The service in question is the electronic messaging systems CEEIS develops and maintains. There is very little information about the email Active Directory / Exchange 2003 infrastructure nor the role CEEIS (Email Team) plays in managing it at an Enterprise level. CEEIS manages the AD forest and hosts the root domain.

There is nothing in the PWS for end users to provide customer satisfaction information. A survey or something should be done so that end users can comment on the quality or lack of quality of service provided by the SP. No one wants to pay for poor service, there should be a way to measure quality of service to end users.

Section Paragraph

State Concern

There has been a lot of email traffic within Corps expressing concern over PWS and CWMS capabilities. These emails were just made available to Tulsa District last week. Seems to be a consistent theme with these email concerns in that Water Control processes and associated administrators were added to A-76 competition at the eleventh hour fifty nine minute of this process and many folks are concerned about consequences. PWS is poorly defined in the Water Control arena. Considering loss of life/property and the fact that Water Control administrators are multi-disciplined at the District level, this Water Control arena is seriously misrepresented in PWS. Some Districts have experienced contract services in WCDS with poor results. Also must recognize that Districts have WCDS and CWMS is only a part of WCDS. CWMS does not meet all District's needs, nor does CWMS appear to meet all those needs in the foreseeable future. Not all Districts are the same when considering Water Control a

During the 2004 Annual CWMS CURGE, Sep 2004, an individual from HQ provided A-76 update via teleconference to CURGE. I believe his name was Gary House, but not sure. Looked on HEC'S web site for minutes, but this discussion was is not included on HEC'S web like the rest of the CURGE minutes. The A-76 PWS update and interpretation from HQ during this teleconference was that WCDS processes and WCDS system administrators would be exempt from competition. Appears that since that discussion, we are receiving conflicting information about WCDS administrators, etc. Recommend that WCDS administrators and processes be exempt from completion. PWS does not adequately define Water Control processes and WCDS is not recognized.

Thru the entire document, where listing of things (like in section ...) are given, recommend adding "include, but not limited to," so that it is explicit that the list provided is not comprehensive.

The HQUSACE has justified bundling, but broken out and addressed the JWOD and other social contracts separately. Are these contract excluded from the competition or are they mandatory to be included within contractor offers? Can they be bid bundled?

From the time this proposal was started, I questioned as many people as I could to ask how power plant work performed by power plant electronics mechanics ever got included in this study. I have stated many times that through Congressional action, work in the power plants has been determined to be inherently governmental and not subject to contract services. I contacted Ray Navidi and he stated that Public Law would not be violated. As written, that is not the case.

Section Paragraph

State Concern

There appear to be few technical descriptions of Water Control Data System (WCDS) and Corps Water Management System (CWMS) and its implementation in district offices. If a more detailed work statement for the Water Control mission is not included in the PWS, then a contract amendment would most likely be required at significant cost to the government.

Congress now requires that contractors price and provide their benefits packages at least equal to the Government's. The PWS does not specify exactly what is expected and how we should proceed to determine the Government's benefits program. Is this procurement exempt from this requirement?

Overall Suggestion: Provide more specific language that provides network architectural guidance, clear network and security management requirements and addresses specific performance specifications and standards that will allow the SP to better estimate costs.

General Comment: The PWS describes how the work is being performed today and details how the work should be performed.

Suggestion: Just describe the requirements. The Offeror should respond as to how to execute the tasks as part of its proposal.

I did not see anywhere where the PWS states an automated workorder system needs to be used, and must contain certain specific elements such as customer, location, priority, dates and times, assigned technician, call type, resolution fields, etc. If I missed it, I apologize. This is a critical component to both good customer service, and good quality assurance. It should also be decided if the workorder system can be SP developed or off-the-shelf, if it can be a separate system for each RIO, and if the same system is used throughout the CORP. Finally, the provision should state that all COTR/QAE personnel have access to the workorder system.

Section Paragraph

State Concern

As stated on Page 4 of the 2nd Draft PWS, the Corps Water Management System (CWMS) is exempt. CWMS software provides reservoir and river system status, flow, and decision support information needed to accomplish the water management mission of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. Section C.1.5. GENERAL REQUIREMENTS of the 2nd Draft PWS states, "The SP shall abide by the provisions and regulations set forth in this PWS". The water management mission U.S. Army Corps of Engineers is regulated per ER-110-2.249 "Management of Water Control Data Systems". This ER regulates "the management of water control data systems (WCDS) including the equipment and software used for acquisition, transmission, and processing of real-time data used to regulate water projects for which the Corps of Engineers is responsible". The ER further defines WCDS as "all hardware and software within the jurisdiction of a Corps of Engineers office which has been acquired and is being used for acquisition, transmission, processing, display, and dissemination of hydrologic, meteorologic, water quality, and project data for the purpose of supporting the water control mission of the Corps of Engineers. This includes computer workstations, microcomputers, X-terminals, port servers, hardcopy devices, water control subnet local area network (LAN) components, data communication devices and circuits, uninterruptible power supplies, field data collection platforms, and other associated components." Additionally, ER-110-2.249 states that "the WCDS is a dedicated purpose system existing only to support the regulation of the Corps of Engineers Congressionally authorized water resource projects". However, WCDS is neither defined or included in TE-17. Please include and define WCDS in the document. ER-110-2.249 also states that "the functional control of the WCDS is the exclusive responsibility of the system administrator in order to ensure project operations as authorized by Congress". As stated in

Section Paragraph

State Concern

the ER, ‘the system administrator shall be a member of the water control management chain of command’ and ‘shall be either the person directly responsible for water control activities or that person’s immediate supervisor’. ER-110-2.249 also defines a (1) WCDS system manager, (2) WCDS site manager, and (3) WCDS data acquisition manager. Of the three above managers, all ‘shall be appointed by the system administrator and shall be assigned within the chain of command of the system administrator’. The one exception noted in ER-110-2.249 is for the WCDS site manager: If necessary, due to lack of site management skills, the ‘use of a Corps of Engineers employee residing in the other divisions such as Information Management Division or even by contract is recommended. The WCDS Site Manager’s duties and responsibilities include the installation, operation, and maintenance of the onsite WCDS hardware, operating systems, network, and supporting facilities. The WCDS data acquisition manager is responsible for managing the installation, including operation and maintenance of the WCDS data acquisition system activities which include ‘data collection platform and sensor installation, operation and maintenance; GOES, direct readout ground station, or domsat read-only terminal installation, operation, and maintenance...and data acquisition of project and hydrometeorological data by voice, radio, terminal, personal computer, etc.’ Currently in the New Orleans District, the WCDS is supported entirely within the Engineering Division, Hydrologic & Hydraulics Branch. IMO involvement is limited to installing, maintaining and upgrading off-the-shelf software that allows H&H Branch employees to access water control data via their desktop PCs. Even this involvement would not be necessary if the employees had administrative rights to install software on their desktop PCs. The operation of the Corps’ water resource projects is something that is learned during hands-on training an

State Concern

The PWS requirements indicate that there are 3 types of services being requested. The first type is the managed services portion. This would include services that can be clearly defined to specific solution sets, such as help desk; data center operations; core web services support, and communications infrastructure support (WAN, LAN, MAN). The 2nd type of service is providing FTE support to a specific task via a delivery order. This task should be clearly defined in the PWS as a delivery order type task and the PWS should define the scope of work, the anticipated labor categories, the location of where the work is to be performed and the est. annual hours by labor category. The 3rd type service is if the task is not yet defined or not known, the PWS should state "that the SP shall assist the Gov. in defining the scope and preparing the task order, including the selection of agreed to labor categories with assoc. rates, prior to receiving authorization to start work on the task.

The H&H CoP leader in Headquarters is currently in the process of developing a data call to identify those IT positions that are in direct support of the Water Control Mission of the Districts. This data call will be sent to the field within the next month and the information will be used to determine which, if any, IT positions must be excluded from the PWS.

Information Paper: Water Management Concerns with the Draft A-76 IM/IT Performance Work Statement Date: 17 March 2005 Current Water Management Systems: The District Water Management staffs (within SWD) each have their own Water Control Data System (WCDS) which is separate from the computer systems used by the other elements of the District. The WCDS at each District is different than the WCDS at another District because each District has unique water control issues. The WCDS at each District is developed, operated and maintained by Water Management staff (not IM/IT). The WCDS is separate from the other District computer systems, due to the critical flood control mission of the COE. The WCDS includes hardware, software, data acquisition, data transmission, and data storage required to successfully accomplish flood control and other water management responsibilities. A common misconception is that the Hydrologic Engineering Center's suite of H&H computer programs referred to as CWMS (Corps Water Management System) has replaced the WCDS at the Districts. This is not true. CWMS is only a small part of the total WCDS at each District. The current version of CWMS can only accomplish a portion of what the Districts need to do their jobs. As improvements are made to CWMS, it may play a bigger role in the future.

State Concern

Information Paper: Water Management Concerns with the Draft A-76 IM/IT Performance Work Statement Date: 17 March 2005
Current Water Management Systems: The District Water Management staffs (within SWD) each have their own Water Control Data System (WCDS) which is separate from the computer systems used by the other elements of the District. The WCDS at each District is different than the WCDS at another District because each District has unique water control issues. The WCDS at each District is developed, operated and maintained by Water Management staff (not IM/IT). The WCDS is separate from the other District computer systems, due to the critical flood control mission of the COE. The WCDS includes hardware, software, data acquisition, data transmission, and data storage required to successfully accomplish flood control and other water management responsibilities. A common misconception is that the Hydrologic Engineering Center's suite of H&H computer programs referred to as CWMS (Corps Water Management System) has replaced the WCDS at the Districts. This is not true. CWMS is only a small part of the total WCDS at each District. The current version of CWMS can only accomplish a portion of what the Districts need to do their jobs. As improvements are made to CWMS, it may play a bigger role in the future. Data required by the Districts Water Management staff include data which must be measured in the field. This includes data such as precipitation, lake levels, river stages, water quality data, and weather data. All this data is also needed by numerous other agencies. The National Weather Service – River Forecast Center (NWS) uses this data to make river flood forecasts which are disseminated to the public. The U. S. Geological Survey (USGS) has the responsibility of statistical analysis and publishing of this data. Many other agencies as well as private engineering firms have a need for a least a portion of this data.

Just a general comment or idea worth considering. I apologize if this was covered and I didn't see it, but would it make sense to have the requirement listed to provision for (bid on) a specified number of unknown projects a year based upon previous year's data. This might prevent contract mods and increasing cost as a result of unidentified workload. Secondly, using that same thought process, should it state that the baseline could increase +/- a specified percentage a year, and to provision for that as well. This would enable baseline growth without the need for contract mods and

Section Paragraph

State Concern

The PWS has the SP providing items such as print cartridges, DVD-R, CD-R, floppy disks, pen drives, etc. These should be considered standard office supplies, and should be purchased by the offices that want them, not purchased, distributed, and billed back by the SP. If you want to state the SP is responsible for purchasing their own supplies, that is different. If that is what the intent is, it is certainly not clear.

This version of the PWS is a dramatic improvement over the first. Good job!

Information Paper: Water Management Concerns with the Draft A-76 IM/IT Performance Work Statement (Cont.) Concerns with the PWS: Flood control is a very critical mission for the COE. Anything that may hamper our ability to do the best job possible is a huge concern. The PWS mentions many of the functions described above, but does not provide any detail or description of how the work will be accomplished (by IM or a contractor). The PWS does make it clear that Water Management will continue to be responsible for the gauge equipment (sensors) in the field, but the selected Service Provider (SP) will be responsible for the DCP that transmits the data. The hydrologic technician will have to be dispatched to a faulty gauge. Then, if it is determined that the DCP has a problem, the SP will have to be contacted to send their crew to fix the DCP. This is a very inefficient and expensive way to do business. The inclusion of the water management functions in the PWS is combining what is currently being done by IM with much of what is currently being done by Water Management and other agencies. Even if the Government wins the competition, IM will have to take over responsibility for a task they know nothing about. Water Management will be at the mercy of a Service Provider who does not know how to provide the critical services and data they need. In addition, how will the cost sharing be resolved? This will not only hurt the COE, but also the NWS, USGS, and many other agencies.

When a report or a metric is asked for, more details need to be provided as to what the report or metric should entail. Also, it needs to be clarified if there one standard for each report or metric, or can each geographic locale, down to the District level, require different information?

Section Paragraph

State Concern

The following are some general comments and thoughts that should be kept in mind regarding the differences between contract bidders and the MEO bid team. The purpose of compiling the PWS is to acquire the best services for USACE customers at a more efficient price. We need to keep in mind that when a contractor bids, they have no institutional knowledge, where the MEO may actually have too much knowledge. They will only bid on what is provided. If things are vague or missing, they can and will ask for a contract mod and price increase once the ambiguous or missing requirement becomes evident after they are doing the job. They know their bid is the least amount of money they will be paid, and this amount will most certainly go up, sometimes dramatically. The MEO, on the other hand, will read things into the stated requirement if it is ambiguous, or missing, as they already know what the job entails. They will subconsciously account for these within their bid because of this detailed institutional knowledge. This situation easily exists when the PWS is vague, or does not provide enough detail to level the playing field. In reading the PWSA, I believe this situation exists. Also, if the SP happens to be a contractor, the level of customer service will fall way short of the current levels they are experiencing. To correct this, more detail as to what is expected, both in performance and reporting requirements should be included, and the workload data must be broken out by District to provide a more clear picture of where specific work is accomplished.

Continuation of previous "truncated" comment...Tulsa Water Control processes and admin folks are independent from IM/IT functions as are many other Districts. Water Control admin's are multi-disciplined and part of the WCDS team. Given the fact that a) Water Control processes and admin was added to the PWS at 2359 hours and is poorly defined, b) CWMS does not meet all WCDS needs at many Districts, c) Water Control admin folks are multi-disciplined, recommend Water Control processes and admin folks be excluded from A-76.

My concern with the entire PWS is that the authors has tried to capture almost all work that involves computers and wireless devices without regard to specialized job functions not currently performed by 2200 series personnel.

Section Paragraph

State Concern

Information Paper: Water Management Concerns with the Draft A-76 IM/IT Performance Work Statement (Cont.) The field data must be obtained by a measuring or sensing device. This device is connected to a DCP (Data Collection Platform) which stores the data and then transmits it via GOES satellite to a downlink which can be accessed by each District's Water Management WCDS (as well as by other agencies which need the data). The maintenance costs of the DCP's are lumped into the total costs of the gauge maintenance. When a problem develops with a gauge in the field, a crew of hydrologic technicians (COE or USGS) must be dispatched in a timely manner (very quick response time during flood events). The crew determines if the problem is with the gauge (sensor) or with the DCP. They are trained to fix either one. They often also make stream flow measurements or other field observations which help to calibrate the data before it is transmitted by the DCP.

is unique to each district office. If the resources, including the WCDS data acquisition system activities listed above, that are used by the water control managers are not under their direct control, the Corps could be exposed to liabilities resulting from inadequately maintained equipment in the field. Furthermore, throughout the Corps, CWMS and WCDS are used as equivalent terms when referencing the water control mission of the Corps. From the reasoning above, WCDS should be exempted as is CWMS. Additionally, I did not see any mention or cost associated with the WCDS in either TE-2, Estimated Current Workload, or TE-15, IM/IT Benefit Analysis. Also, the Government Furnished Equipment (GFE) listed under TE-3 for CEMVN-ED-HC is for the water control mission and should therefore be deleted from TE-3 if WCDS is exempted. Lastly, under TE-3, Government Furnished Software (GFS) for CEMVN-ED, there is no mention of the ten Hummingbird Exceed software licenses used by water control to access water control data. There is mention of NFS Maestro which is also used by water control. If WCDS is exempted, this reference should also be deleted. 5)<tab>Unless this PWS is amended to address all the Corps' unique WCDS implementations, it is unlikely that any realistic bid could be fielded that would not require later modifications or not have detrimental effects on the Corps' ability to operate water resource projects safely.

Section Paragraph

State Concern

Water Control is a unique mission with equipment that is exclusively used for real-time water and flood control to provide the information necessary to operate COE projects as required by the approved project Water Control Manual, Drought Contingency Plan, and Emergency Plan, and to provide for hydroelectric power, a historical record, meet environmental requirements, and prevent loss of property and life. This equipment and facilities are maintained, operated, and used by Engineers and Scientists not by IM personnel. If this equipment or facilities are included in this solicitation the potential for contract modification claims is nearly certain as a result of the cost and complexity of this additional work. Does the SP assume liability for loss of property and persons if they fail to provide information necessary for making critical decisions as required by Water Managers? If so does this document make that clear to them?

General Concern expressed by District field sites as to support for internet based work. Specifically, will there be support for designing, and updating contents of web pages, and assisting with any database maintenance that might be required for web pages as

Information Paper: Water Management Concerns with the Draft A-76 IM/IT Performance Work Statement

(Cont.) Recommendation: The recommendation of the SWD Regional Water Management Community is to remove any reference to Water Control/Water Management functions, facilities, equipment, technology, and computer software from the PWS. This would include CWMS, WCDS, and any water management related equipment such as DCP's.

The Chicago District does not operate water control facilities except Chicago Lock. Therefore, a decision was made a few years ago that the district would use its own water control management system. Our contractor is responsible for equipment, data collection and telemetry in the field, and the only water control engineer with part of his time in the district is responsible for the administration, operations and maintenance of the system hardware and software that do not require IM/IT's service. Therefore, outsourcing of IM/IT in this district would not affect our operation. The IM/IT, however, does supply LAN and remote access support for our domain and does administer data routers and switches. It is important that data communication support in the district office be continued. Since the very limited scope of water control in the district and a unique water control data control system being used in the district, it is expected that the water control function will continue to be isolated.

Section Paragraph

State Concern

The IM/IT Benefit Analysis seems to provide a lot of cost information (i.e. Tables 18/19). It appears as an acceptable organization complete with dollar savings amounts. Is this too much information to provide to bidding vendors? It appears as if the table represents the MEEO.

Part 3 of 3 Part comment The operation of the Corps' water resource projects is something that is learned during hands-on training and is unique to each district office. If the resources, including the Water Control Data System (WCDS) data acquisition system activities listed above, that are used by the water control managers are not under their direct control, the Corps could be exposed to liabilities resulting from inadequately maintained equipment in the field. Furthermore, throughout the Corps, CWMS and WCDS are used as equivalent terms when referencing the water control mission of the Corps. From the reasoning above, WCDS should be exempted as is CWMS. Additionally, I did not see any mention or cost associated with the WCDS in either TE-2, Estimated Current Workload, or TE-15, IM/IT Benefit Analysis. Also, the Government Furnished Equipment (GFE) listed under TE-3 for CEMVN-ED-HC is for the water control mission and should therefore be deleted from TE-3 if WCDS is exempted. Lastly, under TE-3, Government Furnished Software (GFS) for CEMVN-ED, there is no mention of the ten Hummingbird Exceed software licenses used by water control to access water control data. There is mention of NFS Maestro which is also used by water control. If WCDS is exempted, this reference should also be deleted. 5)<tab>Unless this PWS is amended to address all the Corps' unique WCDS implementations, it is unlikely that any realistic bid could be fielded that would not require later modifications or not have detrimental effects on the Corps' ability to operate water resource projects safely.

Section Paragraph

State Concern

Part 2 of 3 Part comment ER-110-2.249 also states that “the functional control of the Water Control Data System (WCDS) is the exclusive responsibility of the system administrator in order to ensure project operations as authorized by Congress”. As stated in the ER, “the system administrator shall be a member of the water control management chain of command” and “shall be either the person directly responsible for water control activities or that person’s immediate supervisor”. ER-110-2.249 also defines a (1) WCDS system manager, (2) WCDS site manager, and (3) WCDS data acquisition manager. Of the three above managers, all “shall be appointed by the system administrator and shall be assigned within the chain of command of the system administrator”. The one exception noted in ER-110-2.249 is for the WCDS site manager: If necessary, due to lack of site management skills, the “use of a Corps of Engineers employee residing in the other divisions such as Information Management Division or even by contract is recommended. The WCDS Site Manager’s duties and responsibilities include the installation, operation, and maintenance of the onsite WCDS hardware, operating systems, network, and supporting facilities. The WCDS data acquisition manager is responsible for managing the installation, including operation and maintenance of the WCDS data acquisition system activities which include “data collection platform and sensor installation, operation and maintenance; GOES, direct readout ground station, or domsat read-only terminal installation, operation, and maintenance...and data acquisition of project and hydrometeorological data by voice, radio, terminal, personal computer, etc.” Currently in the New Orleans District, the WCDS is supported entirely within the Engineering Division, Hydrologic & Hydraulics Branch. IMO involvement is limited to installing, maintaining and upgrading off-the-shelf software that allows H&H Branch employees to access water control data via t

It now appears that rather than to be exempted entirely, CWMS operation is to be performed by the winning contractor. This change may have some unexpected consequences. 1. Currently IM does not perform this work in most offices – Current IM staff likely does not have CWMS/HEC expertise and thus be unable to compete fairly in this area. 2. The work involved in CWMS operation may not be adequately defined in the contract – A winning contractor may be able to force a costly contract amendment to satisfy this work requirement. 3. An outside contractor may not currently have the expertise in CWMS and HEC software – A winning contractor may seek to hire knowledgeable Corps water management staff and thus deplete the Corps’ engineering staff at an inconvenient time. A contractor hiring current HEC staff may hinder the continued development of CWMS.

Section	Paragraph	State Concern
	App B, Contract	The list of Little Rock Contracts shows only 4 of 61 contracts. The latest update was submitted through Contracting channels 2/2/05. The spreadsheet has been sent to Glen DePue for forwarding to the appropriate person for correction.
S-TE		Will the entire CeA be listed as an Exhibit?
TE-1		All performance requirements must be in compliance with current professional industry standards.
		Field Office communication efficiencies are currently the primary concern of the individual Districts. When a change is authorized to the network by the CCB, will these outlying offices be fully considered and monitored? Inefficiencies of the IT systems will require additional man-hours of operation by Corps staff therefore additional cost.
		Why is the PWS showing any allowable deviations. Both the Forest Service and the DOE PWS have 100% performance requirements. While I understand this may reflect the ability to deliver services to all locations, if locations such as Alaska need to have more liberal time requirements, shouldn't that be specified?
		Please insert the following phrase in the Requirements blocks in the "Standard" column. The following phrase should be inserted at the end of the existing blurb: " , and shall be in compliance with the current professional industry standard."
		Most of the criteria in the PWS Performance Requirements section begin with 'upon service request', which tells the SP how to react to services but not the level of services that need to be provided. These phrases alone depict a services based contract rather than a performance based contract.
		In C.5.4.3, a 50% lot of deviation is allowed for IA certification, accreditation, and re-accreditation. If these functions are not completed in a timely manner, the offending activity could have their network access blocked. All of these requirements must be met on-time.
		In C.5.4.7.6, the way this is written, we are allowing 10% of FOIA requests to be 29 days late. This is not acceptable, as judges could hold individuals in contempt of court if these were court-ordered FOIA requests. All FOIAs must be provided by the suspense date. There may be room for negotiation as to what the date is, but once set, it must be met.

Section Paragraph

State Concern

SSEB must make decision of future SP based upon efficiencies of operation. Any reduction in current levels (of support) would significantly impact all Corps sites. (How is the trade-off between core competency productivity and cost of IT level of support going to be evaluated?)

Some services described in PWS relating to VI are not currently available in Districts. Will these services be available in the future or will services be maintained at current levels and cost levels commensurate with same?

Why would an SR be issued and who would enter the request. Email servers should be kept up to date automatically by the server admin.

Throughout the Technical Attributes Chart under the column Architecture there is a heading called "Allowable Downtime". The Allowable Downtime fluctuates for each of the AISs, but I would think that CEFMS (TE-11.13) <5 days Allowed – CEEMIS (TE-11.14) <2 Weeks Allowed – P2 (TE-11.41) 3 days Allowed and other AISs that interface would have a semblance of coherence in their "Allowable Downtimes" if they are in fact to Interface, be Real Time, and On-Line. The Quality and quantity of transactions require that these AIS systems to be up and running EVERY day. These systems are utilized throughout various continents and time zones and are integral in the "flexibility" of deployed personnel to reach back for expertise and real time financial and project related data. The Corps is a World Wide Engineering agency that depends on its resources (human, Equipment, systems, etc) to meet our mission requirements

Backups and redundancy are not specifically addressed. These have not been established consistently throughout the Corps to date. Performance goals should be addressed.

For national security reasons a single location for all servers to support the Corps cannot be allowed. USACE is a prime ESF responder as well as a secondary responder for FEMA and hence homeland security. System must have some redundancy.

TE 1 Performance Requirements Summary: Much of the work in PWS C.5 does not lend itself to performance metrics collection. Experience has shown that attempts to collect and assess metrics similar to those in this section for work that is not repeatable fixed-units consumes excessive effort and provides no value. The techniques of this section can only be successfully applied to repeatable fixed-unit services such as operating servers and networks, answer help desk calls, and installing telephones. Recommend Earned Value Management be used for all other

Section Paragraph

State Concern

In C.5.4.1.1, the way this is written, we are allowing 10% of gateway configuration changes to be 14 days late. This could be disastrous if the configuration change was due to a security issue. All of these must be done on-time.

There is no provision to measure customer satisfaction. Yes, it is somewhat qualitative but it is a very important measure of contractor performance.

Servers should be updated and maintained with need for SR from customer. Security patches, etc should be applied without an end user asking.

A performance based contract would normally provide SLA's which define performance metrics such as network response time, latency, throughput, and so forth. The SLA's in this contract do not reflect these types of metrics. Was this the governments intent?

The performance requirements in the PWS focus on quantities and delivery times and not on quality results or satisfying the customer. As a result, they are often neither sufficient nor even necessary in satisfying customer needs. The PWS simply should not ignore the fact that ensuring customer satisfaction is the key to an effective, meaningful, and successful performance measurement system and should be an integral part of and the purpose for the system. Under the proposed PWS, it is ignored.

The performance requirements as defined in TE-1 fail to provide penalty amounts (\$ or %) for failure by the SP to meet minimum standards. Without this information, the package is unbiddable. Once the SP surpasses the transition phase, what recourse does the Corps have should the SP fail to provide essential services in an acceptable manner? There are no alternative providers to step in should the SP arbitrarily decide to cease providing particular components of the PWS.

This section frequently refers to "no later than the assigned completion date". How is this date determined? What are the parameters? This needs to be spelled out somewhere.

How can the lot of deviation allow a 50% for the 1st year, 40% for the 2nd year, and 30% for the 3rd year in a contract be allowed. Even if the government is currently not performing well, or has the service developed, is it considered good customer service to allow a 1/3 failure rate three years in?

Some lots of deviation do not make sense. For example, how can the lot of deviation for an annual product be anything other than 0%? How can a quarterly product have a lot of deviation other than 0, 25, 50, or 75%?

Section Paragraph

State Concern

I feel that the performance requirements are too broad. There should be a minimum performance requirement in each category of service. In addition, many categories list "Upon Service Request" who in some cases would be submitting these SR's, it is very unclear.

Need a task(s) to reflect the development, implementation and enforcement of web policy. Policy changes can impact content (i.e. POC names are no longer allowed on web pages, must use blind email addresses); software (i.e. active-x controls are forbidden to be used); presentation (i.e. all menus must be on the right side of the page with a Corps castle in the upper right hand corner); approval chain. Changes in policy could be caused by new directives from DOD/Army or local authorities. RS 38 through 43 seem to cover developing new websites not policy mandated changes to existing sites nor the development of the policy and the procedures to implement the policies.

TE 1 indicates that payment calculations will be computed on each requirement at each site on a monthly basis. This will result in over 18,000 calculations every month; almost a quarter million calculations per year. Additionally, many of the requirements allow the government to set assigned completion dates arbitrarily on a task by task basis. This requirement seems to be setting up a very difficult situation between the SP and the government which will require large numbers of staff members on both sides of the table to resolve payment issues.

Section Paragraph

State Concern

These are not acceptable performance requirements for the Washington Aqueduct. We would not permit our employees these margins of errors, downtime, or outages. Basically, they must get the job done and immediately rework if it is not acceptable. Additionally, the fiscal penalties for non-performance should accrue to the organization who is not getting the service as a savings so they are able to supplement the contract and obtain the service they need.

The Washington Aqueduct is a business which is wholly customer financed. Contractor failure to perform at the acceptable specified levels for our facility could result in loss of agency reputation if, for example, we were unable to prove we met EPA standards. This loss of trust by the customer would most likely result in change of ownership and significant adverse media. More needs to be done to ensure this contract supports and protects our unique regulatory and operational requirements. On many of the PRS a major issue is the "assigned completion date." That could make or break the effectiveness of the standard. Another concern is what if the problems continue to occur at one facility? An error rate of 1% may not seem high, but if your facility is always in the 1% error group, it would be totally unacceptable. Certain facilities, especially those providing utility services such as the Washington Aqueduct, need to be ranked as top response priority and the deviations permitted for such facilities need to be lower. This should be shown in both TE 3 and 9

In a performance based contract, one would expect to see criteria that identify things like network and application response time. Using these criteria, the bidders then design an infrastructure to meet these requirements. The current PWS contains no performance based criteria for the infrastructure. Therefore, it is likely that the successful bid will be one that provides a minimal level of service. As an example, there are currently dual- T-1 (1.5Mbps) circuits to each CONUS sites in order to provide responsiveness and redundancy. There is nothing in the Performance Criteria that requires this type of connectivity. The PWS could be met by replacing these high speed lines with 56Kbps lines. This places the USACE infrastructure at a high risk. The same could be said for application response. In order to save on maintenance dollars and reduce the bid cost, the bidder could consolidate all email servers within USACE to a single low-end server with slow response times.

General - I see no requirement detailing with what frequency a copier can be down or broken. What is required up time?

Who is submitting all the SR's? End users, CCB? Very confusing document on where things originate.

Section Paragraph

State Concern

Don't see a provision for contractor failure to perform repeatedly in the same area/location- i.e., may not provide uniform level of service to one location because it is not cost effective

PRS is not presented in a manner that supports a performance based contract.

Performance Requirements Summary, RS 259: The requirement for local Records Holding Areas at each level of command precludes the savings that could be realized by combining and consolidating Records Holding Areas.

Changes to network must be approved by the CCB however standard software changes, upgrades, etc do not appear to be addressed. Who will be making those decisions and will the SP provide support including loading and training?

What about issues of direct accountability, and response time for the SP? For example, TE-1 states the maximum allowable degree of deviation from requirements for server restore is within 5 business days of assigned completion date. A reasonable response time for most elements may not be responsive for Water Control in a flood event situation. If performance is not flexible or responsive enough to meet emergency needs, then who will be responsible for SP non-performance in the event of a local flood event (regardless if the SP is contractor or government)? We need to insure the PWS is detailed enough enable the SP to succeed and provide deterrents to non-performance.

Section Paragraph

State Concern

Te-1-prs 2. te-1 - rs 14 - some can be done during business hours 3. te-1 - rs15 - we do 4 days now 4. te-1 - rs16 - not sure this is reasonable 6. te-1 - rs22 - what about actually implementing coop? 7. te-1 - col header "proportion of required service to total contract price" doesn't make sense 8. te-1 - something should be said in more detail about oracle patching, rs213 mentions it, but it sure doesn't get at the complexity, it's a huge project that happens every quarter. there must be some way of expressing that. 9. te-1 - rs 56 - quality of scripts - frequency of errors, reliability, etc 10. te-1 - rs 32, for example: i can't imagine how you could bid on this - is this a little system? a 15000 user system? how would you even propose staffing with something this vague 11. te-1 - the whole database section talks as if things are to be done for a single database. this almost never happens 12. te-1 - i might be missing this - what about database backups? database recovery? point-in-time? exp/imp? 13. te-1 - need more detail on database coop 14. te-1 - needs to say something about integrating things like 9ias, pure edge, perl, oracle forms, oracle reports server 15. te-1 - must be able to deal with de-supported software, or else keep software up-to-date (ha!) 16. te-1 - add fixing database corruption 17. te-1 - add database integrity checking 18. te-1 - do they know how many people we have? For some functions, we don't have enough people now. How will this affect evaluation of bids? 19. te-1 - i just don't see the complexity of our environment coming across - e.g., what about oracle applications and p2????? 20. te-1 - rs198 - how can they test passwords for complexity? can they actually tell what our passwords are? 21. te-1 - add move of oracle archive logs to tape 22. te-1 - i don't see anything about making Esig cards in this part. I also had the impression that this was inherently governmental.

IT supports to the outlying offices such as area and field offices are not visibly addressed. Will the performance levels of support be the same for them as it is for offices more "centrally" located?

Section Paragraph

State Concern

This table is way off the mark for establishing SLAs for a managed service environment. We recommend an approach that links measurable delivery service to a performance standard which is linked directly to the elements of the PWS. Metrics are key to ensuring performance improvements. We can recommend SLAs that are commonly used for the managed services portion of this program. For services provided under task delivery orders, a cost plus incentive fee strategy could be utilized which would achieve the same result in incentivizing a SP to provide quality service. In this scenario specific measures of performance should be identified and agreed to between the Gov't and the SP, before the task is initiated. Periodic interim reviews should be conducted so that the SP knows how he is doing and has the opportunity to correct any shortcomings prior to the end of the award cycle.

The acceptable performance deviations of 10% or greater are too high, and are considered unacceptable for the Honolulu District. The performance deviations should be 3% at most, with most tolerances in the 0-1% range. The percentage deviations do not address what is allowable as slippage. For example, suppose a tolerance of 1% is allowed for the task of providing helpdesk technical support to all users within a designated time period, but the service provider chooses to totally ignore users located OCONUS (Kwajalein, Palau, etc). Provided the service provider still supports the remaining users, their performance may still technically fall within the 1% tolerance guidelines. The PWS does not address the issue of where deviations are acceptable.

COOP responsibilities reference IM IT COOP. Is this considered to be a component of the corporate COOP (continuity of operations, not just technology and data)?

In C.5.5.1, how can the lot of deviation be anything other than zero when the standard is to have a functioning records program at each location? If the requirement is to have one at each location, there should be no allowable failure for this.

- 1.3 Standards of Technical Exhibits: Many of the performance standards and AQLs are not appropriate for the work they measure and are not aligned with USACE needs
- Section 4 SP Technical Exhibits: penalties far exceed those in Government and commercial practice
- Section 4 SP Technical Exhibits: Penalties for not meeting metrics far exceed those in Government and commercial practice.
- 1.3 Standards of Technical Exhibits: Performance standards do not reflect commercial marketplace standards

Section	Paragraph	State Concern
	1.4. Maximum	TE 1 Performance Requirements Summary: Many of the AQLs are not feasible or reasonable. A good example is C.5.1.3.5 requirements statements. A document with 500 requirements statements can not be reviewed properly in 3 days. If an installation issued one document with 500 requirements the SP would fail to meet the AQL. The most important performance criterion should be the quality of the review, which can not be measured quantitatively, rather than the speed.
	1.6. The primary	TE 1 Performance Requirements Summary: Collection of many of these metrics will be time consuming and provide little true value to USACE for managing this work. We recommend that commercial management information systems metrics be used for commercial fixed-unit services (e.g., availability for C.5.2.5 server support and services). We recommend that earned value management be used to manage all other work (e.g., C.5.1.3.5 Requirements Statements).
	1.7. The	TE 1 Performance Requirements Summary: The type of work defined in the PWS is such that it will not be possible for either USACE or the offeror to accurately predict the amount or percentage of work for each PWS element. For example, the work related to C.5.2.5 server support and services, depends on the number of each type of server and will vary with time. The price for this work should be based on the actual numbers not planned numbers. The price should not be related by percentage to other work areas. We recommend that the price for PWS elements that reflect commercial fixed-unit services, such as operating a Solaris server, should be based on a price per unit multiplied by the number of units.
	4.1	Re: para 4.1 - it insinuates that there would be situations in which the SP's poor performance would NOT be the fault of the SP, but I do not see any reference in TE-1 as to how those situations are addressed, determined, and adjudicated as to their impact on the penalties assessed - or not assessed. Additionally, the systems used to collect data on performance must be relatively sophisticated in order to definitively identify SP performance, according to established metrics. From our experience, such systems are not used currently at the ACE. Can we assume that integration of appropriately capable systems will be accomplished as part of this procurement?
	4.2.1	Technical Exhibits: SP Payment. This paragraph states, "The percentage of the sample found unacceptable subtracted from 100 percent determines the percentage of the lot found unacceptable." It appears that the last word of this sentence should be "acceptable", not "unacceptable".
	81	the "Standard" Column should also include that it "shall be in compliance with the current professional industry standard."

Section	Paragraph	State Concern
	Add to	Add to Performance Monitoring standard – Average bandwidth utilization not to exceed value X determined by CCB and applied per local site including remote field sites covered by the WAN.
C.5.1.5.2	RS 6	Upon service request, but no less than monthly, determine the cost distribution for all customers within 5 business days following the end of the calendar month. According to FC (Millington) the cost distribution must be completed no later than 3 business days prior to the end of the month. The costs should be distributed in the month in which they occur.
C.5.2.2		We need to address the issue of getting e-mail to the correct webmaster. Currently, a lot of webmaster e-mail is misdirected,
C.5.2.2		We need to address the issue of getting e-mail to the correct webmaster. Currently, a lot of webmaster e-mail is misdirected,
c.5.2.7		Email backup has 0% deviation per lot. There should be at least 1% deviation for failed tapes, network problems, etc. Especially for something being done daily.
C.5.3.2.4.1		When requesting SP to add voice service do we identify parameters/standards with which the voice circuit will be provided by the carrier? (e.g. IAW ITU-T standards).
C.5.4.2.5		Technical Exhibits: "Upon receipt and reloading of hardware and software, remove default, guest, or standard service accounts from devices on USACE networks prior to connecting to USACE networks by the assigned completion date". Request USACE clarify the definition of standard service account in the context of this
C.5.5.1 -		I have a concern in that the deviation percentages are extremely high. The records management discipline is governed by Public Law and many Army regulations. If present records officials have a lower deviation percentage in accomplishing our duties, why change now? These duties must be performed to the maximum; albeit, because of top management officials, some areas may not get accomplished, not because of the records official, but because of management decision. However, the requirement does not change.
c.5.7		All products will also comply with the current professional industry standards for graphics, desktop publishing, photography, videography, video production, multimedia production, and multimedia facility design and equipment.
general comment		General Comment: The PRS does not have a column for quantity of work per time period
general comment		The PRS is not broken down by each site (District). We have no way of knowing if it will be adequate for NWS.

Section	Paragraph	State Concern
	general comment	General Comment: There is only one item that requires 365x7x24 support (RS211). This seems inadequate. There are many more situations such as end-of-year closing, emergency operations, and network down situations that require 24x7 support.
	header	The "Standard" Column should be phrased to include "and shall be in compliance with the current professional industry standard."
	NA	Provide technically current web site functions such as streaming media, flash presentations, page layout using the recent tools
	NA	proved high quality static maps appropriate for use on web pages to act as web site navigation aids.
	NA	Maintain and support web site content management application that supports "edit-in-place" for content maintainers, work-flow, supports business rules and approval process, and canned provide web site reports.
	NA	Provide database of all USACE publications. Create web pages from database of publications that are on-line, print only, CD only, or other media.
	PERFORMANCE	Suggest additional line in table covering the CPIC process. IMIT: Capital Planning and Investment Control Support C.5.1.4. Standard Upon service request, execute the select, manage, and control phases of the CPIC process not later than the assigned completion date. AQL: 10% deviation per lot. 0% deviation within 20 business days of assigned completion date. Lot size is number of actions requested.
	RE 309	The "Standard" for RS 309 in the TE-1 Performance Requirements should read as follows: "Upon service request, provide photographic services within the budgeted cost, assigned schedule, assigned completion date, and shall be in compliance with the current professional industry standard."
	RS 102 –	Add "user orientation training", "replace", and "troubleshoot" to this standard. Should read, "Upon service request or as required, provided user orientation training, activate, troubleshoot, replace, or deactivate cell phones no later than the assigned completion date."
	RS 144 –	Add performance standard for high-frequency single sideband radio project management and include in C.5.3.5.1 and C.5.3.5.2.
	RS 161 –	1. General comment – Deviation percentages throughout Information Assurance are too high. PLEASE REVIEW. 2. Standards - Define reporting procedure (higher headquarters).
	RS 165 –	The lot size is confusing compared to the standard.
	RS 167 –	Define lot size.

Section	Paragraph	State Concern
	RS 172 –	15% deviation per lot is really high.
	RS 174 –	1. Delete 8 business hours from the standard. 2. Add: NLT assigned completion date. 3. Add paragraph reference C.5.4.1.16 to this RS (not referenced elsewhere in TE-1).
	RS 175 –	Delete “USACE end users” and insert “appropriate IA personnel within 8 business hours of a new threat”.
	RS 179 –	General comment: Separate performance standards for
	RS 190 –	Degree of deviation - clarify lot size (daily versus per month).
	RS 192 –	Change standard to verify users have agreed via electronic or written signature.
	RS 196 –	In coordination with Government IAM, need verification that user rights and privileges should be elevated.
	RS - 2 & RS - 8	When we talk of a CEFMS tech review of a PR&C, 1 working day is OK. If this is creating a PR&C for a customer (not currently done in all districts) 3 days may be OK. Reference to RS 8 dealing with Acquisition support same concerns. For responding to the other areas in c5.1.3.2 will take longer.
	RS 200 –	RS 200 conflicts with TE-11.
	RS 204 –	Degree of Deviation - Change deviation per lot to 0% for classified.
	RS 211 –	Degree of deviation per lot should be 0% for COMSEC. There is confusion as to whether this RS crosses into COMSEC custodian duties, which should be in accordance with TB 380-41, paragraph 2-7.
	RS 220 –	1. Add paragraph reference C.5.4.7.2. 2. Is this the HQUSACE scan? If not, the local scans must be done weekly. It conflicts with RS 214 if not an external scan?
	RS 233 –	Change deviation degree from 4 business hours to “in accordance with AR 380-5”.
	RS 255– Records	1. Paragraph reference should read C5.5.1.3. 2. AQL for customer service request should be 10% deviation. 50% deviation only acceptable on annual reviews.
	RS 264– Records	Define the interfacing roles between service provider and government personnel (Public Affairs, Librarian, Historian, etc.).
	RS 267 –	Change degree of deviation to 1%.
	RS 271 –	1. Change standard to read, “Based on the customer’s delivery requirement, select the best method/reliability of delivery and place proper postage on outgoing mail and packages.” 2. Delete “freight” as that is a Logistics responsibility.

Section	Paragraph	State Concern
	RS 272– Records	This standard does not apply in all districts. GSA assumes this responsibility in some facilities.
	RS 279 –	Change deviation per lot from 50% to 10% deviation per lot during the first contract year.
	RS 282 –	Use the same deviations as RS 280 – 10% deviation per lot and 0% deviation per lot within approved extension of assigned completion date.
	RS 283 –	Add paragraph reference 5.5.8.1.
	RS 288 –	AQL for customer service request should be 10% deviation. 50% deviation only acceptable on annual reviews.
	RS 293 – Printing	1. The standard only mentions DAPS. 2. Change standard to read, “Upon service request....deliver to DAPS, GPO, and GPO-approved vendors no later than the assigned completion date.” 3. This standard is sufficient for replacement of RS 296 and RS
	RS 294 – Printing	This standard should be split into two RS’s. Make (1) RS for estimating costs and scheduling and (2) RS for coordination and approval of required proofs.
	RS 295 – Printing	Change standard to read, “ Upon receipt of printed materials, provide distribution and facilitate mailing of finished products no later than the assigned completion date.”
	RS 298 – Printing	The SP needs to do a quality check on end-product - printed product is compared to submitted proof or customer submission. Gain acceptance from customer that the product delivered is the product requested.
	RS - 3	What is CGO? It is not included in list of Acronyms. 10 days seems a bit rigid – use the terms found in many of the other RS’s – “no later than the assigned completion date”
	RS 306 – Visual	1. Add to standard “Provide continuous operational support during event as required.” 2. NOTE – Need to include reference to TE-9 for minimal scheduling lead time.
	rs 1	Standards wording should read – for transmittal of information (not that information)
	RS -1	In the Standard section: It seem you should expect the SP to actually transmit the data they have collected back to the requestor.
	RS 1 – IM/IT:	Add 0% deviation per lot within 10 business days of assigned completion date to RS 1.
	RS 10 – C.5.1.12	1. This work item needs to be mirrored in every area of IMIT service. 2. Instead of 10% deviation per lot, it should state 1% deviation per lot. When the lot size is large, the percent deviation should be small.

Section	Paragraph	State Concern
	RS 10 End-user	1. The deviation should be contingent on the lot size as referenced in RS 126. Use the same format for column 4 (AQL) as reflected in degree of deviation in RS 126. These comments should apply throughout entire TE 1. 2. TE 9 makes no provision for hands-on on-site support under any criteria. There is no definition for grave versus substantial in TE-9.
	RS 100 –	Add "replace" to the standard after activate. The standard should read, “Upon service request or as required, activate, replace, or deactivate pagers no later than the assigned completion date.”
	RS 101 –	Add "operate" and "maintain" to the standard. Should read, “ Upon service request or as required, install, configure, de-install, operate, troubleshoot, maintain, and activate mobile satellites no later than the assigned completion date.”
	RS 103 –	Standard should read, “Upon service request or as required, provided user orientation training, activate, troubleshoot, operate, maintain, replace, or deactivate PDAs and supported related services no later than the assigned completion date.”
	RS 105 –	Standard should read, “Upon service request or as required, install, configure, activate, troubleshoot, operate, maintain, replace, or deactivate analog or digital microwave radios and supported related services no later than the assigned completion date. Must submit frequency management actions as required.”
	RS 106 –	Standard should read, “Upon service request or as required, install, configure, activate, troubleshoot, operate, maintain, replace, or deactivate analog or digital microwave repeaters and supported related services no later than the assigned completion date. Must submit frequency management actions as required.”
	RS 107–	1. This work item needs to be mirrored in every area of IMIT service. 2. Delete standard – ...requested no later than the assigned completion time. Replace with – “...requested within one business day of service request.” 3. Include paragraph reference C5.1.12 End-User Support and Services 4. Change deviation per lot from 5% to 1% since lot size is work orders completed per year.
	RS 108 –	1. Add paragraph reference C.5.1.12 – End-User Support and Services. 2. Change deviation per lot from 5% to 1% since lot size is work orders completed per year.
	RS 109 -	1. Add paragraph reference C.5.3.1.4 and C.5.1.12. 2. Change the end of the standard, "no later than the assigned completion date". This should read "based on the service level agreement, see TE-09". Do not use "no later than the assigned completion date".

Section	Paragraph	State Concern
	RS 126 –	Many times, routine operations extend after business hours. This needs to be staffed 24/7.
	RS 127 –	If RS 127 relates to scheduled upgrades, it would appear inappropriate to include priority 1, 2, and 3 acceptable quality levels (AQL) . If “routine” as used in C.5.3.3.2.2 implies process or cycle, it is acceptable as written.
	RS 141 –	Why does this standard have a 4-hour response time here and no where else in TE-1? Does this relate to business hours?
	RS 151 –	On AQL degree of deviation where 0% deviation, delete “initial” on assigned completion date. Should read, “ 0% deviation per lot within 30 calendar days of assigned completion date.”
	RS 153,	Change Standard to include: tower rescue, first aid, and CPR
	RS 154 -	Change standard to include: painting of the towers and repair of tower lighting alarm systems.
	RS 160 –	Paragraph reference should read C.5.3.2.12.
	RS 178 –	Standard – Change calendar days to business days as other standards are written.
	RS 18 –	What about after hours and weekends?
	RS 189 –	Degree of deviation should be 0%.
	RS 197 –	Visit the interface between UPASS and Active Directory.
	RS 199 –	Degree of deviation: Change 1% deviation per lot to 0%.
	RS 2 – IMIT:	Add 0% deviation per lot within 10 business days of assigned completion date to RS 1.
	RS 20 –	Standard - Change physical quarantine from 10 minutes to 1 hour. What happens after hours or weekends?
	RS 205 –	The paragraph reference C.5.4.2.1 does not apply to this RS.
	RS 21 –	Unless there is an exception, in accordance with AR 25-2, this should 0% deviation per lot.
	RS 245	Annual testing of backup data is not frequent enough.
	RS 252 – Records	Why is this RS so critical that the standard has to be acted on within 1 business hour?
	RS 254 – Records	1. Lot size should be the number of records per month. Delete word “USACE”. 2. Review deviations throughout Records Management – RS 254; deviations all seem high. Recommend 50%, 25%, and 10% be used throughout

Section	Paragraph	State Concern
	RS 256 – Records	1. Define unscheduled AIS. 2. AQL for customer service request should be 10% deviation. 50% deviation only acceptable on annual reviews.
	RS 261 – Records	Decrease degree of deviation from 30% to 10% deviation per lot.
	RS 268 – Records	Change degree of deviation to 1%.
	RS 269 – Records	Change degree of deviation to 1%.
	RS 273 – Records	The deviation per lot should be changed from 0.5% to 1% and match RS 268 and RS 269.
	rs 28	Servers should be maintained automatically without a need for an SR from an End User. Some applications for end users should also be automatically maintained and other via SR. Perhaps better clarification for servers vs desktops, etc.
	RS 299 – Printing	1. Define standard – Is it talking about new publications or revisions? 2. Change standard – “Upon service request provide requested existing official publications within 3 business days of receipt of customer request.” 3. There should be a new standard to manage the revision, numbering, approval, and dissemination of official publications in accordance with assigned completion
	RS 300 – Printing	1. Add “approved forms” to the standard. 2. Change deviation per lot from 15% to 5%.
	RS 302 – Printing	Suggest RS 302 be incorporated into RS 301. The business case should be submitted prior to approval as part of the evaluation
	RS 304 – Printing	Change standard to read, "Upon receipt of copier, provide property control information to Logistics Management to update property management system within 5 business days."
	RS 305	The "Standard" for RS 305 in the TE-1 Performance Requirements should read as follows: "Upon service request, provide Visual Information (VI) products in accordance with EP 310-1-6 and all other current applicable policies and regulations no later than the assigned completion date and shall be in compliance with the current professional industry standard."
	RS 308	The "Standard" for RS 308 in the TE-1 Performance Requirements should read as follows: "In accordance with customer project plan, design and install AV facilities within assigned completion date, the approved budget, and shall be in compliance with the current professional industry standard."
	RS 313	The "Standard" for RS 313 in the TE-1 Performance Requirements should read as follows: "Upon service request, set up video shoot within budgeted cost, assigned schedule, assigned completion date, and shall be in compliance with the current professional industry standard."

Section	Paragraph	State Concern
	RS 315	The "Standard" for RS 315 in the TE-1 Performance Requirements should read as follows: "Upon service request, produce video projects in accordance with approved project plan and within budgeted cost, assigned schedule, assigned completion date, and shall be in compliance with the current professional industry standard."
	RS 318	The "Standard" for RS 318 in the TE-1 Performance Requirements should read as follows: "Upon service request, produce multimedia products in accordance with approved project plan and within budgeted cost, assigned schedule, assigned completion date, and shall be in compliance with the current professional industry standard."
	RS 319	The "Standard" for RS 319 in the TE-1 Performance Requirements should read as follows: "Upon service request, produce illustration and drafting projects within budgeted cost, assigned schedule, assigned completion date, and shall be in compliance with the current professional industry standard."
	RS 323	The "Standard" for RS 323 in the TE-1 Performance Requirements should read as follows: "Upon service request, provide desktop publishing services within budgeted cost, assigned schedule, assigned completion date, and shall be in compliance with the current professional industry standard. Produce technical documents in accordance with local format and publishing guidelines."
	RS 42 –	1. Upon service request – doesn't fit as used in the standard for RS 42. 2. C.2.1- Definitions – Expand service request definition. It doesn't fit standards.
	RS 46 –	Adjust standard to read, "Quarterly remove all web sites per Public Affairs Office. Page Masters shall be notified of all page removals."
	RS 48	Webmaster Mail should be answered in 8 work hours, but mail addressed to the webmaster may not actually be mail that the webmaster should answer (e.g. a question about a broken link or a web page design suggestion might be answerable by the webmaster, but a question generally about the services of the Corps of engineers should not be). The requirement should be that the question is forwarded to the appropriate POC for an answer within the 8 hours, with a note to the correspondent giving an estimated time for a complete answer.
	RS 48 –	Upon receipt... should read, "within 8 business hours in coordination with appropriate functional CoP."
	RS 49 –	Standard is not clear.

Section	Paragraph	State Concern
	RS 51-RS55,	Many tasks must be coordinated with exempt AIS (i.e. CWMS) material developer before implementation. The PWS has no specifications that ensure this coordination as directed in relevant Engineer Regulations. The coordination efforts must be included in the performance requirements. Otherwise, the SP cannot bid appropriately for providing essential services.
	rs 6	If this is a monthly report, why would an SR be submitted? Who is the report for?
	rs 61	“prepare contracts” Limits means of acquisition. Will everything be purchased via contract or will the ability to purchase via credit card still be available.
	rs 68	Why would the server admin wait for an SR. They should be proactive in keeping systems up to date.
	RS 69 –	The USACE COOP needs to be defined. It also needs to be a technical exhibit. The 0% deviation per lot is unrealistic – change to 5% deviation per lot to match up with RS 70.
	rs 7	Who would be entering the SR, decisions should be handled accordingly.
	RS 73 –	Is this 24/7? Are they supposed to perform after hours work? If so, it should be in the PRS.
	RS 77–	Is electronic messaging operated 24/7?
	RS 79 –	Change 0% deviation per lot to 5% deviation per lot.
	RS 8 – C.5.1.11.1	Standard - Add review and process to the standard.
	RS 84 –	This needs to be provided 24/7. Reduce the 10% deviation per lot to 1% per lot due to the number of messages received monthly based on Corps-wide workload data in TE 2.
	RS 85 –	Why does this appear to be more critical than backup and restore functions based on 0% lot deviation within 2 business days?
	RS 86 –	Validate RS 86 with Office of Counsel and Security and Law Enforcement.
	RS 88 –	1. Break out classified and unclassified. The deviation would be 1% deviation for unclassified and 0% for classified. Apply this to both RS 87 and RS 88. 2. Define DoD and USACE standards, e.g., Physical Security Plan approved in C.1.
	RS 98 –	There is no standard for O&M. This paragraph number was added to RS 109. Add operate and maintain to the standard. Should read, “ Upon service request or as required, install, configure, de-install, operate, maintain, troubleshoot, and activate wireless routers no later than the assigned completion date.”

Section	Paragraph	State Concern
	RS 99 –	There is no standard for O&M. This paragraph number was added to RS 109. Add operate and maintain to the standard. Should read, “ Upon service request or as required, install, configure, de-install, operate, troubleshoot, maintain, and activate wireless access points no later than the assigned completion date.”
	RS-1	The 10% acceptable deviation per lot is too high and unacceptable for the Honolulu District, and should be 1% at most for the standard: “Upon service request, collect, assemble, and prepare for transmittal that information requested in data calls no later than the assigned completion date.”
	RS113	Since this is an emergency service, suggest that the deviation be 0% as lives/property is at stake.
	RS113	Need to review what is classed “emergency” in TE 9- WA must be classed emergency/priority one. All phones cannot be out for one business day- currently we receive top response priority in the NCR 24/7. That needs to remain in place.
	RS12	Performance requirements for AIS operations does not recognize different classes of systems: i.e. mission critical versus non-critical for the %deviation. Systems requiring 7/24/365+ day operations should be clearly identified as separate items and the performance standard should be much higher than systems not requiring around the clock operation.
	RS-125	The deviation in the last paragraph should address acceptable levels after 24 hours: “Backup after configuration change: 3% deviation per lot within 24 hours of configuration change, and 0% deviation per lot within 48 hours of configuration change. Lot size is number of network configuration changes requested per year.”
	RS126	10% deviation for priority 3 seems very high since it would appear that most day-to-day operations at the District level will fall into this category.
	RS126	Need to review what is classed “emergency” in TE 9- WA must be classed emergency/priority one. All phones cannot be out for one business day- currently we receive top response priority in the NCR 24/7. That needs to remain in place.
	RS126 and RS129	Upon service request or as required, resolve network component problems as per TE-09 is poorly worded. Should have a component for cost of the outage. Not just Life, health and property.
	RS-127	10% deviation for priority 3 level seems high since many issues at the District level will fall into this category.

Section	Paragraph	State Concern
	RS129	Need to review what is classed “emergency” in TE 9- WA must be classed emergency/priority one. All phones cannot be out for one business day- currently we receive top response priority in the NCR 24/7. That needs to remain in place.
	RS-129	10% deviation for priority 3 level seems high since many issues at the District level will fall into this category.
	RS13	Need to review what is classed “emergency” in TE 9- WA must be classed emergency/priority one. All phones cannot be out for one business day- currently we receive top response priority in the NCR 24/7. That needs to remain in place.
	RS131	Need to review what is classed “emergency” in TE 9- WA must be classed emergency/priority one. All phones cannot be out for one business day- currently we receive top response priority in the NCR 24/7. That needs to remain in place.
	RS-131	10% deviation for priority 3 level seems high since many issues at the District level will fall into this category.
	RS134	Need to review what is classed “emergency” in TE 9- WA must be classed emergency/priority one. All phones cannot be out for one business day- currently we receive top response priority in the NCR 24/7. That needs to remain in place.
	RS136	Allowing a 10 percent failure rate for prohibited acts is dangerously high
	RS138	This requirement is very tight in comparison to the “looseness” of many more critical services. Trade this level of responsiveness off for something a little more important!
	RS14	“outside normal business hours” should be modified for facilities with 24 hour 7 day a week operations. There's no recognition of these facilities. PWS needs to have a requirement added to minimize such disruptions at 24 hour operational facilities and bring them back on line first Also need to consider employees required to work overtime; weekends, nights on special projects and items such as year end closings.
	RS15	1% error rate seems rather high for scheduled outages. Can they really be counted as “scheduled outages” if no one is notified?
	RS16	“In response to unscheduled disruptions to automated systems operations, restore service within 2 hours.” Very difficult to meet when you consider that each District has about 20 field sites each. Also, many outages are due to 3rd party service providers such as phone companies.

Section	Paragraph	State Concern
	RS16	Performance requirements for AIS operations does not recognize different classes of systems: i.e. mission critical versus non-critical for the % deviation. Systems requiring 7/24/365+ day operations should be clearly identified as separate items and the performance standard should be much higher than systems not requiring around the clock operation.
	RS-17	Specifics regarding what is expected in the report should be provided , i.e. what was done, why it happened, what will be done to prevent it in the future.
	RS-17	I would think that immediate notification would be needed in these instances.
	RS-175	Notifying USACE end users within 8 hours of a new threat seems like a very long time. In the past for example with the I Love You virus, it was imperative to notify end users immediately to help stop the avalanche.
	RS-18	Standard is not possible in an after-hours situation unless this is limited to data center systems. Recommend separating into duty-hours and after-hours situations. Stated standard is acceptable for duty-hours. 1 hours removal and 1 1/2 hour notification for after-hours response
	RS-18	I would think that immediate notification would be needed in these instances.
	RS-18	Specifics regarding what is expected in the report should be provided , i.e. what was done, why it happened, what will be done to prevent it in the future.
	RS-182	The 50% acceptable deviation per lot is too high and unacceptable for the Honolulu District, and should be 3% at most.
	RS-182	The 50% acceptable deviation per lot is too high and unacceptable for the Honolulu District, and should be 3% at most.
	RS-185	The 50% acceptable deviation per lot is too high and unacceptable for the Honolulu District, and should be 3% at most for all years.
	RS-186	The 50% acceptable deviation per lot is too high and unacceptable for the Honolulu District, and should be 3% at most for all years.
	RS193	Add 'suspend account until issue is resolved'
	RS199	Illegal Log on: If such an incident involved a threat to the water supply/distribution activities at WA, notification of local management MUST be a requirement within 1 hour 24/7. Need coordination with local and federal law enforcement if gained access to operational system

Section	Paragraph	State Concern
	RS-20	Specifics regarding what is expected in the report should be provided , i.e. what was done, why it happened, what will be done to prevent it in the future.
	RS-20	Standard is not possible in an after-hours situation unless this is limited to data center systems. Recommend separating into duty-hours and after-hours situations. Stated standard is acceptable for duty-hours. 1 hours removal and 1 1/2 hour notification for after-hours response
	RS200	IA Certification and Accreditation deviations are way too high. This intensive effort only gets worse to complete as time goes on. These should be more in the range of 20%, 10% 5%, not 50% 20%, 5%.
	RS-200	The 50% acceptable deviation per lot is too high and unacceptable for the Honolulu District, and should be 3% at most for all years.
	RS-21	IAVE Compliance - Recommend 0% deviation per lot.
	RS-216	IAM should be notified immediately upon discovery of network security anomalies.
	RS22	A 50% deviation in 1st year or a 20% deviation in 2nd year much too high for a COOP on CWMS/Water Control systems. There can be no phase-in period for critical systems. Such systems require a higher degree of performance than non-critical systems. The AQL should be set high (a very low allowable degree of deviation) for
	RS-22	The 50% acceptable deviation per lot is too high and unacceptable for the Honolulu District, and should be 3% at most.
	RS-22	Where is the COOP standard defined? Is this different for every system?
	RS228	Security violations should be reported to the IAM immediately.
	RS236	There is no provision to determine how quickly the report shall be delivered.
	RS238	Security Incident Reporting- If such an incident involved a threat to the water supply/distribution activities at WA, notification of local management MUST be a requirement, 24/7. Handing down info from IAM would be too large a risk
	RS244	Backups should have 0% deviation
	RS-250	The 50% acceptable deviation per lot is too high and unacceptable for the Honolulu District, and should be 1% at most for all years.
	RS-253	The 75% acceptable deviation per lot is too excessive and unacceptable for the Honolulu District, and should be 3% during the first year, 1% during the second year, and 0% in subsequent years.

Section	Paragraph	State Concern
	RS-254	The 50%, 40%, and 30% acceptable deviations per lot are too high and unacceptable for the Honolulu District, and should instead be 3%, 1%, and 0% at most.
	RS-255	The 50%, 40%, and 30% acceptable deviations per lot are too high and unacceptable for the Honolulu District, and should instead be 3%, 1%, and 0% at most.
	RS257	30% deviation during the third year is too high.
	RS-257	The 50%, 40%, and 30% acceptable deviations per lot are too high and unacceptable for the Honolulu District, and should instead be 3%, 1%, and 0% at most.
	RS-258	The 50%, 40%, and 30% acceptable deviations per lot are too high and unacceptable for the Honolulu District, and should instead be 3%, 1%, and 0% at most.
	RS262	30% deviation during the third year is too high.
	RS-262	The 50%, 40%, and 30% acceptable deviations per lot are too high and unacceptable for the Honolulu District, and should instead be 3%, 1%, and 0% at most.
	RS-263	The 50%, 40%, and 30% acceptable deviations per lot are too high and unacceptable for the Honolulu District, and should instead be 3%, 1%, and 0% at most.
	RS-264	The 75% acceptable deviation per lot is excessive and unacceptable for the Honolulu District, and should instead be 0%.
	RS266	Does not seem to include mail at WA- not a FOA, District or Center
	RS-278	The 50% acceptable deviation per lot is too high and unacceptable for the Honolulu District, and should instead be 3% at most.
	RS-279	The 50% acceptable deviation per lot is too high and unacceptable for the Honolulu District, and should instead be 3% at most.
	RS-28	It is unclear whether this refers to desktop level software, or large, automated systems. If the former, this standard would still have 1/2 the computers in the Corps running windows 95 and MS Word 4.0. This standard needs to be more proactive for desktop level software. Twice annually, software on desktop systems should be evaluated and upgrade recommendations supplied to customers.
	RS-284	The 50% and 30% acceptable deviations per lot are too high and unacceptable for the Honolulu District, and should instead be 3% and 1% at most.
	RS-288	The 25% acceptable deviation per lot is too high and unacceptable for the Honolulu District, and should instead be 3% at most.

Section	Paragraph	State Concern
	rs3	New technology should be looked at without having a customer submit a Service Request. In addition, a 10 day turn around time is a little short for looking into new technology. For some instances it would be fine, other might take a month or more to get a good handle on for the customers.
	RS3	Assignment of New Technology investigations to SP severely hampers the Corps' ability to be the premier engineering agency for the nation. While many new technologies involve IM/IT equipment, their use goes far beyond the electronics/IT realm of understanding. There is a distinct difference in IM/IT technology and the application of that technology in solving real-world engineering and scientific problems. IM/IT professionals do not have the expertise to evaluate new technology for other engineering disciplines. The PWS and Performance Requirements summary fail to recognize (and define) the often significant overlap between IM/IT and other disciplines. IF ALL new technology evaluations are to be conducted by the SP, the SP will have to increase their bids to provide the package services. As written, the PWS and Performance Requirements fail to give the information required to define overlapping roles so that potential bidders can prepare an adequate bid.
	rs3	1. te-1 - rs3 10 days for initial review of new technology. what about final review?
	RS-305	There is no characterization of the type of quality of service we expect. Please add the following to the end of the "Standard" description: "...completion date, and meets all appropriate professional industry standards (photographic, desktop publishing, video, audio/visual, broadcast, etc) for quality and service."
	RS-306	There is no characterization of the type of quality of service we expect. Please add the following to the end of the "Standard" description: "...completion date, and provides current A/V technology that is consistent with professional industry standards for quality and service."
	RS-309	There is no characterization of the type of quality of service we expect. Please add the following to the end of the "Standard" description: "Upon service request, provide professional grade photographic services using industry standards for equipment, output quality and service, within the budgeted cost, assigned schedule, and assigned completion date."

Section	Paragraph	State Concern
	RS-310	There is no characterization of the type of quality of service we expect. Please add the following to the end of the "Standard" description: "Upon service request, provide professional postproduction services using industry standards for equipment, output quality and service, within the budgeted cost, assigned schedule, and assigned completion date." (I would delete the 2 week turn-around-time. For photography that is way too long.) Why not keep the same language from above.....whether assigned cost, schedule, etc. i don't want to wait two weeks for a photograph if I don't have to.
	RS311	Military photographs should be at 0% deviation. 10% is too high.
	RS-311	There is no characterization of the type of quality of service we expect. Please add the following to the end of the "Standard" description: "Upon service request, produce professional studio-image quality photographs for military personnel.....etc, etc....."
	RS-313	There is no characterization of the type of quality of service we expect. Please add the following to the end of the "Standard" description: "Upon service request, provide broadcast industry quality video shoot within budgeted cost....."
	RS-315	There is no characterization of the type of quality of service we expect. Please add the following to the end of the "Standard" description: "Upon service request, provide broadcast industry quality video products within budgeted cost....."
	RS-317	There is no characterization of the type of quality of service we expect. Please add the following to the end of the "Standard" description: "Upon service request, provide professional graphic displays and signs within the budgeted cost....."
	RS-318	There is no characterization of the type of quality of service we expect. Please add the following to the end of the "Standard" description: "Upon service request, provide professional multimedia products to current industry standards for quality and service with approved project plan and within the budgeted cost....."
	RS-32	Why "approved service request"?
	RS-323	There is no characterization of the type of quality of service we expect. Please add the following to the end of the "Standard" description: "Upon service request, provide professional desktop publishing services that meet or exceed industry standards for quality, within the budgeted cost....."

Section	Paragraph	State Concern
	RS-35	It seems like IMO will be dictating to the S&E Engineering community which CADD/GIS applications/configurations/versions are to be used. Is this the policy?
	RS-38	Should this be "Upon service request" ? Again, where did the project plan come from? This indicates that every web site will have a project plan fully fleshed-out prior to being assigned. This removes the designers from the project-planning phase. Should be same wording as RS 40.
	RS-38	This is the development of the plan, you can't do something "in accordance with project plan" when that is what you're building. Alter to "no less than annually"
	RS-39	Should this be "Upon service request" ? Again, where did the project plan come from? This indicates that every web site will have a project plan fully fleshed-out prior to being assigned. This removes the designers from the project-planning phase. Should be same wording as RS 40.
	RS-43	ALL doesn't make sense here. If this is a service request based item, it should require a service request for each site. If this is a "level of service" based item, it should not have service requests. Also, please clarify title. The "Automation:" in the middle of the title suggests it is cross categorized, but I don't think that's the case.
	RS45	RS45. Software updates and upgrades should be a regular periodic duty that is self-initiated (monthly seems reasonable). Most software companies maintain a list-server that can be joined to notify administrators when new updates/upgrades are available. Before updates/upgrades are applied, their potential impact on production systems should be considered and evaluated.
	RS-45	General Comment - PAO is responsible for content. IM is responsible for development of web sites/pages.
	RS-45	Clarify "web software". Is this the server software (Apache, IIS, ARC EMS) or the client software (IE, Mozilla, Netscape). If this is the server, who is initiating the request? Better to say Weekly/monthly. Server level software is a constantly changing beast, requiring rapid response to vulnerability threats.
	RS46	RS46. The standard needs to include a review of website content (i.e. the current elected/appointed official's name is correctly referenced) and fixes to broken links. The current standard states removing sites as opposed to fixing sites.
	RS-46	change "web sites" to "web site content". Particular page content can be obsoleted without invalidating the entire site.

Section	Paragraph	State Concern
	RS47	RS47. The report should be a web-based report that allows page-masters to access the sections relevant to their sites. Web sites that use parameter strings at the end of the URL to determine which page you see are not easily analyzed by COTS packages like Web Trends. The parameter string is often a series of numbers that aren't easily resolvable to the content being displayed.
	RS-47	There are serious legal issues involved with navigation path analysis. This can be seen as profiling your individual customers. Check the regulations before including this requirement. The distributed nature of web logs between proxy servers, reverse proxy servers and on-system logs makes this task extremely difficult. Shouldn't include "assigned completion date", should have definite dates like "by the 5th of every month", or "by the 3rd working day of every month"
	RS48	RS48. The lot size can't be all e-mails received by webmasters. Webmasters receive an incredible amount of spam. Wording needs to reflect "legitimate" e-mails. It should say within 1 business day (not 8 hours) as weekends/holidays should not count. The time standard seems severe, in that many of the requests webmasters receive deal with questions about the website content and answers will have to be provided by content POCs and/or reviewed by PAO and Security as to whether the answers should be provided. If the standard were reworded to say acknowledgement of email must be provided then 1 day is reasonable.
	RS-48	And forward to Subject Matter Expert as appropriate
	RS49	9. TE1 – RS49- Standard states web site vulnerabilities are to be assessed daily. Is that feasible? We don't have the staff to do this now.
	RS49	RS49. The 30 minute correction standard is unreasonable. Web site security is impacted by OS/software patches and coding issues. Correcting potential software security vulnerabilities typically requires installations that at a minimum necessitate rebooting the server. Sometimes the fixes require more extensive down time. As a result they are usually scheduled ahead of time for off-duty hours. A monthly maintenance time for these patches seems reasonable. If a site is attacked and/or compromised due to security vulnerabilities the server is immediately taken offline upon detection and notification (an hour seems more reasonable for the non-24/7 shops). But the amount of time to evaluate the type and degree of compromise; fix the problem; and verify with IAT and/or RCERT that it is ready to be put back on line can take days.

Section	Paragraph	State Concern
	RS-49	Weekly, assess web site potential security vulnerabilities and correct deficiencies or develop update plan within 30 minutes - practically speaking, many times a vulnerability correction requires system down-time which can't be done to a production system during duty-hours. Also, impact analysis of corrective measures alone can take more than 30 minutes, never mind implementing those measures.
	RS-50,51,52,53	All should read the same "Upon service request, and in accordance with project plan..."
	RS-55	Who is initiating the request? Better to say Weekly/monthly. Server level software is a constantly changing beast, requiring rapid response to vulnerability threats.
	RS56	10. TE1 – RS56 – Every database? Weekly? We don't have the staff to do this now.
	RS-57	change to "Upon service request, archive, validate restoration procedures for database, and remove database no later than assigned completion date."
	RS-60	what project plan? This should be recurring (semi-annual) or "Upon service request"
	RS-68	The use of CCB in this section possibly clarifies some of my earlier concerns. Recommend using this where appropriate throughout the entire document.
	RS-69	USACE COOP plan - should this be a project, or server COOP?
	RS69 and RS79	"Daily, perform validated backups of all servers and store the backups in accordance with the USACE COOP plan." I have never seen a "USACE COOP PLAN". This should read "Local COOP plans"
	RS-7	The 10% acceptable deviation per lot is too high and unacceptable for the Honolulu District, and should be 3% at most for the standard: Upon service request, implement the decisions of the USACE CCB no later than the assigned completion date.
	RS70	5% deviation and then 1% after five days for restorations could put us out of business, at least in the long term. We supply drinking water to D.C and surrounding areas. Say we were unable to have restored critical lab data and were unable to prepare the EPA reports on time? Who is going to restore the public confidence in the water supply then?
	RS71	Three percent error rate in relocating servers is very high
	RS-78	Who is initiating the request? Better to say Weekly/monthly. Server level software is a constantly changing beast, requiring rapid response to vulnerability threats.

Section	Paragraph	State Concern
	RS-79	USACE COOP plan - should this be a project, or server COOP? - Additionally, deviation is unrealistic. Should allow 3% for network/media failure, etc.
	RS80	Should not allow an entire site to be out for up to three days. Five percent seems too high. Could not permit contract to have an entire installation out, even if it added up to less than five percent, while waiting for a good restore.
	RS-80	Why is email restore separated into a distinct category? Backup and restore should be done on an enterprise level at each site.
	RS-84	In times of crisis DMS messages may need to be read with a greater frequency than once per day.
	RS-87	Seems like a DPW responsibility to me. Reporting of problems should be addresses, but DPW should be responsible for the
	TE-1	41.<tab>TE-1 Performance Requirements – Where’s the minimum metrics for each paragraph or section? Is the maximum allowable deviation column more of a quality standard associated with our data or a metric in how far the SP can deviate from the standard? For example, for RS2 the standard is 3 business days to review functional documents with a deviation of 10% - is the metric that the SP can miss 10% of the 3 business day requirement or does it mean that the number of functional documents received per month can vary 10% from the numbers to be cited in TE-2? Where’s the link between TE-1 and TE-2?
	TE-1 and TE-9	RS16 requires service restoration within 2 hours in response to an unscheduled disruption to an automated system. However, TE9, Service Level Matrix, requires problem resolution to a Priority 1 emergency ASAP (which is undefined) and resolution of a Priority 2 emergency within 2 hours. The 2 hour requirement does not appear anywhere in the Matrix.
	TE1 RS38-49	There is no mention of web application development, maintenance, or support.
	TE1 RS48	Change from 8 hours to within 1 working day, unless it is expected to have the webmasters monitor the web sites on a 24 hour basis.
	TE-1: RS-12	How can the SP be held accountable if an AIS fails to perform as a result of failures on the part of the AIS developer or an AIS end user?
	TE-1: RS-12	Deviation per lot seems way to high for classified systems
	TE-1: RS-13	3% Deviation per lot seems too high for classified systems
	TE-1: RS-14	Classified systems should be scheduled during work hours so that security personnel can escort technician(s) who may need to access the equipment to complete repairs.

Section	Paragraph	State Concern
	TE-1: RS-191	What about using U-PASS to manage UserIDs and passwords?
	TE-1: RS-211	For the standard, add "or other applicable regulations." We COMSEC Responsible Officers must follow the regulations of our COMSEC Custodian; i.e., AFIs.
	TE-1: RS-232	Regarding COMSEC: violations must be reported immediately to the COMSEC Custodian and perhaps 1% deviation (not violation) would be acceptable during the first year.
	TE-1: RS233	Regarding COMSEC: violations must be reported immediately to the COMSEC Custodian and perhaps 1% deviation (not violation) would be acceptable during the first year.
	TE-1: RS-238	COMSEC incidents must be reported immediately to the COMSEC Custodian and, where physical security is involved, to the Security Manager, as well as to the IAM. 2% deviation per lot is way too high -- maybe .5%/mo for the first 6 months, and 0% thereafter.
	TE-1: RS-243	Clarify statement to agree with PWS Para C.5.4.9: must be destroyed prior to leaving DoD control. Also: classified hard drives and other storage media must be destroyed prior to leaving the secure area.
	TE-1: RS-	Performance Requirements Summary, RS 278, RS 283, RS 287 and RS 291: Is it not clear whether these measures require multiple programs with separate local program execution and supervision at each level/location, or if the requirement is for a single program may be executed in support of multiple locations.
	TE-1: RS-37	It is not clear whether development and deployment of customized GIS tools and interfaces (e.g. using ESRI ArcObjects) are included.
	TE-1: RS-69	Periodic testing of backup sets needs to be performed to ensure data integrity.
	TE-1: RS-7	How is the SP to implement a CCB decision which generates an arbitrary workload on some arbitrary timeline? This requirement needs better definition.
	TE-1: RS-79	Periodic testing of backup sets needs to be performed to ensure data integrity.
	TE-1: RS-84	Printing is usually not required. Unclassified DMS messages can be decrypted and forwarded via normal e-mail
	TE-1: RS-88	We are unclear on the meaning of 'facility.' If you are talking about the SP allowing unauthorized access to classified rooms or areas, or accessing classified systems, 1% deviation per month is high. If you are talking about the SP accessing a secure area without proper procedures or clearances, 1% may be OK for the 1st year.

Section	Paragraph	State Concern
	TE-1:RS 104	Delete RS104. The only reference to a GPS in the PWS is page 112 paragraph C.5.3.1.4 concerning devices that are exclusively Water Control mission essential equipment used for real-time water and flood control to provide the information necessary to operate COE projects as required by the approved project Water Control Manual, Drought Contingency Plan, and Emergency Plan, and to provide for hydroelectric power, a historical record, meet environmental requirements, and prevent loss of property and life. They are maintained, operated, and used by Engineers and Scientists not by IM personnel. By including this equipment in this solicitation the potential for contract modification claims is nearly certain as a result of the cost and complexity of this additional work, and the SP may have to assume liability for loss of property and persons if they fail to provide information necessary for making critical decisions as required by Water Managers.
	TE-1:RS-21	Should be 0% deviation per lot. Also does not speak to extensions.
	TE-1:RS-3	Did I miss the definition of CGO? It's not in the acronyms list either.
	TE-1:RS-46	Qtrly removal of obsolete websites isn't mentioned anywhere else, nor does the description state it is done at the direction of the content provider.
	TE-1; RS-269	Not clear whether mail must be delivered to each office or just available for pick-up. There is a variety in the field, some deliver to the office, some have mail slots where mail is picked up. Recommend allowing local option here. PWS doesn't mention
	TE1-RS15	With scheduled responses requiring 3 business days notice and then only allowing 2 unscheduled outages per month, the SP will fail during some months given sporadic IAVA releases.
	TE1-RS33	The assigned completion date needs to be an agreement and not a directive or assignment from the customer.
	Throughout	Under the column Maximum Allowable Degree of Deviation from Requirements (AQL) and lot size.<tab> It is written near the bottom "Lot size is the number automated systems required to implement _____ per year" or "Lot size is the number of application design deliverables per month" What defines the number of automated systems or applications to be judged from as the
	Throughout	Under the column Maximum Allowable Degree of Deviation from Requirements (AQL) and lot size.<tab> It is written that there is a "10% deviation per lot", and then a line is skipped, whereupon it is written, "0% deviation per lot within so many days of assigned completion days." What does that mean to John or Mary Doe? So is it 10% or 0% deviation? 10% of 0% = 0% deviation Right?

TE-10

Section	Paragraph	State Concern
		<p>a good portion of the VI Technical Exhibit pieces (i.e. TE-10-62 DVD) show an improper usage of the Corps logo. Why is there no adherence to the rules for correct usage of the Corps symbol and signature as laid out in the Corps' Graphics Standards Manual EP 310-1-6? A corporate symbol, logo, and/or signature is an identifying mark of the organization it represents. The Corps symbol by itself is easily recognizable as representing the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. If we were working for any other corporation in the world and the logo was incorrectly displayed as it is numerous times in various settings and publications at the District, Division, and National level, we'd hear about it, if not lose our jobs. This seems as though no one cares enough about the Corps to display the symbol and signature as laid out in our Graphics Standards Manual.</p> <p>I see no samples of computer-based animation or 3-D rendering (animated and static). Suggest including these kinds of products.</p> <p>Many of the examples given are not representative of the quality of work that we often do. New, better examples that show more artistic/design skills should be used or bidders are going to get the wrong idea about what's required.</p>
TE-10		As an example on TE 10-62 DVD the sample has an incorrect logo. A majority of these examples show poor consistency with the USACE logo, this is a registered trademark of the US Army Corps of Engineers. The entire VI section should be prefaced with a requirement to follow EP 310-1-6, US Army Corps of Engineers Graphic Standards Manual.
TE-10-		Add TE-10-XX: Field Books -- "Non-standard sizes. Development includes design and layout using desktop publishing software. Print and bind according to customer specifications."
TE-10-		Add TE-10-XX: Historical products -- "Various sizes and formats. Development includes conceptualization, design and layout, editing and proofreading, web authoring, creation of both printed and multimedia products."
TE-10-		Add TE-10-XX: Magazine -- "17 in. by 11 in. Folded. Development includes design and layout using desktop publishing software; proofreading; full color process printing using various paper weights and coatings. Printing by DAPS/GPO or through a vendor using a GPO-procured SPA."
TE-10-		Add TE-10-XX: Interior/Exterior Site Design -- "Various sizes and materials. Development includes conceptualization, design and layout, and procurement."
TE-10-		Add TE-10-XX: Mathematical/Scientific Formulas -- "Heavy equations may be used in all VI products."

Section	Paragraph	State Concern
	TE-10-	Add TE-10-XX: Fact Sheet -- "8-1/2 in. by 11 in. Development includes design and layout using desktop publishing software; technical writing, editing, and proofreading. Printing on high-quality color output device."
	TE-10-	Add TE-10-XX: Fact Sheet -- "8-1/2 in. by 11 in. Development includes design and layout using desktop publishing software; technical writing, editing, and proofreading. Printing on high-quality color output device and published on the Internet."
	TE-10-	Add TE-10-XX: Time-lapse Photography -- "Documentation of sequential events recorded at a given period over a specific duration of time."
	TE-10-	Add TE-10-XX: High-speed Photography -- "Documentation of sequential events recorded either digitally or to film at a rate of 100 - 100,000 pictures per second."
	TE-10-	Add TE-10-XX: Computer Animation -- "Various sizes and lengths. Development includes conceptualization, design, and illustrations used to visualize situations that are extremely difficult to photograph, or to provide a bridge between the sponsor's vision and the technical personnel who must carry out the vision."
	TE-10-	Add TE-10-XX: Vinyl signage/decals -- "Various sizes and materials. Development includes conceptualization, design and layout, proofreading, creation, and installation."
	TE-10-17, 18, 52	Change all to read, "Development includes writing and editing; ..."
	TE-10-25	The description of this visual information and printing product includes the phrase, "Development includes cartography, design and layout". This implies that the SP will be providing actual cartographic, CADD or GIS services. Such services are not listed anywhere else in the draft PWS. Therefore, to avoid confusion, the language should be changed to match that of other entries: "Development includes design and layout using desktop publishing software".
	TE-10-26	The description of this visual information and printing product includes the phrase, "Development includes cartography, design and layout". This implies that the SP will be providing actual cartographic, CADD or GIS services. Such services are not listed anywhere else in the draft PWS. Therefore, to avoid confusion, the language should be changed to match that of other entries: "Development includes design and layout using desktop publishing software".

Section	Paragraph	State Concern
	TE-10-27	<p>The description of this visual information and printing product includes the phrase, "Development includes cartography, design and layout". This implies that the SP will be providing actual cartographic, CADD or GIS services. Such services are not listed anywhere else in the draft PWS. Therefore, to avoid confusion, the language should be changed to match that of other entries: "Development includes design and layout using desktop publishing software".</p>
	TE-10-28	<p>The description of this visual information and printing product includes the phrase, "Development includes cartography, design and layout". This implies that the SP will be providing actual cartographic, CADD or GIS services. Such services are not listed anywhere else in the draft PWS. Therefore, to avoid confusion, the language should be changed to match that of other entries: "Development includes design and layout using desktop publishing software".</p>

TE-11

Application: US Army Force Management Support Agency (USAFMSA) WEB site Description Required to access WEB Total Army Analysis Document System (TAADS) to view approved Military positions and Uniform Officer positions.

Definition of infrastructure conflicts with C. 1 para 4.

When allowable downtime is listed as "varies", who decides what the allowable time really is.

The purpose of this exhibit is to describe AIS's but it actually includes descriptions of requirements and ways in which the government intends to obtain AIS support. This information should be reflected in section C.5 of the PWS.

Must clarify what is meant by statement that SP will not support or service the listed AIS's. How does this Exhibit conform to C.1 which lists certain AIS's which the SP is responsible for operating.

How was "allowable down time" determined? Is that based on some current policy? I'm surprised to see that CEFMS could be down for up to 5 days. CEFMS could be considered critical to operations, as availability of the system directly impacts USACE capability to make payments of funds. APPMS, on the other hand, seems less critical to me, but can only be down for up to 2 days?

SCADA is not a corporate AIS. However, reviewing the documents indicates it is used in many locations. Not including it here seems to imply, based on text at the beginning of segment, that it is covered under the contract already.

Section Paragraph

State Concern

What is the relevance of the last three pages? They seem to be links to external entities with no associated AIS.

The follow system is missing from this exhibit. Application: Defense Finance Accounting System (DFAS) WEB site Description COE-RM requires this WEB site to interface with DFAS on Payroll concerns/problems

The following system is missing from this exhibit. Application: Defense Civilian Personnel Data System (DCPDS) Description System interfaces with CEFMS to run the Districts payroll. COE & CPAC system to process personnel actions. Transactions affect budget and manpower. Manpower person needs to review each action to insure the correct Army Management Structure Code (AMSCO) and Unit Identification Code (UIC) are assigned. It is reviewed also to insure the correct Paragraph number and Line number correlates to the Integrated Manning Document (IMD).

The following system is not listed. Application: Program Budget Accounting System (PBAS) Description System utilized to process Funding Authorization Documents (FADs) between HQUSACE and Divisions/Districts/Foes.

Application: Corps of Engineers Manpower Requirements System (CEMRS) Description CEMRS is the new Manpower module to ascertain workload generated Full Time Equivalent (FTEs), which interfaces with P2. This system is missing from this technical exhibit.

Locally driven is listed for allowable downtime. Who locally makes that decision? Is this something that is to be negotiated with the SP?

Why is allowable downtime not specified?

Why is the allowable downtime listed as N/A

It does not seem proper consideration of the impact on cost of doing business if a major system such as CEFMS was down for five days has been done. That has never occurred and would be totally unacceptable. Additionally, the time of year this happened should have varying penalties. A five day outage would cost plenty in lost productivity; interest accrued; ability to conduct business and required follow-up overtime to get the work done.

TE-11 needs a table of contents.

Section	Paragraph	State Concern
	11.13 Application:	The down time for the CEFMS AIS is unacceptable (too high). This is a critical AIS. This AIS does not mention labor, timekeeping and payroll interface in the brief synopsis. Other systems, such as REMIS (Real Estate, Pg 48) and ATMP (Pg 6), are only allowed 2 days of Down Time.
	1.0 Introduction	Request consistent description of responsibility for service provider listed in C.1 – Introduction, page 4; paragraph C.5.2.1.2; and TE-11, page 2, regarding operation, maintenance, sustainability, and development of AISs. Among these three sections, it is not clear whether or not the service provider is required to support AISs.
	11.13	Application: CEFMS Description The Technical Attributes chart under column heading “Architecture” Allowable downtime < 5 Days. 5 days downtime should not be allowed. CEFMS is an on-line real-time system that is required to process a multitude of financial transactions and AIS interfaces on a daily basis.
	11.13	Allowable downtime for CEFMS is 5 days! Only if you want to put a halt to everything in the Corps. This REALLY needs to be changed to 24 hours or less.
	11.13	Location list does not include WA, which does have separate CEFMS SID.
	11.13	CEFMS Cannot permit 5 day downtime (ITIPS is 2!!)
	11.13	Allowable downtime of CEFMS (<5 days) not acceptable to perform mission req's. revise to <2 days
	11.15	The statement that "CWMS directly supports all USACE water resources management decision making related to reservoir regulation, flood control, hydropower, navigation, water quality, water supply, environment, recreation, irrigation, fish and wildlife, and other project-relegated water restores objectives of the USACE water resources infrastructure" is an overstatement of CWMS capabilities. Many Districts have existing WCDS that exceeded CWMS capabilities and no mention is made in TE11.15 about District's WCDS. District WCDS system administrators are multi-disciplined with specialized expertise unique to the Corps mission. COTS should be included in TE11.15 for a complete and comprehensive WCDS scheme. All Districts have varying levels of WCDS needs based on local/regional complexity and have developed WCDS to meet those needs. CWMS should not be considered an all inclusive water control system, rather, CWMS is only a part of the WCDS.
	11.15	ALL CWMS/WCDS systems should show run-time of 24 hours per day, 7 days per week, 365+ days per year.

Section	Paragraph	State Concern
	11.15	Run time should be 24 hrs. Allowable downtime should be Priority 1 during emergencies and Priority 2 during normal operations. Priorities as defined in TE-9.
	11.15 Application:	Delete 11.15 Application: Corps Water Management System (CWMS). CWMS is a specific software package developed by HEC, Davis CA for Water Control and Hydrology and Hydrologic Engineering Applications. It is designed to run on Unix Solaris platforms and use an Oracle database. This software has been introduced to and tested by all Water Control Offices but because of the enormous diversity of the Water Control mission across the COE it has not yet been fully developed to supply each Districts needs. As a result it has not been implemented or used by all Districts and used only partially by some Districts. The CWMS software and servers are exclusively Water Control mission essential used for real-time water and flood control to provide the information necessary to operate COE projects as required by the approved project Water Control Manual, Drought Contingency Plan, and Emergency Plan, and to provide for hydroelectric power, a historical record, meet environmental requirements, and prevent loss of property and life. They are currently maintained, operated, and used by Engineers and Scientists not by IM personnel. By including this equipment in this solicitation the potential for contract modification claims is nearly certain as a result of the cost and complexity of this additional work, and the SP may have to assume liability for loss of property and persons if they fail to provide information necessary for making critical decisions as required by Water Managers.
	11.24	11.24<tab>FEMS Not currently deployed at WA, but could not permit five day downtime Possibly should be mission driven
	11.3	APPMS states currently fielded at Lab, Center, District and Division with CEFMS SID: Location list does not include WA, which does have separate CEFMS SID. Potentially misleading. Note that if APPMS is down for allowed maximum of two days, a lot of procurement would stop since procurement must be approved in APPMS
	11.37	allowable downtime should be revised to <2 days

Section	Paragraph	State Concern
	11.37	RAMS is a named legacy system and ORM is perhaps a subset of OMBIL plus which is discussed here. The discussion of the systems includes "... a data warehouse that merges data related to finance, activities, inventory, and outputs to create performance measures of efficiency and effectiveness." RAMS OMBIL does more than the above to include provide standard and special (one time) queries, generate correspondence from template letters and database elements, provides basic GIS services, allows delta range and other location searches, and provides automated suspense messages based on database elements.
	11.39	allowable downtime should be revised to <2 days
	11.39 PPDS	The description of PPDS is ancient! It is no longer used by SAD only. It is a Corps-wide application. It no longer interfaces with PROMIS, but rather P2. It does not interface with Lotus Notes. After P2 is fully implemented, PPDS will have reached the end of its life cycle.
	11.4	allowable downtime should be revised to <2 days
	11.41	11.24<tab>FEMS Not currently deployed at WA, but could not permit five day downtime Possibly should be mission driven
	11.41	P2 allowed downtime of 3 days is too long, everything financial must be dragged through P2
	11.41	allowable downtime should be revised to <2 days
	11.41	Allowable downtime for P2 is 3 days! This is way to high, 24 hours maximum downtime. So much is tied to P2 now, it is a critical application.
	11.5	Technical Attributes of Specs Intact (SI): Operating systems: All 32-bit versions of Windows, including Windows 98, ME, 2000, NT, and XP. Windows 95 not formally supported, but compatible. Programming languages: C, C++, Visual Basic, VBA, HTML, ASP. Architecture: Stand-Alone
	2	11. TE 11.0 Paragraph two states "Moreover, the AIS descriptions are not intended to solicit a proposal for their IT support and service at this time". CEEIS is listed as an AIS. This could interpreted to mean CEEIS is not part of the A76 proposal. The statement also appears to be in conflict with C.1. of the PWS that states "This PWS also calls for the SP to accept responsibility for the material development, operation, maintenance and sustainment of all non-exempted Automated Information Systems(AIS)."
	TE11	Web sites are included in this TE, but no specifics regarding the backend systems or number of users is included. Why these two web sites and not all web sites or web applications?

Section	Paragraph	State Concern
	TE11	A full definition or description of AIS should be provided. In the current list, AIS can be a corporate financial system like CEFMS or the CEEIS Organizations at CPC and WPC. The Corps needs to separate AIS from IMIT programs/organizations.
	TE-11	NWD District use 315 local AIS. Input on this was never requested of the Districts.
	TE11.15	TE11.15 identifies "Run Time" and "Allowable Downtime" as "Varies". When considering risk of nonfunctional water control data systems (WCDS), life and property being at risk, WCDS architecture needs to be 24/7. Could not find service level priority for WCDS in the pdf files, maybe because WCDS was not recognized/differentiated from CWMS. TE 9 Service Level Priority for WCDS must be "Priority 1 Emergency". Tulsa District WCDS has outage notification and data recovery standards that should not be compromised either by service provider nor CWMS.
TE-12		need for vehicle access not covered. Would need to include need of valid drivers license, evidence of registration, etc.
TE-13		<p>The District Boundary is not shown correctly. It covers the California coastal area from the Oregon border to approximately San Luis Obispo, and is contiguous with the Los Angeles District boundary on the south and the Sacramento District Boundary on the East. The South Pacific Division Boundary, bounding the San Francisco District Boundary appears to be correct. The Eureka Field Office has been omitted from the diagram.</p> <p>Location of end users maps. Page 37 and 39 of 46. Maps do not show existing users in Redding, CA, St. George, UT, Salt Lake City UT, Frisco, CO, or Durango, CO. Note: Regulatory Branch has two offices in the Salt Lake City area including Bountiful office and an office in the SLC Federal Building. Construction also has an office on Ft Douglas. Including Hill AFB there should be 4 boxes in the Salt Lake City area. Note also that the Durango Regulatory Office has both SPK and SPA offices in the same office. The Durango office is not on either the SPK (sheet 39) or SPA (sheet 36) maps. While outside of my area of responsibility, I also note that on sheet 41 of 46 does not show the Eurica, CA Regulatory Office.</p> <p>Nine Seattle District IM/IT user sites are missing from the nws_5.pdf diagram. A more accurate diagram will be provided to the PWS team via e-mail.</p>

Section Paragraph

State Concern

Figure needs a legend to describe what the numbers in the arrowed boxes depict.

The user distribution numbers are incorrect for POH, and should instead read as follows: Palau: 20 Guam:

3 Kwajalein: 12 Island of Oahu: 400 users, 37

locations Island of Hawaii: 15 users, 6 locations Indonesia:

20+ anticipated users, various locations (future) Midway Island:

0, no offices American Samoa: 0, no offices

End Users Location Maps Geographic Distribution of IM/IT Users and USACE Labs and Finance Center – does not include employees stationed in remote locations (i.e. Alaska). Are they included in the local sites numbers?

There are a number of offices missing from the "Geographic Distribution of IM/IT Users Baltimore District (NAB)." See Additional Info below.

Missing offices from NAB IM/IT Users map - see below

Technical Exhibits: This information is extremely difficult to use because we can not determine the locations from the map. Please provide a spreadsheet with installation name, city, and number of users.

Section	Paragraph	State Concern
	CENAB	<p>Many Field Offices are not shown. See list, below of some we believe may be missing: 200 North Harrison Street Easton, MD 216013 38.77681 - 76.076937 401 East Louther Street Carlisle, PA 17013 40.20247-77.18042 1631 South Atherton Street State College, PA<tab>16801 7 40.785504<tab>-77.83683 12th & water Street Washington, DC 20003 8 38.8736</p>
	Geographic	<p>1. The MVM boundary map is out of date. 2. The legend is incomplete – should identify boxes and triangles. 3. Verify data shown for site locations against TE-4, Facility location and user information submitted.</p>
	Geographic	<p>1. The MVD boundary map is out of date. 2. The legend is incomplete – should identify boxes and triangles. 3. Verify data shown for site locations against TE-4, Facility location and user information submitted.</p>
	Geographic	<p>1. The MVN boundary map and sites listed are out of date. 2. The legend is incomplete – should identify boxes and triangles. 3. Verify data shown for site locations against TE-4, Facility location and user information submitted.</p>

Section	Paragraph	State Concern
	Geographic	1. The MVR sites listed are not correct. 2. The legend is incomplete – should identify boxes and triangles. 3. Verify data shown for site locations against TE-4, Facility location and user information submitted.
	Geographic	1. The MVS boundary and sites listed are not correct. 2. The legend is incomplete – should identify boxes and triangles. 3. Verify data shown for site locations against TE-4, Facility location and user information submitted.
	Geographic	1. The MVP sites listed are not correct. 2. The legend is incomplete – should identify boxes and triangles. 3. Verify data shown for site locations against TE-4, Facility location and user information submitted.
	Geographic	1. The MVK boundary map is out of date. 2. The legend is incomplete – should identify boxes and triangles. 3. Verify data shown for site locations against TE-4, Facility location and user information submitted.
	N/A	There is no map showing CEIWR located in Alexandria, VA and CEIWR-HEC located in Davis CA
	TE-13	38.<tab>TE-13 USACE Locations – LRD Division Office drawing not included; # for LRD Division office is included in the Division-wide drawing, however 168 appears high; LRH numbers missing from Division-wide drawing.
	TE-13	Does not show all the locations of the IM/IT Users. It lumps them in Resident Office locations. This is not accurate as it does not include the various Project Offices; Chambersburg, Scranton, Wilkes-Barre, Philadelphia area Pittsburgh, Johnstown, PA, Cumberland, WV. Some are long term Project Office. Some Project Offices come and go with specific projects. Also, we have users/equipment in Pittsburgh (Western Project Office - WPO) that is not even included within the boundary lines. If all these locations are not shown then a statement needs to be added that the service is to be provided where the equipment is located to include all remote project/office sites.
	TE-13	Does not show all the locations of the IM/IT Users. It lumps them in Resident Office locations. This is not accurate as it does not include the various Project Offices; Chambersburg, Scranton, Wilkes-Barre, Philadelphia area Pittsburgh, Johnstown, PA, Cumberland, WV. Some are long term Project Office. Some Project Offices come and go with specific projects. Also, we have users/equipment in Pittsburgh (Western Project Office - WPO) that is not even included within the boundary lines. If all these locations are not shown then a statement needs to be added that the service is to be provided where the equipment is located to include all remote project/office sites.

Section	Paragraph	State Concern
	TE-13:sam_1.pdf	The end-user map for Mobile District (sam_1.pdf) does not show the offices supported in Bolivia, Ecuador, Honduras or El Salvador. These offices are listed in TE 4 under "CESAM_Facilities." Consequently, the end-user map for South Atlantic Division (sad_1.pdf) is not correct either.
TE-14		<p>IM/IT work done in the field not included in this</p> <p>IM/IT work done in the field not included in this</p> <p>The number of districts and regions that mention WAN support in their mission statements seems to be too low. I assume that WAN support is being included in with LAN support in these mission statements. The two should be separated. WAN support includes LAN support tasks such as connectivity to servers, e-mail and databases, but WAN support also includes managing connectivity between sites, such as a district office and a lock and dam or recreation project. If your job includes managing frame-relay or some other type of site to site circuit or interfacing with vendors who supply this type of service, you are considered WAN support by private industry.</p> <p>Application: Netscape WEB site, which requires special software for the Manpower specialist in the District. Description This WEB site is required to access "COGNOS Access Manager", which produces Integrated Manning Documents (IMD) reports. The IMD does not have a report menu</p> <p>Does not include WA: Administrative Branch or Plant Operations McMillan Section for SCADA Should include missions of offices (or segment of work) for all persons who are being competed in any organizational segments which would have to be supported under the contract</p>
	38537 Appears to be all	<p>Are you proposing that IMO operate our GPS and Survey equipment?</p> <p>After reading the TE-14 IMO Mission Statements, LRH appears to be the only district that supports WAN (Wide Area Networks) to their field locations. This can not be accurate???? Also noticed that Field support for all IT / Telecomm areas that are supported for the District Office are not mentioned. We currently support Telephone systems and all other Communication needs District Wide not just the District Office. Field support should be explicitly mentioned in this document to prevent the oversight of that part of supporting the mission. Field support is roughly 50% of the IT support mission.</p>

Section	Paragraph	State Concern
	CEMVM #11	CEMVM IM/IT functions incorrectly state that site and systems support, operations support, and administrative management are provided for Water Control Data Systems. This is not true. IM/IT does provide security reporting and scanning functions, but no other support is provided for CWMS/WCDS systems in MVM. The statement should be corrected. According to ER 1110-2-249, management of the WCDS in within the Engineering Division at CEMVM.
	TE14	For the CENWS mission under Planning and Implementation, paragraph 11, change LAVA to "IAVA".
TE-15		<p>Another table that appears to be incomplete. I cannot print this page. Embedded special characters perhaps?</p> <p>Another possibly incomplete table. This page would not print on my printer. Perhaps some embedded special character?</p> <p>It appears that the diagram C-6 on page C-4 is incomplete. The remainder of the page is also blank. This page would not print on my printer. I received an error message that stated "the document could not be printed."</p> <p>LRH MCI and Sprint FTS2001 contract cost are not captured. These are paid with manual obligations in CEFMS, and no purchase orders are written.</p> <p>The LRH Compaq listing is for equipment purchases and not maintenance.</p> <p>DTS-W services aren't included as a contract, at least at HQ</p> <p>The LRH contract with ICI has expired. DLT solutions is a one time IT equipment purchase,</p> <p>The LRH contract with ICI has expired. DLT solutions is a one time IT equipment purchase,</p> <p>The LRH Secure Info is a duplicate entry. This is a regional wide contract.</p> <p>Your statement "The General Services Administration has demonstrated value of such contracting actions through its supply schedules. Using the power of large purchases to.... Negotiate the best terms which are not available on a single locations bases. <tab>Please review where the contracting data collected noted which contracts/purchase orders were issued referencing a GSA schedule and the proposed best terms and conditions were achieved.</p> <p>The \$384,000 LRH Verizon contract has expired, and should be eliminated.</p>

Section Paragraph

State Concern

No CADD IT cost are not listed for LRH.

This section describes the impact on small business contracting. Since IT/IM contract dollars figures prominently in the achievement of the district's small business and set-aside goals, does the potential removal of small business recorded contracting dollars, affect the district, or any our compliance of other federal laws, and policies. New policies will be to be written to take into account smaller small business goals.

Most of the projects reviewed are not similar size and scope of the USACE A-76 IM/IT competition. Your comment "Most of these project either have not had enough time to generate any savings, or the agencies have not identified their savings. Why did the consultant use these projects as references, that have not confirmed any cost saving which they are projecting the Corps will save? For example, much press, and {much of it has not been flattering,} has been written concerning the Navy/Marine Corps Intranet outsourcing initiatives which is in its 5th year of transition.

"DD 350 Validation.... After identifying the 1,099 contracts delivering services.... Is the document collecting statistics for contract services, or both contract services and hardware/software purchases.

Analysis of Contracts obviously does not include most recent data I believe Items collected under this datacall focused in on purchases originated from the IMO office, and did not identify IT equipment purchase outside the Information Management office, and other IT services, for example which were a subordinate part of a Construction or A/E services contract. It is also unclear if the source data included IT equipment and services ordered using the IMPAC Visa Card program which also are originated in offices outside of the IMO office.

I believe Items collected under this datacall listed one time purchases for IT equipment as an ongoing contractual relationship with many of the vendors collected. For example, GTSI is identified on the list of top contract holders. To my knowledge much of GTSI's business model centered around the selling of IT goods, i.e. Printer, computers, monitors, etc. -vs- custom support services. Some of these purchases are ordered on a infrequent specialized equipment basis. For example, a Tape backup library is not a common frequent purchase. To my knowledge the datacall did not list whether the IT equipment purchased from GTSI were actually delivery orders placed against a existing Army, or other DOD Indefinite Quantity Indefinite delivery pre-competed contracts, which GTSI holds many difference pre-competed contracting vehicles.

Section	Paragraph	State Concern
		NAB-WA Messenger contract not included
		The cost of local phone services at the LRH field sites has not been captured. This would includes local telephone companies, SBC/AMERITECH, Verizon, Alltel, Foothills Rural, Sprint United, and Citizens Communications. Locally are booked as utilities, and not counted as IT telecom services contracts
	1.1	Estimate of the cost benefit from cross training. Has the cost of the increased skill level of the employee after cross training been taken into account the benefit reduction?
	2.1,	The Budget shown in Figure 3 is for FY03, and the cost shown for the District alternative appears to be for Contract cost. What is the in-house cost for each of the alternatives? Are they assumed to be the same or will there be increasing in-house costs as the service provided is more centralized? Also, is there a cost for migration to a more centralized approach, and has that been factored into the cost benefit, especially if that cost is amortized over the life of the contract?
	2.5.5. Top Ten	Looking at the contract amount for Alpha Data Corporation (ADC) in this table (2,858,291), I can only surmise that the reference is made to Mobile District's FY04 IT services contract. I realize that the information is a "moment in time," but it may be significant that the FY05 successor to the ADC contract is Bowhead IT Services (BITS), an Alaskan Native Corporation. The current value of the BITS contract is \$3,878,980.
	6.1.3 Price Tag	Having worked with the PWS Team in data collection with many other IMers and knowing what my CIM and Communications Chief have spent labor-wise working with the MEO Team, this table presents an extremely low estimate of the labor dollars used to conduct this competition! I hope that there has been a diligent effort to record the labor, travel, training and materials from the onset of the IM/IT competition announcement.
	6.2.1.1.	The sentence immediately above Table 22 refers to Table 21. It should read Table 22.
	B-1	The information New Orleans District provided in the original PWS datacall is incomplete. There is a more accurate / detailed listing which includes vendors associated with the reimbursable and District costs. Please let me know the best way to get this more complete information included.

Section	Paragraph	State Concern
	TE-15	<p>I would question whether USACE has dozens of individual unique contracts with telecomm vendors such as MCI, Verizon, Qwest, Sprint, and others. This should reviewed for example, most likely most of these contracts/purchase orders issued from a district would reference products, services, and prices from the GSA FTS2001 government-wide telecomm contract. Also, in many cases contracts/purchase orders issued to local incumbent exchange carriers would just reference services regulated by the state's local public service utilities. In these cases the prices are regulated by government entities. It is my experience that local purchase order/Contracts are generated yearly, to certify that funds are available so that services can be legally purchased and paid. In most cases these are just paperwork exercise to comply with Federal purchasing and spending Laws.</p>
	TE-15	<p>39.<tab>TE-15 IM-IT Benefit Analysis – question whether this section should even be in the PWS document. It contains information that has costs in it. The material is dated (from FY03). Several referenced contracts not being used anymore or were estimates with actuals coming in much lower. For example, for LRH – Verizon contract of \$389K is not used anymore. LRH switched providers significantly lowering costs. There are many assumptions made about consolidating contracts that are incorrect. For example, many Districts reference communication contracts that are the same contract – such as MCI or Verizon. The difference is that to obligate funds, each District has to write separate PO's against that contract. The analysis in this section counts each one as separate contracts which inflates the numbers. Unless contracting or finance regulations are changed, or the each site Pays the SP for these services, each District will have to continue paying for these services on a separate PO.</p>
	TE15 Appendix B	<p>Note that an update to the list of IT Contracts and Reimbursable services was provided to Ray Navidi and James Rich with suspense of 15 March 2005. Seattle's contracting changes were significant.</p>

Section	Paragraph	State Concern
	TE-15 IM/IT	<p>If any of the Water Control mission essential equipment or facilities were to be included in this solicitation the conclusion of the existing Benefit Analysis could be completely reversed. Water Control is not conducive to any set method or process. Each Water Control office has unique needs based on many varied constraints. As a result if any aspect of the Water Control mission is included in this document the Benefit Analysis should be recomputed using specific details and associated costs of contracting out each particular equipment or facility and a cost determined for not only the equipment or facility but the impact to the Water Control mission. Water Control is a unique mission with equipment and facilities that are exclusively used for real-time water and flood control to provide the information necessary to operate COE projects as required by the approved project Water Control Manual, Drought Contingency Plan, and Emergency Plan, and to provide for hydroelectric power, a historical record, meet environmental requirements, and prevent loss of property and life. This equipment and facilities are maintained, operated, and used by Engineers and Scientists not by IM personnel. If this equipment or facilities are included in this solicitation the potential for contract modification claims is nearly certain as a result of the cost and complexity of this additional work, and the SP may have to assume liability for loss of property and persons if they fail to provide information necessary for making critical decisions as required by Water Managers.</p>

TE-17

Certain programs in support of attorneys have historically been carried under the CEALS name. A current critical program is the Matter Tracking System, used by nearly every attorney in the Corps. I certainly hope this IM task is covered somewhere.

Water Control, identified as a unique workload for CESPL (and other Districts), is in no way defined in any of the provided documents (TEs, Section C, etc.) Additionally, the importance and criticality of Water Control in relation to loss of lives and property is not mentioned. Furthermore, no mention is made of the complexity of the hardware and software comprising CESPL's water control system or those of other Districts. Thus, the term Water Control is totally ill-defined and impossible to comprehend (and thus bid) as it is currently presented in the PWS.

Table lists Water Control/River Forecast Center as unique workload for CESPL. CESPL only supports a Water Control mission and NOT a River Forecast Center. Since Water Control requirements (at least at CESPL) are not combined with River Forecast, then stating such is at best misleading if not completely incorrect.

Section Paragraph

State Concern

CENAB Unique missions not highlighted should include (at least) the following areas: Beach Restoration BRAC (Base Realignment and Closure) COOP (<= 150 customers at any one time) Cost Engineering Dam Safety Defense Message System (DMS) GPS Dredge Operations Environmental Restoration (wetlands) EOC-Floods EOC-Hurricane EOC-Tornado DTOS-RRV HTRW Homeland Security/FEMA Military Housing Military Programs Military Deployments Real Estate NRRS SCADA Recreation SIPRNET Water Control

TE-17 needs reference and explanation in the main PWS or an introductory section. What are the SP responsibilities for these areas.

DGPS support can easily consume one fifth an FTE per supported site and has special response time requirements. None of this information is addressed. Unique requirements statements may be necessary for many of these mission areas but nothing is provided.

The table showing the unique missions & workloads (TE-17) has no entries except for 'archaeology' for NAD and also none for any subordinate districts . I don't know how this table was supposed to be populated but in our review comments last review, I know we mentioned the SCADA system at Baltimore's Washington Aqueduct and I believe the DTOS-RRV assigned to Baltimore. This needs to be completed before the PWS is issued.

The following should also be checked for the Honolulu District: Hydrographic Survey Ice Roads National Missile Defense SCADA Control Systems SOFA – Japan SOFA – Korea SOFA – Others USFK

The unique workload for SPN includes Bay Model Visitor Center, Dredge Material Management Office and Real Estate. The Bay Model Visitor Center and Dredge Material Management Office has been incorrectly assigned to CESP.

Washington Aqueduct could be listed as a unique mission, reflecting essential utility nature and emphasizing production. The SCADA for water treatment production at Washington Aqueduct should be listed as a unique mission

Section Paragraph

State Concern

Missing the NAD functions: Archeology, Beach Restoration, BRAC, CERP, COOP, Cost Engineering, Dam Safety, Defense Message System, Dredge Material Disposal, Dredge Operations, DTOS-CTOC, DTOS-DTOC, DTOS-RRV, Environmental Restoration, EOC-Floods, EOC-Hurricane, Federal Executive Board, Homeland Security/FEMA/HTRW, Hydrographic Survey, Mapping, Military Programs, Military Reserve Center, Navigation Data Center, Real Estate, Recreation, Regulatory Permits, SIPRNet, Tele-Engineering Operations Center, Water Control, Water Safety

CENAD Unique Missions and Workloads in not populated. This is inaccurate. I can only address CENAP: CENAP Unique Missions should include: Beach Restoration Building Access Control Systems Coast Guard Cost Engineering Dam Safety DMS DGPS/GPS Dredge Material Disposal Dredge Operations Environmental Restoration EOC FEB FEMA HTRW HUD Mapping Recreation Regulation SCADA SIPRNET< Tele-engineering Water Control In addition, two new categories should be added: 1) GMS (Groundwater Modeling System) 2) Marine Design Center of Expertise

Add another unique mission requirement, Mississippi River Commission Bank Grading and Mat Loading Units. The requirement impacts CEMVM and CEMVD. Add/Highlight CEMVD and CEMVM to the unique mission, Mississippi River Commission Mat Sinking Unit.

There are no standards identified with this exhibit. The performance standards will be applicable the same as the standards provided in C.5 and TE-1.

Regulatory Permits is appropriately listed without detail of requirements. Regulatory Program uses IM support in management, updating, standard and unique (one time)reporting, and generally facilitating use of RAMS/ORM (two integrated Regulatory unique database management systems). Regulatory also receives GIS support, web page update and management, intranet web page update and management, as well all of the standard IM processes that all other employees use. Currently SPK Regulatory Branch maintains RAMS on two separate Sun Unix systems supporting 8 widely dispersed offices. Also, SPK Regulatory Program has significant contact with Native American tribal governments so the Native American Nations box should be highlighted for SPK.

Add Historic Preservation and Homeland Security under NWS.

There is no performance requirements summary identified for unique automation requirements for C.5.2.10, IMIT Unique Requirements

Section Paragraph

State Concern

Need to add "Real Estate Systems National Center (RESNC)" to CESAM's Unique Missions and Workloads

I originally submitted a PWS document that detailed the specific duties of the USACE Spectrum Management Center; however, I only see the duties relating to the local frequency managers addressed in the PWS. The tasks associated with the SMC and the overall management of the program appear to be missing from the report. Please let me know if you would like for me to forward a copy of the SMC PWS document. I'm not sure why it was not included. Thanks, Greg

There is no explanation on how the unique missions and workloads are indicated. For CENAD and all of its Districts the table seems to be incomplete compared to the tables for other Divisions and Districts. The information for CENAD and its Districts needs to be reviewed for accuracy and should accurately show its unique missions and workloads.

Under section C.1.3.7 Visual Information, there is no discussion of Webpage Support under the provisions of supporting the Command Information mission of the command. For that matter, there is no mention at all of the Command Information mission of the command, nor is there a delineation of responsibilities under this PWS to clearly identify the role of IM and PAO. This document may have a flaw for the reason that the "systems management" role of IM is not defined versus the "content management" role of the PAO. As this document reads now, this is a glaring weakness that could compromise the PWS and eventual bid. Right now, it is as if the IM team would be responsible for all web activity—this simply is not the case and could effect a cause to misinterpret the requirements.

Two corrections to the Unique Missions and Workloads chart for CESP: CESP, not CESP, manages the Bay Model Visitor Center in Sausalito, CA. Also, CESP (and CESP, as shown) participates in the Dredge Material Management Office.

the table showing the special requirements for NAD / NAB has not been filled out.

All

13. TE17 – do not understand this exhibit, particularly with regards to CEEIS section.

Section	Paragraph	State Concern
	N/A	<p>CEIWR doesn't appear to have a Unique Missions & Workloads Matrix. Suggest something like the following be added for CEIWR: Navigation Data Center Research/Projects/Training – Environmental Research/Projects/Training – Flood Damage Analysis Research/Projects/Training – Ground Water Research/Projects/Training – Hydrology Research/Projects/Training – Hydraulics Research/Projects/Training – Long Range Planning Research/Projects/Training – Reservoir Systems Analysis & Optimization<tab> Research/Projects/Training – Risk Analysis Research/Projects/Training – Water Control/Management Research/Projects/Training – Statistical Analysis</p>
	n/a	<p>Hydrographic Surveys MVP unique software Hypack survey software and license maintenance, the maintenance of the USCG DGPS tower at Alma Wisconsin, the maintenance of our large format plotter and copier, and acquiring an FCC radio license for the district for RTKGPS survey systems data links</p>
	TE17	<p>Seattle District monitors tagged fish at the Lake Washington Ship Canal.</p>
	TE-17	<p>40.<tab>TE-17 Unique Missions and Workloads – Does this section really have any impact on IM/IT services required? Only reference to it is in section C.5.2.10 but does not elaborate on how this section and TE impacts IM/IT requirements. Workloads are not given in this section.</p>
	TE-17 Unique	<p>Replace all occurrences of “Water Control/River Forecast Center” with “Water Control/Reservoir Control offices”. The River Forecast Centers are part of the National Weather Service, not part of the COE. Water Control is a unique mission with equipment and facilities that are exclusively used for real-time water and flood control to provide the information necessary to operate COE projects as required by the approved project Water Control Manual, Drought Contingency Plan, and Emergency Plan, and to provide for hydroelectric power, a historical record, meet environmental requirements, and prevent loss of property and life. This equipment and facilities are maintained, operated, and used by Engineers and Scientists not by IM personnel. If this equipment or facilities are included in this solicitation the potential for contract modification claims is nearly certain as a result of the cost and complexity of this additional work, and the SP may have to assume liability for loss of property and persons if they fail to provide information necessary for making critical decisions as required by Water Managers.</p>

TE-18

Section Paragraph

State Concern

Little Rock (SWL) has a NISH contract for mail services which is not listed.

MVD, MVN, Goodwill, Rec Mgmt, Mail Services, 28 Feb 06, 1 yr, 12, JWOD, NISH, FFP, 1472, 4, New Orleans District

TE-2

Several paragraphs direct the SP to construct cost benefit analysis (CBA), but there is no corresponding data in TE 02.

This is fairly significant exhibit to be missing during the review period! When will this exhibit be available for review? Will the review period be extended to allow sufficient time to review?

I see no provision for timeliness and deviations and performance measures regarding property inventory control. Constraints on how IM will interact with LM should be scoped as property is generally a very time consuming and laborious effort.

Please provide Estimated Current Workload by location for each of the functional areas in the PWS.

TE 2 Estimated work load: Much of the work defined in PWS C.5 cannot be accurately priced based on the workload data because the labor hours and skill levels required for this type of work vary significantly with the complexity and difficulty of the specific task. If USACE intends to use this workload data as the basis for pricing, both the acquisition process and IMIT performance are at

I have two comments and examples regarding workload data being rolled up via division in lieu of district. First, not all district's have a requirement for a service. An example is switchboard operator services. Not all districts within a division have a switchboard operator. Without the rollup not broken down to district level, how does the SP know where to put these folks, or devise a strategy for proper and efficient support of the requirement. Second, if workload is not broken down to the district level, districts requiring a specific service may not get the service, or may get it at an additional cost above baseline if other districts are allowed to utilize the service at a higher rate, or utilize a service they previously didn't. An example is in the photography area. Some districts have a large workload in photography, and require this service late in the fiscal year, like districts in hurricane areas. If other districts are able to use the baseline work requirement up before the district that provided the workload data needs it, it will either not be provided, or would be provided at additional cost above the baseline requirement. In closing, workload data must be broken down to the district level so the proper district will have the service available when needed, and the SAP will be staffed in the proper locations to provide the service required.

Section	Paragraph	State Concern
	2.8.2	<p>Technical Exhibits: The table describes the numbers of classified computing devices by organizations at the district level, rather than physical address location. The relation of these devices to physical address is unclear. For example, there are 684 classified server listed under HQRDs, yet zero classified workstations. Classified workstations at the HQRDs Washington, DC, location to support both management and administration of that large number of servers is either uncounted or counted under other organizational units. Request USACE provide the classified device counts by physical facility address.</p>
	5.7.1.2	<p>MVN reported 1 Privacy Act Officer appointed. The space is blank.</p>
	RS238	<p>Incidents should be reported immediately.</p>
	RS-9	<p>IM/IT PR&C assistance - 3 day review may very well meet 90-95 percent of PR&C's, but so would 4 days though. The remaining 5-10% are usually time critical for one reason or another and this requirement will not meet the need at those times.</p>
	TE-2	<p>: This TE is not available for comment? Delete any reference to SCADA, DCP, GPS, CWMS, Water Control, or Reservoir Control. Water Control is a unique mission with equipment and facilities that are exclusively used for real-time water and flood control to provide the information necessary to operate COE projects as required by the approved project Water Control Manual, Drought Contingency Plan, and Emergency Plan, and to provide for hydroelectric power, a historical record, meet environmental requirements, and prevent loss of property and life. This equipment and facilities are maintained, operated, and used by Engineers and Scientists not by IM personnel. If this equipment or facilities are included in this solicitation the potential for contract modification claims is nearly certain as a result of the cost and complexity of this additional work, and the SP may have to assume liability for loss of property and persons if they fail to provide information necessary for making critical decisions as required by Water Managers.</p>
	TE-2: Para 3.2	<p>Why isn't CEEIS included?</p>
TE-3		<p>Government Furnished Software. Will end users be restricted from purchasing and installing specialized software? Will they have to go thru a "National" software repository?</p> <p>There is no Government Furnished Property listed for CEERD – Hanover, New Hampshire. All other ERDC sites are listed (Vicksburg, Champaign and Alexandria).</p>

Section Paragraph

State Concern

There is absolutely no attempt made to correlate the functionality let alone the criticality of the hardware systems listed in the various GFE lists. It would require considerably more effort to support a critical server 24/7 than a server simply disseminating the company newsletter; that differentiation is not provided. This TE is only a database dump of hardware providing no clue as to support requirements.

Circuits: In many cases the data on circuits is missing or in error. The number of internal building lines is missing altogether, giving no scale of the site support requirements. Sites with VOIP not clearly indicated. Support for recreation sites (campgrounds, payphones, etc) is missing.

Cable Plant: cursory review of sites indicates many sites with cable plants have no cable plant indicated. Sites such as powerhouses should have significant communications infrastructure.

Government-Furnished supplies/materials submitted under TE-3 is missing (information relating to IT supplies, copiers, fax, (paper/toner), mail management, and records management.) Please advise if you wish us to submit.

Is the USACE IT industry relationship commensurate with the agency's size and implicit leverage?

The GFE technical exhibits that outline hardware to be provided to the SP contains a number of devices that are questionable. There are instances where very old Workstations are listed in this TE including 486 based systems. Due to the Army mandate that all Army systems be operating on Windows 2000 or XP, it is unclear how these systems meet this operating system requirement. Also, since the Software and Hardware TEs are separated, it is impossible to determine what hardware is used for what functions, and what software runs on which of the servers that are listed. If these TEs were created by simply performing an inventory dump, recommend some level of scrubbing prior to release.

I noticed that the files, TE-3 PBX CESPd and TE-3_CP_CESPd include equipment for both SPD and SPN. SPN is the operational service provider for SPD HQs. Did not know if your intent was to have them broken out or the filenames by organization.

Technical Exhibits: The information on GFE voice and data circuits is documented in an inconsistent manner across USACE Divisions and Districts. If the intent of the Government is for prospective service providers to utilize this information for pricing, request USACE standardize the format of information provided by each

Section Paragraph

State Concern

Technical Exhibits: Please provide all tables in Excel format for the following documents: Parent Directory/ Cable Plant/ Circuit Info/ GFE/ GFS/ PBX/. This will allow us to more effectively analyze the data.

Missing WA property inventory list

I may have missed it, but didn't see a file for GFS for SPL. Would have been TE-3-GFS_SPL

TE 3 outlines government furnished equipment (hardware), software, cable plant, PBX's and circuits. For hardware, software, PBX's and cable plant it is clear in that the government provides these items to the SP for the SP's use in meeting the contract requirements.

Circuits are not owned by the government but are procured for a specific period of time as a service. Is it the government's intent to continue to pay for these circuits separately from the A76 contract and could offerors propose alternative technologies or configurations that would provide the same or better service to the government at a lower cost?

CEMVS-ED-H requests that the DCP streamgaging network equipment be deleted from the TE-3 Government Furnished Property list for transfer to the SP. This equipment is maintained as per Engineer Regulation 1110-2-1455, Cooperative Streamgaging Program.

Recommend that HQDA IT equipment provided to CPACs residing and supported at Corps sites be either excluded from this list or identified as equipment that will supported by the SP but not Hand-receipted to the SP.

Technical Exhibits: Are circuit costs for data and voice communications within scope of the SP offering? If so, how will the Government credit savings to the prospective service providers cost proposal if existing GFE circuits are replaced by SP-provided communications?

The CESPL submission for Government Furnished Software has been excluded.

Technical Exhibits: Regarding the GFE pdf files showing the desktop and server information. Request USACE include information such as current warranty coverage (i.e. 3-yr term, 4-yr term, etc.), relative equipment age (acquisition date, etc.), # of CPUs (for servers).

C.<tab>We request that the DCP streamgaging network equipment be deleted from the TE-3 Government Furnished Property list for transfer to the SP. This equipment is maintained as per Engineer Regulation 1110-2-1455, Cooperative Streamgaging Program. Further discussion/description is attached.

Section	Paragraph	State Concern
		<p>TE-3_GFS-CEERD shows large quantities of software at the ERDC-CRREL site however TE-3_GFE-CEERD page 28 shows absolutely no hardware.</p> <p>TE-3_GFS-CEERD repeats the first ten line items on each of the four ERDC sites giving the impression that there is four times as much software as there really is.</p>
	2.<tab>GFE	data is missing from the spreadsheet
	2.<tab>GFE	data is missing from the spreadsheet
	2.<tab>GFE	data is missing from the spreadsheet
	A76/05-R-	<p>All of the outside circuit info that MVN provided for the data calls is missing in this document - a very significant amount of information. It's too much info to paste into this comment box, so I will forward it in a spreadsheet to the webmaster. Omitting this data from the contract would result in a significant modification later on. It would also mean that MVN would have no WAN connectivity if not</p>

Section	Paragraph	State Concern
	C.5.3.1.4	<p>OH DCPS (cont)- While this office (CELRH) did not originally submit hardware/software descriptions pertinent to DCPS, it now appears they should be included. Descriptions are incomplete, but provided to minimize costs of a possible contract modification. All listed are manufactured by</p> <p>Handar/Viasala: DESCRIPTION<tab>STATE<tab>DCP TYPE NEWCOMERSTOWN<tab>OH<tab>555 NEW LEXINGTON<tab>OH<tab> NORTH INDUSTRY<tab>OH<tab>560 w/ pswd 1949 NEWARK<tab>OH<tab>Hydrologger NEW PHILADELPHIA<tab>OH<tab> OCTA<tab>OH<tab> PAIN T CREEK LAKE<tab>OH<tab> PAINT CREEK OUTFLOW (BAINBRIDGE)<tab>OH<tab>Hydrologger PEORIA (UNION)<tab>OH<tab>Hydrologger PIEDMONT LAKE<tab>OH<tab> PIEDMONT OUTFLOW GAGE<tab>OH<tab> PLEASANT HILL LAKE<tab>OH<tab>560 PLEASANT HILL OUTFLOW<tab>OH<tab>560 PORTSMOUTH<tab>OH<tab>55 5 PROSPECT<tab>OH<tab>555 REES<tab>OH<tab> ROSEVILLE<tab>OH<tab> SENECAVILLE<tab>OH<tab>555 >SENECAVILLE OUTFLOW<tab>OH<tab> SALT FORK LAKE<tab>OH<tab>555 SUMMERFIELD<tab>OH<tab>555 >TAPPAN LAKE<tab>OH<tab>560 TAPPAN OUTFLOW<tab>OH<tab>Hydrologger TIPPECANOE<tab>OH< tab> TOM JENKINS LAKE<tab>OH<tab> UHRICHSVILLE<tab>OH<tab>555 W ALHONDING R.P. (NELLIE)<tab>OH<tab> WAYNESBURG<tab>OH<tab>560 >WASHINGTON COURTHOUSE<tab>OH<tab>560 WILLS CREEK LAKE<tab>OH<tab> WILLS CREEK OUTFLOW<tab>OH<tab> WILLOW ISLAND<tab>OH<tab>555 WEST JEFFERSON (MADISON CO)<tab>OH<tab> WILLIAMSPORT<tab>OH<tab> WORT HINGTON<tab>OH<tab>555 TEST (S.G. SHOP, OH)<tab>OH<tab>555 ZANESVILLE<tab>OH<tab> <b r></p>
	C.5.3.1.4	<p>NC DCPS - While this office (CELRH) did not originally submit hardware/software descriptions pertinent to DCPS, it now appears they should be included. Descriptions are incomplete, but provided to minimize costs of a possible contract modification. All listed are manufactured by</p> <p>Handar/Viasala: DESCRIPTION<tab>STATE<tab>DCP TYPE JEFFERSON<tab>NC<tab>560 TRIPLETT<tab>NC< tab>560 WILBAR<tab>NC<tab>555</p>

Section **Paragraph**
C.5.3.1.4

State Concern

KY DCPS - While this office (CELRH) did not originally submit hardware/software descriptions pertinent to DCPS, it now appears they should be included. Descriptions are incomplete, but provided to minimize costs of a possible contract modification. All listed are manufactured by

Handar/Viasala: DESCRIPTION<tab>STATE<tab>DCP
TYPE ALLEN<tab>KY<tab>555 ASHLAND<tab>KY<tab>5
55 BLAINE<tab>KY<tab>555 DEWEY
LAKE<tab>KY<tab>Hydrologger DEWEY
OUTFLOW<tab>KY<tab>555 ELKHORN
CITY<tab>KY<tab> FISHTRAP
OUTFLOW<tab>KY<tab>560 FISHTRAP
LAKE<tab>KY<tab> FULLERS
(LOUISA)<tab>KY<tab> GRAYSON
TOWN<tab>KY<tab>Hydrologger GRAYSON LAKE
(DAM)<tab>KY<tab>555 GRAYSON
OUTFLOW<tab>KY<tab>560 GREENUP<tab>KY<tab> LE
ON<tab>KY<tab>Hydrologger MAYSVILLE<tab>KY<tab>555<
META<tab>KY<tab> OLIVE
HILL<tab>KY<tab>555 PAINTSVILLE
LAKE<tab>KY<tab> PAINTSVILLE
OUTFLOW<tab>KY<tab>560 PIKEVILLE<tab>KY<tab> P
RICE<tab>KY<tab>560 PRESTONSBURG
(LEVISA)<tab>KY<tab> PAINTSVILLE
TOWN<tab>KY<tab>555 RELIEF<tab>KY<tab> SANDY
HOOK<tab>KY<tab>Hydrologger VIRGIE<tab>KY<tab> W
HEELERSBURG<tab>KY<tab>560 WILLARD<tab>KY<tab>560
YATESVILLE<tab>KY<tab>555 YATESVILLE
OUTFLOW<tab>KY<tab>555

Section	Paragraph	State Concern
	C.5.3.1.4	<p>OH DCPS - While this office (CELRH) did not originally submit hardware/software descriptions pertinent to DCPS, it now appears they should be included. Descriptions are incomplete, but provided to minimize costs of a possible contract modification. All listed are manufactured by</p> <p>Handar/Viasala: DESCRIPTION<tab>STATE<tab>DCP TYPE ALUM CREEK LAKE<tab>OH<tab>555 ALUM CREEK OUTFLOW (AFRICA)<tab>OH<tab>560 ATHENS<tab>OH<tab> ADA MSVILLE<tab>OH<tab> ALEXANDRIA<tab>OH<tab>555 ASHLAND<tab>OH<tab>Hydrologger ATWOOD LAKE<tab>OH<tab> BEACH CITY LAKE<tab>OH<tab>555 BEACH CITY OUTFLOW (SUGAR CREEK)<tab>OH<tab>555 BELLEVILLE LOCKS & DAM<tab>OH<tab>560 BELLEPOINT<tab>OH<tab>555 B ARRETT'S MILLS OH<tab>OH<tab>560 BOLIVAR DAM<tab>OH<tab>560 BOURNEVILLE<tab>OH<tab>560 CADIZ<tab>OH<tab> CAMBRIDGE<tab>OH<tab> CHIPPE WA ON THE LAKE<tab>OH<tab>555 CHILICOTHE (SCIOTO)<tab>OH<tab>555 CIRCLEVILLE<tab>OH<tab> COLUMBUS AT ALUM CREEK<tab>OH<tab>Hydrologger CLENDENING LAKE<tab>OH<tab>560 CLARIDON<tab>OH<tab>555 SCI OTO RIVER AT COLUMBUS<tab>OH<tab> CHARLES MILLS LAKE<tab>OH<tab>555 CHARLES MILL OUTFLOW<tab>OH<tab>560 CENTRAL COLLEGE<tab>OH<tab>555 COSHOCTON<tab>OH<tab> CENTERFIELD<tab>OH<tab>Hydrologger DEER CREEK LAKE<tab>OH<tab>Hydrologger DEER CREEK OUTFLOW<tab>OH<tab>Hydrologger DELAWARE LAKE<tab>OH<tab>Hydrologger DELAWARE OUTFLOW<tab>OH<tab>Hydrologger DILLON LAKE<tab>OH<tab>Hydrologger DILLON OUTFLOW<tab>OH<tab> DOVER DAM<tab>OH<tab>Hydrologger DOVER OUTFLOW<tab>OH<tab>560 DRESDEN<tab>OH<tab>555 >DERWENT<tab>OH<tab>560 DUBLIN<tab>OH<tab>555 DARBYVILLE<tab>OH<tab>Hydrologger ENTERPRISE<tab>O H<tab>Hydrologger FRAZEYSBURG<tab>OH<tab> GALIO N<tab>OH<tab>555 GLOUSTER<tab>OH<tab>560 GREEN FIELD<tab>OH<tab>Hydrologger HEBRON<tab>OH<tab>Hydro logger HIGBY<tab>OH<tab>560 HILLSBORO<tab>OH<tab> > KENTON<tab>OH<tab>560 KILLBUCK<tab>OH<tab>55 5 KILBOURNE<tab>OH<tab>Hydrologger LANCASTER b>OH<tab>555 LEESVILLE AUX<tab>OH<tab> LEESVILLE LAKE<tab>OH<tab> LEESVILLE OUTFLOW<tab>OH<tab>560 LITHOPOLIS<tab>OH<tab>560<</p>

Section Paragraph

State Concern

LOUDONVILLE<tab>OH<tab>Hydrologger LONDON
(MADISON CO)<tab>OH<tab>Hydrologger MAGNOLIA
LEVEE<tab>OH<tab>560 MASSILON<tab>OH<tab>555 M
C CONNELSVILLE<tab>OH<tab>Hydrologger MELDAHL
LOCKS &
DAM<tab>OH<tab>560 MELCO<tab>OH<tab>Hydrologger
MOHAWK DAM<tab>OH<tab>Hydrologger MOHAWK
OUTFLOW<tab>OH<tab> MILLPORT
(COLUMBIAN)<tab>OH<tab>Hydrologger MOHICANVILLE
DAM<tab>OH<tab> MOHICANVILLE
OUTFLOW<tab>OH<tab> MARIETTA<tab>OH<tab> MT
STERLING<tab>OH<tab>555 MT.
VERNON<tab>OH<tab> NORTH BRANCH OF
KOKOSING<tab>OH<tab>5

Section **Paragraph**
C.5.3.1.4

State Concern

WV DCPS - While this office (CELRH) did not originally submit hardware/software descriptions pertinent to DCPS, it now appears they should be included. Descriptions are incomplete, but provided to minimize costs of a possible contract modification. All listed are manufactured by

Handar/Viasala: DESCRIPTION<tab>STATE<tab>DCP
TYPE ALDERSON<tab>WV<tab>Hydrologger BAILEYSVI
LLE<tab>WV<tab>Hydrologger BEECH FORK
LAKE<tab>WV<tab> BEECH FORK
OUTFLOW<tab>WV<tab>555 BECKLEY<tab>WV<tab>Hydrolo
gger BELVA<tab>WV<tab>560 BRANCHLAND<tab>WV
b>555 BIRCH
RIVER<tab>WV<tab>560 BLAND<tab>WV<tab> BLUEST
ONE LAKE<tab>WV<tab>560 BRADSHAW (DRY FORK AT
BEARTOWN)<tab>WV<tab>555 BURNSVILLE
TOWN<tab>WV<tab>Hydrologger BUCKEYE<tab>WV<tab>55
5 BURNSVILLE LAKE
DAM<tab>WV<tab>555 BURNSVILLE
OUTFLOW<tab>WV<tab>560 CHARLESTON
S.S.<tab>WV<tab>555 CLEAR
FORK<tab>WV<tab> CHARLESTON LOCK
6<tab>WV<tab> CAMDEN ON
GAULEY<tab>WV<tab>555 CRANBERRY<tab>WV<tab>555<b
r>CRAIGSVILLE<tab>WV<tab>555 CLAY<tab>WV<tab>560<
DUNLOW<tab>WV<tab>560 ELIZABETH
(PALESTINE)<tab>WV<tab> EAST LYNN
LAKE<tab>WV<tab> EAST LYNN
OUTFLOW<tab>WV<tab>Hydrologger FRAMETOWN<tab>WV
<tab>555 GLENVILLE<tab>WV<tab>Hydrologger GALLIP
OLIS<tab>WV<tab> GRANTSVILLE<tab>WV<tab>560 GA
RY<tab>WV<tab>560 HARTS<tab>WV<tab> HILLDALE
WV<tab> HINTON<tab>WV<tab> HUNTINGTON<tab
>WV<tab> JACOX
KNOB<tab>WV<tab>Hydrologger JOB'S
KNOB<tab>WV<tab>560 KANAWHA
FALLS<tab>WV<tab> KERMIT<tab>WV<tab> KOPPERST
ON<tab>WV<tab> LAVALETTE<tab>WV<tab>Hydrologger
>LOGAN<tab>WV<tab>Hydrologger LONDON
L&D<tab>WV<tab>560 MAN<tab>WV<tab> MARMET
WQ<tab>WV<tab> MICCO<tab>WV<tab>Hydrologger MA
RMET L&D<tab>WV<tab>555 MT
LOOKOUT<tab>WV<tab>Hydrologger MULLINS<tab>WV<tab
>560 NESTLOW<tab>WV<tab>Hydrologger ODD<tab>WV
<tab>Hydrologger TEST (S.G. SHOP,
WV)<tab>WV<tab> PIPESTEM<tab>WV<tab> POINT
PLEASANT<tab>WV<tab>560 PARKERSBURG<tab>WV<tab>
PINEVILLE<tab>WV<tab>555 QUEEN
SHOALS<tab>WV<tab> RAINELLE<tab>WV<tab> RACIN

Section Paragraph

State Concern

E<tab>WV<tab>560 R.D. BAILEY<tab>WV<tab>560 R.D. BAILEY
OUTFLOW<tab>WV<tab> REPLETE<tab>WV<tab> ROCK
CAMP<tab>WV<tab>555 RED OAK
KNOB<tab>WV<tab>Hydrologger ROCKSDALE<tab>WV<tab>
555 SHARPS KNOB<tab>WV<tab> SUTTON
LAKE<tab>WV<tab> SUTTON
OUTFLOW<tab>WV<tab> SUMMERSVILLE
LAKE<tab>WV<tab> SUMMERSVILLE
OUTFLOW<tab>WV<tab> THURMOND<tab>WV<tab> TO
RNADO<tab>WV<tab>560 WANETA<tab>WV<tab>555 W
AYNE<tab>WV<tab>555 WEBSTER
SPRINGS<tab>WV<tab>555 WELCH<tab>WV<tab>555 W
INFIELD (UPPER)
WQ<tab>WV<tab> WILDCAT<tab>WV<tab> WINFIELD
L&D<tab>WV<tab> WILLIAMSON<tab>WV<tab>Hydrologger
WOLFPEN<tab>WV<tab>Hydrologger WHITE SULPHUR
SPRINGS<tab>WV<tab>555

C.5.3.1.4

VA DCPS - While this office (CELRH) did not originally submit hardware/software descriptions pertinent to DCPS, it now appears they should be included. Descriptions are incomplete, but provided to minimize costs of a possible contract modification. All listed are manufactured by

Handar/Viasala: DESCRIPTION<tab>STATE<tab>DCP
TYPE ALLISONIA<tab>VA<tab>555 BANE<tab>VA<tab>
Hydrologger BARTLICK<tab>VA<tab> BIG
ROCK<tab>VA<tab> CLINTWOOD<tab>VA<tab> CLAYT
OR LAKE NEAR
RADFORD<tab>VA<tab>Hydrologger DAVENPORT<tab>VA
560 FLAT GAP<tab>VA<tab>560 GEORGES
FORK<tab>VA<tab>560 GALAX<tab>VA<tab> GLEN
LYNN<tab>VA<tab> GRAYSONTOWN<tab>VA<tab> HAY
SI<tab>VA<tab>Hydrologger HURLEY<tab>VA<tab>555 J.
W. FLANNAGAN OUTFLOW<tab>VA<tab> J.W.
FLANNAGAN<tab>VA<tab> NARROWS<tab>VA<tab>Hydrolo
gger NORTH FORK OF POUND
OUTFLOW<tab>VA<tab>Hydrologger NORTH FORK OF
POUND
LAKE<tab>VA<tab> NORA<tab>VA<tab>555 PILGRIM
KNOB<tab>VA<tab> POUND LOWER (ABOVE INDIAN
CREEK)<tab>VA<tab>555 POUND UPPER (BELOW BOLD
CAMP CREEK)<tab>VA<tab> RADFORD<tab>VA<tab>

Section	Paragraph	State Concern
	Cable Plant -	cable plant info shown for NAB is WAD only. WAD is remote location. NAB has a lot more buildings.
	GFE	2 PC's and printers assigned to 'WAD Project Office'. There is no such office in CENAB.
	GFE Equipment	data is missing from the spreadsheet
	GFE Equipment	data is missing from the spreadsheet
	GFE Equipment	data is missing from the spreadsheet
	GFE-CENWS.pdf	We have identified numerous errors (equipment reported incorrectly under one physical location instead of another, possible duplication of some equipment and some non-IT related equipment reported) under our GFE exhibit. We understand that the inventory will be revisited at the beginning of the transition period. Do we need to identify all errors at this time? Please advise if you wish us to make changes or resubmit our GFE.
	GFE-CENWS.pdf	14 Seismic Sensor sites are missing from NWS GFE.
	GFE-CENWS.pdf	39 Data Collection Platform sites are missing from NWS GFE.
	NAP GFS	The following software needs to be added Adept, Hypack, Mathsoft, StaadPro, Trane Too, SKM, Late Pro, Aqua Chem, Automated Data Review, Digi Pro, DMMWin,DSP7T, Geochemist Workbench, Geonet Suite, gNIT, HSc Chemistry for Windows, Origin, Street Atlas USA, Topo USA, WinIDP
	Section on NWS	Continuation of record tag 20761:49217 If all these items meet the FAR definition of GFP, then I believe a thorough scrub of the NWS list is needed to delete items such as the examples listed below. CENWS-PPMD: safe, ofc gray door; table, drafting; CENWS-OD-LW: scooter, motor 3-wheel Cushman; 4 lawn mowers; nailer, pneumatic; press, hydraulic; CENWS-OD-MM: 2 lifts, man basket; CENWS-EC-CO: system, furniture. You get the picture.
	Section on NWS	I believe many items in this TE are really not GFP but rather plant equipment. I can't believe the intent is to hand receipt all this equipment to the SP. I believe most of these items will be maintained by the SP, but not used to perform the services described in the PWS. I believe there is a distinction between GFP and plant equipment that needs to be more clearly identified. Suggest you verify the definition of GFP and plant equipment in the FAR to assure this list accurately reflects those definitions.
	TE 3 03 CID-	The Site Name and Address for the listed circuits in TE 3 03 CID-CEIWR is missing. The Site Name and Address are: CEIWR-HEC; 609 Second Street; Davis, CA 95616. This is particularly important since CEIWR is in Alexandria VA and the circuits listed in TE 3 03 CID-CEIWR are at CEIWR-HEC in Davis, CA.

Section	Paragraph	State Concern
	TE 3 PBX-CEIWR	Site Name and Address are mis-labeled as being at IWR. The correct Site Name and Address are: CEIWR-HEC; 609 Second Street; Davis, CA 95616 for the pbx equipment listed.
	TE-3	Request that each IM office be requested to replace their list in this TE with a new list of equipment that does not include equipment that is specifically Water Control mission essential. Water Control is a unique mission with equipment and facilities that are exclusively used for real-time water and flood control to provide the information necessary to operate COE projects as required by the approved project Water Control Manual, Drought Contingency Plan, and Emergency Plan, and to provide for hydroelectric power, a historical record, meet environmental requirements, and prevent loss of property and life. This equipment and facilities are maintained, operated, and used by Engineers and Scientists not by IM personnel. If this equipment or facilities are included in this solicitation the potential for contract modification claims is nearly certain as a result of the cost and complexity of this additional work, and the SP may have to assume liability for loss of property and persons if they fail to provide information necessary for making critical decisions as required by Water Managers.
	TE-3 CID-CESAS	Missing circuit data that was submitted for Savannah district
	TE-3 CID-CESAS	Missing circuit data that was submitted for Savannah district
	TE-3 GFS-SAS	Missing list of software that was submitted for Savannah District. Only show others
	TE-3 PBX-CESAS	Missing data submitted by Savannah District on phone systems.
	TE-3_CID-	The information shown in the above PDF file is incomplete for the ERDC-Vicksburg site. I have an email showing the correct information that I would be happy to send. Jerry L. Stringer
	TE-3-CEERD	CRREL's GFE data was blank.
TE-4		<p>Many buildings owned by Washington Aqueduct Division, Baltimore District are not listed, see 'Additional Info', below.</p> <p>Add existing Regulatory Office located at 125 S. State Room 5221, Salt Lake City, UT, 84138, federal building (GSA lease), 1 person office.</p> <p>Employee telecommuting support requirements are not identified or specified. In addition TE-4 specifies field locations that will most likely change by the time a contract could proceed. Couldn't we just specify a requirement for a level of remote telecommuting support requirements, regardless of location (home or field office)?</p>

Section Paragraph

State Concern

A cursory review of TE-4 for Baltimore seemed to be incomplete with discrepancies. I could not find such facilities as Stillwater Lake, or Bush Dam. On the other hand, there seem to be minor leases and government owned property that may not be applicable to this Contract. Recommend a caveat be added similar to that for TE-3, in C.3.1.2.1., Page 97, which states the list may not be complete.

The PWS defines "Information Technology Facilities" as including the computer rooms, offices spaces, stock rooms, etc that the SP will presumably use however there does not appear to be a list of the facilities that the government plans for the SP to occupy. Can offerors assume that adequate facility space will be made available where ever it is needed at no cost to the SP; or will the cost of space somehow be recognized so that offerors who propose to use less space can have those savings recognized?

Construction Division Harrisburg Area Office is included but not other Construction Area Offices/Resident Offices

First entry under narrative description - believe you need to add the word EMPLOYEES after Aprox 550 in last sentence.

Construction Division Harrisburg Area Office is included but not other Construction Area Offices/Resident Offices

Not all sites are listed. Antenna/Microwave transmission sites and other field support sites are missing.

Facilities description in this T.E. does not include commo towers.

The data is not correct for Charleston. It appears there is NO data for SAC. Please contact me for correct info.

The data is not correct for Charleston. It appears there is NO data for SAC. Please contact me for correct info.

CELRP_Facilities_ For the entry for the Pittsburgh District Office, 1000 Liberty Avenue, Pittsburgh, PA 15222. ADD 42,000 under Square Feet CHANGE "Federal Building, 4 Floors, 300 Employees" to "Federal Building, 2 Floors, 200 Employees"

Section	Paragraph	State Concern
	CENAB	<p>Some facilities are not in the list and most have incorrect area entered. Here are</p> <p>NAB Site: Jennings Randolph Lake Corps of Engineers PO Box 247 Elk Garden, WV 26717 Employees 12 Square Footage: 22608 Workstations: 9 Laptops 1 Servers: 1 Physical Location (Either room numbers or if it's at a field site the name of the site): Jennings Admin Building Role(s) (i.e. Mail, Web Server, Print Server): File, Print, Application, NAV server CPU: Dell PowerEdge 2600 Dual Xeon Processors Storage Capacity: 400 GB OS: Windows 2000 Ownership: (GSA, Corps, Lease) Corps NAB Site: Raystown Lake RD 1, Box 222 Hesston, PA 16647-9227 Employees 41 Square Footage: 319654 Workstations: 18 Laptops 1 Servers: 1 Physical Location (Either room numbers or if it's at a field site the name of the site): Raystown Vistors Center Role(s) (i.e. Mail, Web Server, Print Server): File, Print, Application, NAV server CPU: Dual Xeon 2.4 GHz Processors, 3 GB RAM Storage Capacity: 400 GB OS: Win2K Ownership: (GSA, Corps, Lease) Corps NAB Site: Tioga-Hammond/Cowanesque Lakes RD 1, Box 65 Tioga, PA 16946 Employees 43 Square Footage: 71183 Workstations: 22 Laptops 3 Servers: 1 Physical Location (Either room numbers or if it's at a field site the name of the site): Vistors Center Role(s) (i.e. Mail, Web Server, Print Server): File, Print, NAV and Application Server CPU: Dell PowerEdge 2600 3.06 GHz Storage Capacity: 620 GB OS: Win2K3 Ownership: (GSA, Corps, Lease) Corps NAB Site: Susquehanna River Project Corps of Engineers 306 Railroad St. Rear (2nd Floor) Danville, PA 17821 Employees 5 Square</p>

Section	Paragraph	State Concern
		Footage:<tab><tab>1290<tab> Workstations:<tab>5<tab> Laptops<tab>3<tab><tab> Servers:<tab>0<tab><tab> Ownership: (GSA, Corps, Lease)<tab><tab><tab>Lease NAB Site:<tab><tab><tab> Almond Lake<tab><tab><tab> PO Box 400<tab><tab><tab> Hornell, NY 14843- 0400<tab><tab><tab> Employees<tab>3<tab><tab> Square Footage:<tab>

CENAB	Some field offices are missing. We believe the following CENAB locations should be added. The last 2 numbers in each row are Latitude/Longitude of the locations
	200 North Harrison Street<tab>Easton <tab>MD<tab>21601<tab>3<tab>38.77681<tab>-76.076937 401 East Louther Street<tab>Carlisle<tab>PA<tab>17013<tab>4<tab>40.20247<tab>-77.18042 1631 South Atherton Street<tab>State College<tab>PA<tab>16801<tab>7<tab>40.785504<tab>-77.83683 12th & water Street<tab>Washington<tab>DC<tab>20003<tab>8<tab>38.8736-76.9901 2603 Leahy Street<tab>Baltimore<tab>MD<tab>21230<tab>13<tab>39.2671<tab>-76.5805 NW of Tighlam Island<tab>Talbot Co<tab>MD<tab><tab>1<tab>38.77<tab>-76.38 RR Box 218A<tab>Franklin<tab>NY<tab>13775<tab>3<tab>42.3367<tab>-75.1529 2933 Markle Road<tab>York<tab>PA<tab>17403<tab>3<tab>39.914<tab>-76.766 PO Box 227<tab>Beech Creek<tab>PA<tab>16822<tab>4<tab>41.107<tab>-77.587 PO Box 143<tab>Forest City<tab>PA<tab>18421<tab>3<tab>41.6508<tab>-75.464 306 Railroad Street Rear<tab>Danville<tab>PA<tab>17821<tab>5<tab>40.9588<tab>-76.6105 PO Box 400<tab>Hornell<tab>NY<tab>14843<tab>3<tab>42.3269<tab>-77.6541 3848 Kettle Creek<tab>Renovo<tab>PA<tab>17764<tab>3<tab>41.3234<tab>-77.7701 PO Box 128<tab>Curwensville<tab>PA<tab>16833<tab>3<tab>40.944899-78.54 PO Box 706<tab>Whitney Point<tab>NY<tab>23862<tab>4<tab>42.323417<tab>-75.946548

CENAB_Facilities1 It appears that several facilities are not indicated . Example – the District HQ office building is not indicated and multiple military installation facilities that NAB occupies are not indicated.

Section	Paragraph	State Concern
	CENAB_Facilities2	communications Metrics portion of the page should not be in this location. Suggest deleting and inserting in appropriate location.
	CESPK	Many gaging locations are missing from the list of facilities.
	N/A	The Hydrologic Engineering Center (CEIWR-HEC) is not listed in the Facilities TE 4. Please add CEIWR-HEC below the CEIWR entry on the CEIWR_Facilities_V1.1 page. It's important that CEIWR-HEC be listed since the location and its GFE and staff are physically located on the other side of the country. Needed information is: Address: 609 Second Street; Davis, CA 95616 Square Feet: 10,180 Ownership: Privately owned leased by GSA Real Estate POC: John Doe, 402-221-8888 Narrative Description: 2nd floor of 609 Second Street; Davis, CA 95616
	RS232	IAM should be notified immediately of violations.
	RS269	Bid Solicitations must be delivered IMMEDIATELY upon receipt to Contracting Division. This is extremely important to avoid claims.
	SPD Section	Delete Moffett AFB under the facilities listed for CESPD. This site will be closed down July 05.
	TE-4	37.<tab>TE 4 Facilities – missing LRD Division Office information.
TE-5		Without the network diagram, I cannot determine how the PWS can accurately reflect the connectivity between all the Water Control sites (via LOS, telephone, GOES, etc) and District offices.
	RS-258	The 50%, 40%, and 30% acceptable deviations per lot are too high and unacceptable for the Honolulu District, and should instead be 3%, 1%, and 0% at most.
	TE-5	This TE is not available for comment? Delete any reference to SCADA, DCP, GPS, CWMS, Water Control, or Reservoir Control. Water Control is a unique mission with equipment and facilities that are exclusively used for real-time water and flood control to provide the information necessary to operate COE projects as required by the approved project Water Control Manual, Drought Contingency Plan, and Emergency Plan, and to provide for hydroelectric power, a historical record, meet environmental requirements, and prevent loss of property and life. This equipment and facilities are maintained, operated, and used by Engineers and Scientists not by IM personnel. If this equipment or facilities are included in this solicitation the potential for contract modification claims is nearly certain as a result of the cost and complexity of this additional work, and the SP may have to assume liability for loss of property and persons if they fail to provide information necessary for making critical decisions as required by Water Managers.

Section **Paragraph**
TE-6

State Concern

Data Collection Platforms (DCPs) must be excluded entirely from this PWS. The Corps Water Management System/Water Control Data System consists of much more than several UNIX/LINUS servers running some software. Data Collection Platforms are a critical part of those systems. The PWS fails to include any mention of DCP locations or types of equipment. IF the PWS intends to capture DCPs and CWMS, then the PWS must identify the myriad locations where DCPs are operated. Should DCP operation and maintenance be included in the final PWS, then potential bidders must have enough information to identify transit time to/from those sites as well as the complexity of the various equipment and technical knowledge required at each site. For example, MVD alone has more than 700 DCPs at various sites located between the Gulf of Mexico to the Canadian Border, each of which requires year-round operation and maintenance. The PWS fails to include any information on this type of equipment, the personnel qualifications required, or the locations.

Data Collection Platforms (DCPs) must be excluded entirely from this PWS. The Corps Water Management System/Water Control Data System consists of much more than several UNIX/LINUS servers running some software. Data Collection Platforms are a critical part of those systems. The PWS fails to include any mention of DCP locations or types of equipment. IF the PWS intends to capture DCPs and CWMS, then the PWS must identify the myriad locations where DCPs are operated. Should DCP operation and maintenance be included in the final PWS, then potential bidders must have enough information to identify transit time to/from those sites as well as the complexity of the various equipment and technical knowledge required at each site. For example, MVD alone has more than 700 DCPs at various sites located between the Gulf of Mexico to the Canadian Border, each of which requires year-round operation and maintenance. The PWS fails to include any information on this type of equipment, the personnel qualifications required, or the locations. Does this A76 initiative intend to include Water Control? Without local control and operation of DCP equipment costs for operating river gages will escalate considerably as both the SP and Hydrologic Technicians will have to BOTH visit the remote sites. This will significantly increase the cost of doing business.

N/A

The Hydrologic Engineering Center should be listed under IWR, for example: Institute for Water Resources (CEIWR), Alexandria, VA Hydrologic Engineering Center (CEIWR-HEC), Davis, CA Again, CEIWR-HEC is physically located on the other side of the country from CEIWR.

Section	Paragraph	State Concern
TE-7	NAD Location	All of CENAP sites are not shown on CENAD map. Please show sites 349, 74 & 2.
TE-8	N/A	<p>Many MOU/MOA/SLAs are missing for CENAB</p> <p>Please disregard earlier transmission of this section, dated 4 March 2005. Transmission sent in error. Thank you, Marilyn O. Sullen MVN</p> <p>WA/NAB MOU missing</p> <p>Seattle District has additional and updated agreements for copy machines that should replace the existing "CENWS Fed Source Agreement.pdf" and "CENWS FedSource Copier Order.pdf" These will be provided to the PWS team via e-mail.</p> <p>Recommend the MOU between COE and HQDA regarding CPACs be included. I can provide a copy if necessary.</p> <p>Some of the listed MOA/MOU/SLAs do not appear to have anything to do with IM/IT. Such as: CEMVN CAFE CEMVN CHILD CARE CEMVN LAO (Building Rental MOU/MOA)</p> <p>The Reservoir Regulation MFR with the National Weather Service/Oxnard is not included in the MOU matrix for CESPL.</p> <p>MOU with Letterkenny Area Depot missing</p> <p>The Hydrologic Engineering Center CEIWR-HEC has an MOU with CEEIS for network connectivity.</p> <p>Training Requirement. need to list training requirements for: Freedom of Information Officer (FOIA) Records Manager COMSEC Custodian VI Specialists Photographer Acquisition Training if SP will do acquisitions</p> <p>This TE defers to Section C to identify skill and knowledge requirements. However, Section C provides in only the very BROADEST terms the necessary requirements. Nowhere in Section C or other documents is there any mention of the numbers/types of data servers, databases, web servers, proprietary software and myriad other systems/equipment/software to be managed. How is one to really determine the knowledge and capabilities actually required?</p> <p>Why are specific experience and education requirements included?</p>

Section Paragraph

State Concern

Federal Acquisition Circular 2001-01, Item IX, Section 813 prohibits the use of minimum experience or education requirements for contractor personnel in solicitations for the acquisition of information technology services, unless (1) the contracting officer first determines that the needs of the agency cannot be met without such requirement; or (2) the needs of the agency require the use of a type of contract other than a performance-based contract.

Positions subject to mandatory drug testing should probably specify pre-employment and random Who, if anyone, approves the personnel- why collect the resumes?

There are no personnel qualifications listed for providing CWMS/WCDS, DCP, LRGS, DRGS, NOAAPORT, or other water management capabilities associated with operating and maintaining data collection platforms or the CWMS AIS. Without those qualifications, the package fails to provide necessary services essential for one of the Corps' primary missions.

Section Paragraph

State Concern

We would like the PWS to address continuing training. The GSA ANSWER contract has a provision that reads as follows that we believe captures this requirement, and would like it added to the PWS: H.15 Training of Contractor Employees The contractor is responsible for providing training to ensure task order requirements are met and to keep personnel current on leading edge and state-of-the-art technologies and methods. Within each contract year, on average, a minimum of 40 hours per year of technical training will be provided to all full-time personnel billed as skill-levels described in Section C*, assigned to this contract to maintain their technical knowledge as current and up-to-date. At least eighty percent of this training must be in technologies directly related to task performance. The cost of such training, including tuition and labor, shall not be directly chargeable to the Government. Necessary non-local travel associated with training, will be reviewed, and if appropriate paid for by the Government. Only hours of attendance at a symposium or conference, formal training in a classroom environment by bona fide instructors, or Computer Based Training (CBT) are creditable under this provision. CBT for which Continuing education Units (CEUs) are credited shall be considered as formal classroom training. At least 60% of this training must be conducted as formal classroom training or CBT with associated CEUs. The Government may provide additional training at its discretion. In those cases where the Government has provided training, comparable training for replacement personnel will be provided at contractor expense. Training provided by the Government will not be credited toward the forty-hour requirement.

POH Comment: This provision has proven very useful when deploying new technologies. In the past few years, our contractors have been trained on the administration of the Dell EMC SAN, Active Directory, Windows 2003, SharePoint Portal

Mandatory training required of the SP should be added to this TE to include the following: Consideration of Others (4 hours annually) Safety (4 hours annually) Prevention of Sexual Harassment (1 hour annually) Violence in the Workplace (1 hour annually) Anti-Terrorist Force Protection (1 hour annually) Project Management Business Process (varies) Computer Security (1 hour annually) Ethics (1 hour annually) ISO

Criteria, skills and knowledge required for Project Managers and CIO office staff functions are not given.

Section	Paragraph	State Concern
	2	SP personnel must have the education, professional certifications/licenses, training, and degrees required for the technical work. A review of qualifications required of current staff should be made and similar requirements placed in the Scope of Work. We must require a bachelors degree or specialized experience related to the particular functional area or occupation in order to ensure a minimum level of expertise for technical work. An engineering background is also necessary for personnel modifying technical applications such as the Corp's Engineering Automated Information Systems and Numerical Modeling applications
	Project Managers,	Technical Exhibits: This paragraph requires resumes for key personnel including project managers. PWS Section C.1.6.1 Program Manager(s) and Key Personnel states in paragraph 1, "The SP shall provide onsite program manager(s) at each installation as shown in Figure 1 during normal operating hours." (The paragraph appears to use the terms program manager and project manager interchangeably.) PWS Figure 1 includes 59 installations in scope (counting each of the 7 ERDC labs as a separate installation). The SP may want to hire incumbent experienced individuals with knowledge of each installation to fill these positions and therefore may be unable to provide these resumes in the proposal. This requirement precludes the SP from hiring incumbent experienced individuals with knowledge of each installation to serve in this position. Requiring this number of resumes is unusual and unlikely to benefit USACE. We recommend that key personnel be limited to the most senior leadership positions including the overall SP IMIT program manager and the senior managers responsible for managing service delivery across the IMIT program.
	Project Managers,	Technical Exhibits: This paragraph defines key personnel as including "SP leads for each of the major areas identified in Section C5." This statement implies an organizational structure for the SP that follows the structure of PWS Section C5. Organizing to follow the structure of PWS Section C5 may not facilitate the SP's ability to deliver quality service at the lowest price. We recommend that USACE not impose any organization structure on the SP and that the SP have the maximum flexibility to leverage experience and best practices in structuring the delivery organization. This paragraph could be reworded to state "SP leads responsible for delivering services identified in Section C5".
	Security Clearance	Security Clearance first paragraph Add at end of paragraph: "At a minimum, all IT users will have a National Agency Check and Inquiry (NACI).

TE-9

State Concern

What happens when the Tier-3 vendor cannot resolve the problem. Is it held against the SP as a performance measure?

How does the SLA matrix incorporate current/future standard support needs for AWS workers and other after-hours requirements?

Many employees perform potentially important (maybe critical) work during non standard business hours, plus AWS workers may be expected to perform work when offices are closed. Is the intent to maintain support capability to meet these and other current/future needs?

May the offerors propose an alternative set of SLAs?

The priority levels are good. However, I see nothing that indicates which priorities are assigned to which systems.

It is not clear who decides what Service Level each "system" requires. This may vary from District to District, and can vary depending on the season. Furthermore, it appears that the escalation is within the SP. Since the acronym CGO is not defined (I assume that is a Senior Gov't Officer), it is not clear who is notified. In many instances, the end-user will benefit from being included in a reporting scheme. This will reduce the number of incident reports filed for a given situation, and allow the SP to respond to the problem, not those reporting the problem.

(1) I am concerned about a possible lack of on-site support to resolve IT problems. It appears to me that Tier I response is a helpdesk, with no requirement that that be at the District seeking help; Tier 2 consists of specialized internal experts, which I take to mean internal to the Contractor, again with no requirement that this be a resource physically available to the District seeking help; and Tier 3 is made up of things like MicroSoft helpdesk. This is NOT equivalent to present IT support and will frequently prove insufficient to timely/effectively resolve District needs. (2) It appears that for all but "emergency" needs involving actual safety issues, the fastest response time that can be insisted upon is 3 days (for "critical" items resolution time is said to be 12 hours, however the Matrix refers to escalating the matter after 2 days if is not resolved). Again, this is so far from current District IT support as to be ridiculous and will frequently be unacceptable. While no "safety" issues are involved, a Corps or DOJ attorney in the midst of discovery or litigation may need a same day response/assistance, for example. No doubt there are countless other examples. A broader definition of "critical" is needed, and a shorter turn-around than 3 days is required.

Section Paragraph

State Concern

1. te-9 are the sentences in the definitions of emergency, critical, non-critical, and scheduled connected by implied and's or implied or's? if they're implied and's, i don't think i've never dealt with any issue that would qualify as critical. is that how they want it to be? is there going to be something somewhere about the volume of after hours calls? maybe there should be a requirement to have staff on site whenever any site, anywhere, is having its business day.

Times stated for response at all levels is inadequate and poorly written. Time for an on-site RESPONSE (not notification) should be less than 1 hour for priority 1, less that 4 hours for Priority 2, etc. Escalation to higher tier should not be delayed by 24 hours for Priority 1, or by 2 days for priority 2. The PWS fails to identify which critical systems, such as CWMS/WCDS, are in each priority classification. The potential bidders do not have sufficient information to provide accurate estimates.

It appears that many District-level IT problems/issues would fall into the non-critical category allowing the SP up to 3 days for resolution. This would constitute a significant downgrade over current resolution times, at least in Philadelphia.

Define Grave, Substantial & Minimal

In Tech Exhibit 9, priorities are defined and response standards detailed. I question whether many circumstances of life, health, safety, or property is threatened or affected. This would make nearly every request a priority 3, providing an allowable three day problem resolution for most problems. Tell me what District Commander is going to go without anything working for 3 days? A more prudent definition of Priority one might be an outage affecting multiple users, or a District Commander and above. Priority two might state an outage affecting a single user, or a slowdown affecting multiple users. A priority 3 might be a problem affecting a single user. A priority 4 could then be routine or scheduled work such as software or hardware installations.

What is the guaranteed service level associated with the desktop and associated applications?

A mechanism to request or require upgrading priority level must be addressed. Recommend provision be made to allow for priority level upgrade in response time for X% of services based on site COTR concurrence.

Section Paragraph

State Concern

Should not tell the SP how to structure their service level tiers. Response requirements are not reasonable for all parts of the infrastructure; why would the same response be required for a data entry clerk's PC that is required for an enterprise level server. Response and resolution requirements should be specified individually for most of the requirements described in TE 1; not covered by this single blanket specification.

definition of Priority 1, 2, etc. undefined? I don't see the link between this and the rest of document WA needs Emergency Level-public health impact

Service Level Tier 2 does not list any computer specialists (hardware and software support).

The service level matrix lists priority service levels more on a global level than a local level. End users are going to want to know when to expect someone to assist them when their computer will not boot, etc. As written they would receive "scheduled" service if no-one's life or health would be affected. This type of service is not acceptable and could cost the government a lot of money if employees are unable to work due to a computer or network issue on the local level. I feel that the priority levels should be addressed and more specific information added for the local level. Most of the standards include "no later than the assigned completion date". I could not find a table showing what timeframes someone is expected to perform under.

This reference was also found in other locations: Presently, users are normally (90% of the time) are responsible to input their own service requests. This exhibit seems to put the onus on helpdesk staff. While I acknowledge that when users can not access a helpdesk system, they should call the helpdesk to log the issue, it would seem to put an unneeded burden on IM. Recommend re-evaluating this scheme.

Who decides what service level to assign to a call? Assignment could be highly subjective based on definitions of "grave", "substantial" and "minimal"

: TE9 – Service

Technical Exhibit 9: Up to 3 days resolution for Priority 3 (Non-critical) problems is much poorer service than now delivered. Current level of service for 90% of computer end-user problems in 24 hours of the call. Overall this matrix requires a lower level of service than IMO now offers.

Section	Paragraph	State Concern
	9 Service Level	<p>TE-9 - GENERAL COMMENTS: 1. Clarify intended use for TE-9, e.g., Helpdesk versus user request response time. Is it intended to address all IT mission areas? 2. There is no reference in the parent document that identifies the application, intended use, standards, etc., and how they integrate with the rest of the documents. 3. The flow path for service request is never documented in this document except for HelpDesk activities. Should they be approved by the COTR? 4. Is there a government approval process for service requests? 5. Does TE-9 apply to all service requests? If NOT, it should be stated. 6. There should be a customer requirements escalation process for changes in priority. 7. Customer can escalate 1% of service requests as needed based on COTR approval. 8. Note: Other than Automation and Communications PRS descriptions, the other mission area descriptions do not tie back directly to TE-9. 9. There is no provision for onsite labor under any condition.</p>
	All	<p>The distinction of categories of the "Priority of Service Levels" is vague and subjective. Who and how will it be determined that a loss of IM/IT service threatens, could affect or does not affect life, health, safety or property? The distinction is significant because it defines the contractors availability (24x7 vs 8x5) and problem resolution which will impact USACE productivity. For example, if an employee in Emergency Mgmt has a PC or phone problem would this always be critical since their response to emergency concerning life, health, safety or property "could be effected"? In addition it could be considered that most of our individual employee day-to-day problems would be considered "Non-Critical". A 3day problem resolution would severely impact most employees' productivity and would be a decrease in present service.</p>
	Response,	<p>The technical escalation time for a Priority 2 incident to Tier 3 is indicated as 2 days which is longer than the required resolution time. Recommend that the time for escalation to Tier 3 be changed to 8</p>
	TE9	<p>For emergency priority calls, the Tier 2 should escalate to Tier 3 no later than 24 hours. This means all commercial maintenance agreements must be funded to support 24x7x365 support levels.</p>