

**Appendix D: Sample Manufacturing and Quality Assurance
Request for Proposal Input**

**Sample Manufacturing and Quality Assurance
Request for Proposal Input**

Office of the Under Secretary of Defense for Research and Engineering

2021

Developed in coordination with Air Force Life Cycle Management Center and industry representatives following the 2017 Defense Manufacturing Conference Manufacturing and Quality Roundtable, which identified the need for more consistent manufacturing and quality contracting approaches across the Department of Defense.

Contents

Introduction.....	D-3
1. Core SOW Inputs	D-5
1.1. Manufacturing Management Program	D-5
1.2. Quality Management System Requirements.....	D-5
1.3. Manufacturing Readiness Levels and Assessments (MRLs).....	D-6
1.4. Quality and Manufacturing Metrics.....	D-6
1.5. Counterfeit Parts Prevention	D-7
1.6. First Article Inspections (FAI)/First Article Tests (FAT).....	D-7
1.7. Government Industry Data Exchange Program (GIDEP) Participation	D-8
1.8. Production Readiness Review (PRR)	D-8
2. Other SOW Requirements to Consider	D-9
2.1. Aviation Critical Safety Items (CSIs).....	D-9
2.2. Manufacturing Modeling and Simulation.....	D-9
2.3. Calibration	D-10
2.4. Configuration Management	D-10
2.5. Risk Management	D-10
2.6. Parts, Materials, and Processes Control Program	D-10
2.7. Environmental Stress Screening	D-11
2.8. Key Characteristics and Variation Reduction.....	D-11
2.9. Advanced Product Quality Planning (APQP) & Production Part Approval Process (PPAP)	D-11
3. Suggested Section L and M inputs.....	D-12
3.1. Instructions to Offerors Guidance (Section L):	D-12
3.2. Evaluation Criteria Guidance (Section M):	D-12
4. FAR/DFARS Clauses	D-14
4.1. Higher Level Quality Requirements	D-14
4.2. Counterfeit Parts Prevention.....	D-14
4.3. First Article Approvals	D-14
4.4. Contract Administration Functions.....	D-14
4.5. Labor Relationships	D-14
4.6. Government Property.....	D-15
4.7. Records Retention.....	D-15
4.8. Contractor Debarment, Suspension, and Ineligibility.....	D-15
Acronyms.....	D-16
Bibliography	D-20

Introduction

This document provides examples for Manufacturing and Quality Request for Proposal (RFP) inputs, including the Statement of Work (SOW), Sections L and M for competitive acquisitions, and Federal Acquisition Regulation (FAR)/Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation (DFAR) requirements.

The Core SOW requirements should be used on all Acquisition Category (ACAT) I programs. They may be used on other programs but should be tailored as needed to match the scope and needs of each program. For all of the requirements and other inputs in this guide, program team with input from manufacturing and quality specialist should conduct specific tailoring to ensure requirements are appropriate to meeting the unique needs and circumstances of each program.

If possible, developing contractual requirements should be a collaborative process between the government program office and the prime contractor.

Data Item Descriptions (DIDs):

- Prior to using a DID, ensure the most current version is being referenced.
- Use caution when calling out DIDs: Some requirements in the SOW do not have DIDs that directly correspond to them. In those cases, the closest, related DID is suggested. In other cases, some DIDs may be significantly outdated. They were provided to serve as a potential starting point and may need to be tailored. These will be discussed in each section, if applicable.

Manufacturing and Quality RFP Guide Summary Applicability Matrix

The following table is provided for general guidance only. Specific determinations of program and contract applicability should be made on a case-by-case basis.

All requirements are applicable to land, sea, air, and space-based systems. The only exception is for Aviation Critical Safety Items, which are applicable only to air and space systems.

Where checkmarks are shown, that requirement should be considered for inclusion in a SOW. Requirements may still be tailored to meet program needs.

Appendix D: Sample M&Q Assurance RFP Input

Manufacturing and Quality Input to RFP

Manufacturing/Quality RFP Inputs	MSA	TMRR	EMD	P&D	O&S	Design Change	NDI/COTS
Core SOW Inputs							
Manufacturing Management Program		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	
Quality Management System Requirements		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Manufacturing Readiness Levels and Assessments (MRLs)	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Quality and Manufacturing Metrics		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Counterfeit Parts Prevention		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
First Article Inspections/First Article Tests			✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
GIDEP Participation			✓	✓	✓	✓	
Production Readiness Review			✓	✓		✓	✓
Other SOW requirements to consider							
Aviation Critical Safety Items		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	
Manufacturing Modeling and Simulation		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	
Calibration			✓	✓	✓	✓	
Configuration Management		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	
Risk Management		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	
Parts, Materials, and Processes Control Program		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	
Environmental Stress Screening		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	
Key Characteristics and Variation Reduction		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	
Advanced Product Quality Planning (APQP) & Production Part Approval Process (PPAP)			✓	✓	✓	✓	

1. Core SOW Inputs

1.1. Manufacturing Management Program

The contractor shall establish and maintain a Manufacturing Management Program that meets the requirements of SAE AS6500A and flow this requirement down to major/critical suppliers. The contractor shall document this program as part of their Manufacturing Plan. The contractor shall include its plans for Production Readiness Reviews (PRRs) and Manufacturing Readiness Level (MRL) Assessments in the Manufacturing Plan.

Suggested Data Item Description (DID):

- DI-MGMT-81889B, Manufacturing Plan

Guidance:

1. Major and critical suppliers are defined in AS6500A:

Critical Supplier: A contractor whose performance could seriously jeopardize the successful achievement of a program's cost, schedule, technical, or supportability requirements if not satisfactorily managed (e.g., a sole source supplier or supplier of critical parts, strategic and critical materials, or unique or special processes.)

Major Supplier: A supplier, distributor, vendor, or firm that furnishes supplies or services to or for the prime contractor whose total costs are a significant portion of the total purchased value for the program.

2. While the requirement for a manufacturing management system is applicable during the TMRR phase, it may be too early to require a deliverable manufacturing plan.

3. The DID for a Manufacturing Plan, DI-MGMT-81889B, was updated to be consistent with AS6500A.

1.2. Quality Management System Requirements

The contractor shall establish and maintain a Quality Management System (QMS) that meets the requirements of AS9100. The quality system shall ensure delivery of product that complies with all technical requirements. The Contractor shall document how the QMS is implemented with any unique requirements within the Quality Assurance Program Plan. Major/critical suppliers and suppliers with design authority shall be required to establish and maintain a Quality Management System (QMS) in accordance with requirements of AS9100. Suppliers without design authority shall be compliant to SAE AS9003, Inspection and Test Quality System, as a minimum.

Suggested DID:

- DI-QCIC-81794A, Quality Assurance Program Plan, contractor format acceptable

Guidance:

- 1. AS9100 is the preferred requirement for a Quality Management System for ACAT I programs in Aviation, Space, and Defense Organizations. The Federal Acquisition Regulation, Part 46, also recognizes overarching quality management system standards such as ISO 9001, ASQ/ANSI E4; ASME NQA-1, SAE AS9003, and ISO/TS 16949. If applying any of these other standards, ensure they are appropriate to the complexity and criticality of the product.*
- 2. The most recent version of AS9100 (or equivalent standard) shall be specified.*
- 3. While the requirement for a quality management system is applicable during the TMRR phase, it may be too early to require a deliverable quality plan.*

1.3. Manufacturing Readiness Levels and Assessments (MRLs)

The contractor shall conduct assessments of manufacturing readiness in accordance with AS6500A and use the definitions, criteria, and processes defined in the Manufacturing Readiness Level Deskbook as a guide. Assessments will be conducted at the locations and frequencies specified in Appendix TBD. They will be led by the government program office at the prime contractor's facilities. The prime contractor shall lead the assessments at suppliers and include government participants. The selection of supplier assessments should be determined by the government and prime contractor using the MRL Deskbook, Section 4.3 as a guide. The contractor shall develop and implement Manufacturing Maturation Plans or their equivalent for criteria in which the MRL is lower than the target MRL. The contractor shall monitor and provide status at all program reviews for in-house and supplier MRLs and shall re-assess MRLs in areas for which design, process, source of supply, or facility location changes have occurred that could impact the MRL.

Suggested DIDs:

- DI-SESS-81974, Assessment of Manufacturing Risk and Readiness
- DI-ADMIN-81249B, Conference Agendas
- DI-ADMIN-81250B, Conference Minutes
- DI-MISC-80508B, Technical Report – Study/Services

Guidance:

- 1. Ensure DIDs are current and appropriate.*

1.4. Quality and Manufacturing Metrics

In accordance with AS6500A, the contractor shall maintain a manufacturing surveillance process. The contractor shall submit quality and manufacturing metrics at the agreed upon frequency that report the contractor's and major/critical suppliers' performance and progress. Metrics shall include cost, schedule, and quality metrics to monitor the effectiveness of the contractor's manufacturing, quality, and supplier management programs. Metrics shall be

presented at design, technical, and program management reviews. The contractor shall provide on-line access of these metrics to the government.

Suggested DIDs:

- DI-QCIC-82323, Manufacturing and Quality Assurance Status Report

Guidance:

- 1. Tailor the list of metrics in the DID to meet your specific program needs.*
- 2. On-line access to contractor metrics may be desired, but not feasible. Discuss this with the prime contractor before including this as a requirement.*

1.5. Counterfeit Parts Prevention

The contractor shall develop and implement a Counterfeit Parts Prevention (CPP) program in compliance with SAE AS5553 and AS6174 to prevent the inclusion of counterfeit parts or parts embedded with malicious logic into products intended for sale to the Government. These requirements shall be flowed to suppliers to ensure requirements are met. As part of CPP, the contractor shall make available to the government Certificates of Conformance (CoC) as well as supply chain traceability for all electronic part purchases.

Suggested DID:

- DI-MISC-81832, Counterfeit Prevention Plan

Guidance:

- 1. The RFP could request the elements of DI-MISC-81832 be included in the contractor's Program Protection Implementation Plan (PPIP), DI-ADMN-81306. Another good reference source is SAE-AS6081; Parts, Electronic, Fraudulent/Counterfeit: Avoidance, Detection, Mitigation, and Disposition.*
- 2. The DID may be significantly out of date. Review for appropriateness prior to use.*

1.6. First Article Inspections (FAI)/First Article Tests (FAT)

The contractor shall establish an FAI/FAT process and perform FAIs/FATs on new and modified product in accordance with AS9102, "Aerospace First Article Inspection Requirement." First article inspections shall be conducted on new products representative of the first production run and when changes occur that invalidate the original results (e.g., engineering changes, manufacturing process changes, tooling changes). The contractor shall notify the Government program office, and designated representative(s) of first article inspection events to allow for participation. An FAI/FAT report shall be generated for each product as evidence that the engineering requirements have been met.

Suggested DIDs:

- DI-NDTI-81307A, First Article Qualification Test Plan and Procedures
- DI-NDTI-80809, Test/Inspection Report

Guidance:

1. The DIDs may be out of date or not related exactly to the SOW requirement. Review for appropriateness prior to use.

2. Applicability to O&S phase is based on new designs, suppliers, or other changes.

1.7. Government Industry Data Exchange Program (GIDEP) Participation

The contractor shall implement procedures and processes for their participation in GIDEP, including the submission of alerts/advisories to GIDEP when warranted. The processes and procedures shall describe how the contractor (a) receives alerts and advisories from GIDEP and other sources, (b) determines any impact to their product design and already manufactured hardware, (c) implements corrective action procedures when design and/or produced hardware are affected, and (d) includes supplier participation.

Suggested DID:

- DI-QCIC-80125B, Government Industry Data Exchange Program (GIDEP) Alert/Safe-Alert Report
- DI-QCIC-80126B, Government Industry Data Exchange Program (GIDEP) Alert Response

1.8. Production Readiness Review (PRR)

The contractor shall perform PRRs in support of the Milestone C/FRP Decision in accordance with IEEE 15288.2. These requirements shall be flowed to the contractor's major and critical suppliers.

Suggested DIDs:

- DI-ADMIN-81249B, Conference Agendas
- DI-ADMIN-81250B, Conference Minutes
- DI-MISC-80508B, Technical Report – Study/Services

Guidance:

1. The requirement for a PRR is a Core requirement for contracts that will result in a Milestone C or FRP Decision

2. Ensure deliverable plans, minutes, etc., are not already required in another section of the SOW for technical reviews and audits. Ensure DIDs are compatible with IEEE 15288.2 requirements, if imposed.

2. Other SOW Requirements to Consider

2.1. Aviation Critical Safety Items (CSIs)

The contractor shall identify, establish and manage aviation CSIs using the Joint Aeronautical Logistics Commanders (JALC) Critical Safety Item Management Handbook and SAE AS9017, “Control of Aviation Critical Safety Items,” as guides. The contractor shall develop a list of Critical Safety Items, their Key or Critical Characteristics (KCs/CCs), and associated Critical Manufacturing Processes. The contractor shall identify, measure and reduce variability of KCs/CCs and provide a formal method to manage and monitor all critical processes associated with CSIs. The contractor shall flow requirements to the lowest level of the supply chain.

Suggested DIDs:

- DI-SAFT-81932, Critical Safety Item (CSI) / Critical Application Item (CAI) List
- DI-SAFT-80970A, Critical Safety Item, Characteristic and Critical Defect Report

Guidance:

1. Requirements for CSI management should be balanced against the costs.
2. The DIDs may be out of date. Review for appropriateness prior to use.

2.2. Manufacturing Modeling and Simulation

The contractor shall analyze manufacturing processes using Modeling & Simulation (M&S) techniques to identify potential bottlenecks or constraints and confirm the achievability of planned cycle times, etc., and provide the government access to the model and data. The model should use commercially available simulation software used to evaluate scenarios and impacts of process variabilities, plant optimizations, production rate changes, capacity planning, and estimate required quantities of tooling, personnel, and inventory. The contractor shall update the production simulation model for facility modifications and other significant changes.

Suggested DID:

DI-MISC-80508B, Technical Report – Study/Services

Guidance:

1. While AS6500A requires the use of Modeling & Simulation, this additional requirement should be imposed if the government program office needs to obtain the contractor’s manufacturing model(s) as a deliverable item. This would enable the program office to conduct independent capacity and schedule assessments and to better identify risks independently from the contractor.
2. The DID may be out of date. Review for appropriateness prior to use.

2.3. Calibration

The contractor shall maintain a calibration system in accordance with ANSI/NCSL Z540.3. The calibration system shall control the accuracy of measuring and test equipment, and measurement standards, used to ensure that products delivered to the Government comply with all contract technical specifications. The calibration system shall prevent inaccuracy by ready detection of deficiencies and timely positive action for their correction. Contractors who operate and maintain calibration laboratories or subcontract to outside calibration laboratories shall ensure compliance with requirements of ISO/IEC 17025:2017, General Requirements for the Competence of Testing and Calibration Laboratories.

2.4. Configuration Management

The contractor shall establish, document, and maintain a Configuration Management (CM) system for control of all configuration documentation, physical media, and physical parts representing or comprising the product, which includes all hardware, software, and firmware. The contractor's configuration management system shall consist of these elements:

- a. Configuration management and planning.
- b. Configuration identification.
- c. Configuration change management.
- d. Configuration status accounting.
- e. Configuration audit.
- f. Configuration management of digital data.

The contractor may use MIL-HDBK-61A as additional guidance for CM.

Guidance:

1. Applicability during TMRR should be determined on a case-by-case basis. Consult Configuration Management Subject Matter Experts for guidance.

2.5. Risk Management

The contractor shall establish and maintain a risk management program to continuously identify, analyze, mitigate, monitor, and report systems engineering process, product, technology, cost, schedule, and other program risks. Risk management process results shall be used for continual improvement and risk reduction. Program risks must be assessed and managed at the appropriate level. The contractor shall establish and maintain risk management programs consistent with the DoD Risk, Issue, and Opportunity Management Guide for Defense Acquisition Programs.

2.6. Parts, Materials, and Processes Control Program

The contractor shall establish, document, and maintain a Parts, Materials, and Processes Control Program (PMPCP) to ensure selection and use of parts, devices, and materials, including commercial and non-developmental items, meet specified performance, quality, reliability, safety, supportability, and configuration management requirements throughout the life cycle of

the system. The program shall include provisions for mitigating the impact of counterfeit parts and parts obsolescence on product integrity.

The contractor shall flow down applicable PMPCP requirements to applicable lower-tier suppliers.

The contractor may use SD-22, MDA-QS-003-PMAP, MIL-STD-3018, or SMC Standard SMC-S-009 as additional guidance for control of Parts, Materials, and Processes.

Suggested DID:

- DI-MGMT-81949, DMSMS Implementation Plan

2.7. Environmental Stress Screening

The contractor shall implement an Environmental Stress Screening (ESS) program to surface defects by stressing the item without degrading its inherent reliability. Environmental stresses (i.e., thermal cycling and random vibration) may be applied in sequence or in combination, with the intent of stimulating hardware defects. The ESS program should not be used to simulate an operational environment. Results of ESS shall be used to continually improve manufacturing processes. The contractor may use MIL-HDBK-344 as additional guidance for planning, controlling, and measuring the effectiveness of the ESS program.

Guidance:

1. Imposing ESS requirements should be a joint determination by engineering, manufacturing, Quality, and Reliability functional experts. Consider using ESS on major and critical suppliers of electrical, electronic, electro-optical, electromechanical or electrochemical components in demonstration & validation, engineering & manufacturing development and production phases.

2.8. Key Characteristics and Variation Reduction

The contractor shall identify Key Characteristics and implement a Variation Reduction program in accordance with AS9103.

2.9. Advanced Product Quality Planning (APQP) & Production Part Approval Process (PPAP)

The contractor shall implement APQP and PPAP programs in accordance with AS9145.

3. Suggested Section L and M inputs

3.1. Instructions to Offerors Guidance (Section L):

1. Manufacturing Readiness Level Demonstration. The offeror's proposal shall identify those elements (systems, subsystems, suppliers, and/or processes) being assessed for manufacturing risk and their current Manufacturing Readiness Levels using the criteria and process identified in the Manufacturing Readiness Level Deskbook (Link <http://www.dodmrl.com>). The contractor shall describe the approach used to assess the MRLs. For any element that is assessed to be below the target MRL of 'X', the offeror shall identify the current MRL and the plan to achieve the target MRL.

(Note: DFARS Subpart 215.304 requires that the manufacturing readiness of offerors be considered during source selection for ACAT I programs.)

2. Manufacturing Plan. The offeror shall describe:

- a. How their manufacturing management system meets the requirements of AS6500A.
- b. The major assembly sequence chart and anticipated manufacturing process flow.
- c. The manufacturing build schedule, including drawing release; tooling design, build, and proofing; key supplier deliveries; and fabrication, assembly, and delivery schedules.
- d. Facility requirements and layouts.
- e. The offeror's plans to provide the needed manpower, facilities, and equipment for expected delivery rates.

3. Quality Systems. The offeror shall describe how their quality system assures product quality; achieves stable, capable processes; prevents defects; and employs effective methods for conducting root cause analyses and implementation of corrective actions.

4. Supplier Management. The offeror shall describe their:

- a. Approach to selecting and managing key suppliers.
- b. Processes for integration of key supplier activities into the overall program plan to assure that supplier activities support the overall program performance.
- c. Specific supplier risks to the program and plans for mitigating those risks.
- d. Plan for preventing the intrusion of counterfeit parts in factory equipment and delivered products.

3.2. Evaluation Criteria Guidance (Section M):

1. Manufacturing Readiness Level Demonstration. The offeror's proposal will be evaluated on the maturity of their proposed manufacturing capability, the adequacy of their supporting documentation to justify this capability, and the adequacy of the offeror's process and plans to achieve the target MRL as described in the Manufacturing Readiness Level Deskbook.

This sub-factor is met when the offeror's proposal identifies the elements being assessed for manufacturing readiness and their current MRLs. As described in the proposal, the offeror's

MRL assessment process is consistent with the MRL Deskbook. For elements that are below the target MRL, the proposal describes an achievable plan to meet the target MRL.

2. Manufacturing Plan. This sub-factor evaluates the proposed methods, schedules, and resources for producing the required products. This sub-factor is met when the offeror's proposal:

- a. Describes how their manufacturing management system meets the requirements of AS6500A.
- b. Describes the major assembly sequence and manufacturing process flows.
- c. Includes an integrated, achievable schedule incorporating design, tooling, supplier, fabrication, assembly, and delivery milestones.
- d. Describes facility requirements and layouts.
- e. Describes achievable plans to provide the needed manpower, facilities, and equipment for expected delivery rates.

3. Quality Systems. This sub-factor evaluates the offeror's planned quality assurance system. This sub-factor is met when the offeror's proposal describes policies and practices that will:

- a. Assure product quality.
- b. Achieve stable, capable processes.
- c. Prevent defects.
- d. Result in effective root cause analyses and corrective actions.

4. Supplier Management. This sub-factor evaluates the offeror's proposed supplier management program. This sub-factor is met when the offeror's proposal:

- a. Describes how key suppliers are selected and managed.
- b. Describes how supplier activities will be integrated into the overall program plan.
- c. Lists specific supplier risks and achievable plans for mitigating those risks.
- d. Describes effective plans for preventing the intrusion of counterfeit parts in factory equipment and delivered products.

4. FAR/DFARS Clauses

Although the Contracting Officer is ultimately responsible for applying the appropriate FAR and DFARS clauses to the contract, the following sections address topics relevant to the Manufacturing and Quality function. Manufacturing and Quality Subject Matter Experts should be familiar with the requirements of these sections and offer their support and recommendations to the Contracting Officer.

4.1. Higher Level Quality Requirements

FAR Part 46, “Quality Assurance,” prescribes the use of various FAR clauses that address quality and inspection requirements, depending upon the nature of the contract. For critical or complex items, clause 52.246-11 must be included in the contract. This clause requires the identification of a specific higher-level contract quality standard. Section 46.202-4 lists examples, such as ISO 9001 and AS9100. The Manufacturing/Quality Subject Matter Expert should work with the Contracting Officer to ensure the appropriate clause is included in the contract and the appropriate higher-level quality requirement is included in 52.246-11.

4.2. Counterfeit Parts Prevention

DFARS 246.870-3 prescribes the use of clauses 252.246-7007, “Contractor Counterfeit Electronic Part Detection and Avoidance System,” and 252.246-7008, “Sources of Electronic Parts” when procuring electronic parts or end items that contain electronic parts.

4.3. First Article Approvals

FAR Subpart 9.3 governs First Article Testing and Approval and describes when this testing is required. When it is required, Subpart 9.3 requires either FAR clause 52.209-3 for contractor testing or 52.209-4 for government testing.

4.4. Contract Administration Functions

FAR Subpart 42.302, “Contract Administration functions,” lists the activities performed by the Contract Administration Office (typically DCMA.) Manufacturing & Quality-related functions include activities such as performing production surveillance and status reporting, conducting pre-award surveys, monitoring industrial labor relations, ensuring contractor compliance with contractual quality assurance requirements, and reviewing waivers and deviations.

4.5. Labor Relationships

FAR Part 22 describes the government’s policies and practices regarding labor relations at contractor facilities. Subpart 22.103-5 prescribes the use of Clause 52.222-1 to require the contractor to notify the government of labor disputes.

4.6. Government Property

FAR Part 45 governs the use of government property. Subpart 45.107 prescribes the use of Clause 52.245-1 when government property is being used.

4.7. Records Retention

FAR Subpart 4.7 governs records retention. Many Manufacturing and Quality-related items, such as receiving and inspection reports, purchase orders, and quality control and inspection records must be retained for four years.

4.8. Contractor Debarment, Suspension, and Ineligibility

FAR Subpart 9.4 discusses reasons that contractors may not be allowed to obtain government contracts. This includes limitations on subcontracting (Subpart 9.405-2). Most contracts must include Clause 52.209-6 that protects the government's interests when subcontracting with debarred (or soon to be debarred) or suspended suppliers.

Appendix D: Sample M&Q Assurance RFP Input

Acronyms

3D	Three-Dimensional
A _o	Operational Availability
AAF	Adaptive Acquisition Framework
AFRL	Air Force Research Laboratory
AM	Additive Manufacturing
AoA	Analysis of Alternatives
ASR	Alternative Systems Review
CARD	Cost Analysis Requirements Description
CBA	Capabilities-Based Assessment
CCTD	Concept Characterization and Technical Description
CDD	Capability Development Document
CoI	Community of Interest
CONOPS	Concept of Operations
COTS	Commercial Off-the-Shelf
Cpk	Process Capability
CSI	Critical Safety Item
CTE	Critical Technology Element
DARPA	Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency
DID	Data Item Description
DCMA	Defense Contract Management Agency
DTIC	Defense Technical Information Center
DE	Digital Engineering
DFARS	Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement
DFMA	Design for Manufacturing and Assembly
DFMEA	Design Failure Modes and Effects Analysis
DIU	Defense Innovation Unit
DMSMS	Diminishing Manufacturing Sources and Material Shortages
DoD	Department of Defense
DoDD	DoD Directive
DoDI	DoD Instruction
DP	Development Planning
DTRAM	Defense Technical Risk Assessment Methodology
EMD	Engineering and Manufacturing Development
ESOH	Environment, Safety, and Occupational Health
FFRDC	Federally Funded Research and Development Center
FMEA	Failure Modes and Effects Analysis
FOC	Full Operational Capability
FRP	Full-Rate Production
GAO	Government Accountability Office

Appendix D: Sample M&Q Assurance RFP Input

GFE	Government Furnished Equipment
GOTS	Government off-the-shelf
IB	Industrial Base
IBA	Industrial Base Assessment or Industrial Base Analysis
ICA	Industrial Capability Assessment
ICD	Initial Capabilities Document
IMP/IMS	Integrated Master Plan/Integrated Master Schedule
IoT	Internet of Things
IIoT	Industrial Internet of Things
IOC	Initial Operational Capability
IPT	Integrated Product Team
ISO	International Organization for Standardization
IT	Information Technology
ITRA	Independent Technical Risk Assessment
JCIDS	Joint Capabilities Integration and Development System
KC	Key Characteristic
KPP	Key Performance Parameter
KSA	Key System Attribute
LCSP	Life Cycle Sustainment Plan
LRIP	Low-Rate Initial Production
M&S	Modeling and Simulation
M&Q	Manufacturing and Quality
ManTech	Manufacturing Technology
MBE	Model-Based Engineering
MBSE	Model-Based Systems Engineering
MCA	Major Capability Acquisition
MDA	Milestone Decision Authority
MDAP	Major Defense Acquisition Program
MDD	Materiel Development Decision
ME	Mission Engineering
MFA	Manufacturing Feasibility Assessment
MOE	Measure of Effectiveness
MOP	Measure of Performance
MOS	Measure of Suitability
MOSA	Modular Open Systems Approach
MTBF	Mean Time Between Repair
MTTR	Mean Time To Repair
MMP	Manufacturing Maturation Plan
MRA	Manufacturing Readiness Assessment
MRL	Manufacturing Readiness Level

Appendix D: Sample M&Q Assurance RFP Input

MS A	Milestone A
MS B	Milestone B
MS C	Milestone C
MSA	Materiel Solution Analysis
MS&T	Manufacturing Science and Technology
MTA	Middle Tier of Acquisition
NDAA	National Defense Authorization Act
NEPA	National Environmental Policy Act
NIST	National Institute of Standards and Technology
NRL	Naval Research Laboratory
NTIB	National Technology and Industrial Base
O&S	Operations and Support
OT	Operational Technology
OT&E	Operational Test and Evaluation
PDR	Preliminary Design Review
PESHE	Programmatic Environmental, Safety, and Occupational Health Evaluation
PFMEA	Process Failure Modes and Effects Analysis
PM	Program Manager or Program Management
Ppk	Process Performance
PPP	Program Protection Plan
Pre-MDD	Pre-Materiel Development Decision
P&D	Production and Deployment
PRR	Production Readiness Review
QA	Quality Assurance
QMS	Quality Management System
R&D	Research and Development
RAM	Reliability, Availability and Maintainability
RCO	Rapid Capability Office
RCT	Requirements Correlation Table
RFP	Request for Proposal
RIO	Risk, Issue, and Opportunity
ROI	Return on Investment
SBIR	Small Business Innovation Research
SE	Systems Engineering
SEMP	Systems Engineering Management Plan
SEP	Systems Engineering Plan
SETR	Systems Engineering Technical Review
SFR	System Functional Review
SME	Subject Matter Expert
SRD	System Requirements Document

Appendix D: Sample M&Q Assurance RFP Input

SRR	System Requirements Review
STTR	Small Business Technology Transfer
S&T	Science and Technology
TAPP	Technology Area Protection Plan
T&E	Test and Evaluation
TEMP	Test and Evaluation Master Plan
TMRR	Technology Maturation and Risk Reduction
TPM	Technical Performance Measure
TRA	Technology Readiness Assessment
TRL	Technology Readiness Level
UCA	Urgent Capability Acquisition
WBS	Work Breakdown Structure

Appendix D: Sample M&Q Assurance RFP Input

Bibliography

Resources related to the guide are listed below and contain links to the referenced document. As many of these resources are revised frequently, readers are advised the documents may change or may be updated, replaced, or cancelled. Readers may need to conduct an Internet search to find the most recent version.

- 10 USC 2440, DFARS Subpart 207.1, Technology and Industrial Base Plans.
<https://www.govinfo.gov/app/details/USCODE-2011-title10/USCODE-2011-title10-subtitleA-partIV-chap144-sec2440>
- 10 USC 2448b, Independent Technical Risk Assessments.
<https://www.govinfo.gov/content/pkg/USCODE-2016-title10/html/USCODE-2016-title10-subtitleA-partIV-chap144B-subchapIII.htm>
- 10 USC 2503, Analysis of the Technology and Industrial Base.
<https://www.govinfo.gov/app/details/USCODE-2011-title10/USCODE-2011-title10-subtitleA-partIV-chap148-subchapII-sec2503>
- 10 USC 2521, Manufacturing Technology Program.
<https://www.govinfo.gov/content/pkg/USCODE-2010-title10/pdf/USCODE-2010-title10-subtitleA-partIV-chap148-subchapIV-sec2521.pdf>
- 48 CFR 252.204-7012, Safeguarding Covered Defense Information and Cyber Incident Reporting.
<https://www.law.cornell.edu/cfr/text/48/252.204-7012>
- Acquisition Process/Acquisition Strategy, Defense Acquisition University.
www.acqnote/acquisitions/acquisition-strategy
- Adaptive Acquisition Framework, Defense Acquisition University.
<https://aaf.dau.edu>
- Air Force Digital Campaign—Contracting Approaches (AFMC)
<https://wss.af.mil/af/aficmc> (request user account and password)
- Air Force Materiel Command (AFMC), Development Planning Guide, June 17, 2010.
- Analysis of Alternatives, Defense Acquisition University.
www.acqnote/acquisitions/analysis-of-alternatives
- Analysis of Alternatives (AoA) Handbook, Office of Aerospace Studies, August 2017.
<https://afacpo.com/AQDocs/AoAHandbook.pdf>
- CJCS. Manual for the Operation of the Joint Capabilities Integration and Development System (JCIDS Manual), Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, J-8, October 30, 2021.
- CJCSI 3100.01E, Joint Strategic Planning System, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, May 21, 2021.
- CJCSI 5123.01I, “Charter of the Joint Requirements Oversight Council (JROC) and Implementation of the Joint Capabilities Integration and Development System (JCIDS),” Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, J-8, October 30, 2021.
- DCMA-INST-3401, Defense Industrial Base Mission Assistance.
<https://www.dcma.mil/Portals/31/Documents/Policy/DCMA-INST-3401.pdf>
- Defense Technical Risk Assessment Methodology (DTRAM) Tier 0-1 Criteria.
<https://ac.cto.mil/wp-content/uploads/DTRAM-0-1.pdf>
- Design for Manufacturing and Assembly (DFMA).
<https://www.dau.mil/cop/pgm/DAU%20Sponsored%20Documents/DFMA%20new.doc>

Appendix D: Sample M&Q Assurance RFP Input

- DFARS Clause 207.106, "Additional Requirements for Major Systems."
- DFARS Clause 252.204-7012, "Safeguarding Covered Defense Information and Cyber Incident Reporting."
- DoD Digital Engineering Body of Knowledge, February 2022.
<https://www.dodtechipedia.mil/dodwiki/pages/viewpage.action?pageId=760447627>
- DoD Digital Engineering Strategy, Office of the Under Secretary of Defense for Research and Engineering, June 2018.
https://ac.cto.mil/wp-content/uploads/2019/06/2018-Digital-Engineering-Strategy_Approved_PrintVersion.pdf
- DoD Directive 4200.15, "Manufacturing Technology (ManTech) Program," October 15, 2018.
- DoD Directive 5137.02, "Under Secretary of Defense for Research and Engineering, USD(R&E)," July 15, 2020.
- DoD Directive 5000.01, "The Defense Acquisition System," September 9, 2020.
- DoD Handbook 5000.60H, "Assessing Defense Industrial Capabilities," April 1996.
- DoD Instruction 4245.15, "Diminishing Manufacturing Sources and Material Shortages Management," November 5, 2020.
- DoD Instruction 5000.02, "Operation of the Adaptive Acquisition Framework," January 23, 2020.
- DoD Instruction 5000.60, "Defense Industrial Capabilities Assessments," July 2014.
- DoD Instruction 5000.67, "Prevention and Mitigation of Corrosion on DoD Military Equipment and Infrastructure," August 2018.
- DoD Instruction 5000.80, "Middle Tier of Acquisition," December 2019.
- DoD Instruction 5000.81, "Urgent Capability Acquisition," December 2019.
- DoD Instruction 5000.83, "Technology and Program Protection to Maintain Technological Advantage, Change 1," May 21, 2021.
- DoD Instruction 5000.85, "Major Capability Acquisition," August 6, 2020.
- DoD Instruction 5000.88, "Engineering of Defense Systems," November 18, 2020.
- DoD Manual 4245.7-M "Transition from Development to Production," September 1985.
<https://apps.dtic.mil/dtic/tr/fulltext/u2/a303209.pdf>
- DoD Manufacturing and Quality Body of Knowledge, January 2021 (or latest version).
<https://www.ac.cto.mil/maq/>
- DoD Risk, Issue, and Opportunity Management Guide for Defense Acquisition Programs, Office of the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for Systems Engineering, January 2017.
- DoD Systems Engineering Plan (SEP) Outline, Version 4.0, Office of the Under Secretary of Defense for Research and Engineering, September 2021.
<https://ac.cto.mil/erpo/>
- Engineering of Defense Systems Guidebook, Office of the Under Secretary of Defense for Research and Engineering, February 2022.
<https://ac.cto.mil/erpo/>
- GAO Report 09-665, Analysis of Alternatives, September 2009.

Appendix D: Sample M&Q Assurance RFP Input

GAO Report 20-48G, Technology Readiness Assessment Guide: Best Practices for Evaluating the Readiness of Technology for Use in Acquisition Programs and Projects, January 2020.

<https://www.gao.gov/assets/710/703694.pdf>

IEEE 15288.2, Standard for Technical Reviews and Audits on Defense Programs, July 7, 2015.

Independent Logistics Assessment Guidebook, Defense Acquisition University, July 2011.

<https://www.dau.edu/tools/t/Logistics-Assessment-Guidebook>

Independent Technical Risk Assessment (ITRA) Resources, Office of the Under Secretary of Defense for Research and Engineering.

<https://ac.cto.mil/itra/>

Manufacturing Maturation Plan (See MRL Deskbook). MRL Working Group.

<http://www.dodmrl.org>

Manufacturing Readiness Level (MRL) Deskbook. MRL Working Group.

<http://www.dodmrl.org>

The Measures Handbook. Office of Aerospace Studies, Kirtland Air Force Base, August 2014.

MIL-HDBK-727, Design Guidance for Producibility.

MIL-HDBK-896, Department of Defense Handbook Manufacturing Management Program Guide.

Mission Engineering Guide, Office of the Under Secretary of Defense for Research and Engineering, November 2020.

<https://ac.cto.mil/erpo/>

NAVSO P-3687, Producibility Systems Guidelines, December 1999.

http://everyspec.com/USN/NAVY-General/NAVSO_P-3687_8510/

NIST SP 800-171 Rev 2, Protecting Controlled Unclassified Information in Non-Federal Systems and Organizations, February 2020.

Reliance 21 Operating Principles: Bringing Together the DoD Science and Technology Enterprise. Defense Science and Technology, January 2014. https://defenseinnovationmarketplace.dtic.mil/wp-content/uploads/2019/08/Reliance_21_Op_Principles_Jan_2014.pdf

SD-26, Defense Standardization Program Office DMSMS Contract Language Guidebook, October 2019.

https://quicksearch.dla.mil/qsDocDetails.aspx?ident_number=283456

Systems Engineering Guidebook, Office of the Under Secretary of Defense for Research and Engineering, February 2022.

<https://ac.cto.mil/erpo/>

Technology Readiness Assessment (TRA) Guidance. Assistant Secretary of Defense for Research and Engineering, April 2011.