Kronos Program

Family of Systems (FoS)

Commercial Solutions Opening (CSO)

Dated

01 July 2026

Record of Revisions

Revision	Description	Date
Initial Release 1.0	Establishment of CSO 1.0 and Opens 1st Call	12 Nov 2025
Amendment	Admin Changes	02 Dec 2025
Initial Release 2.0	Establishment of CSO 2.0	01 July 2026

Table of Contents

1. INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND 4
2. PURPOSE 4
3. CSO APPROACH 4
4. GENERAL INFORMATION 5
5. SUBMISSION INFORMATION 6
6. ADDITIONAL INFORMATION 7

ATTACHMENT 1: PHASE 1 – Initial Submission 9

ATTACHMENT 2: PHASE 2 – TECHNICAL AND PRICE PROPOSAL 12

ATTACHMENT 3: REVIEW, EVALUATION AND SELECTION PROCESS 17

ATTACHMENT 4: AREAS OF INTEREST (AOI) 20

Focus Area Statements (FAS) 20

1. INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND

1.1 Space Systems Command (SSC), through its Kronos Program of Record, is issuing a Commercial Solutions Opening (CSO) in accordance with Revised Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement (R-DFARS) 212.70, Defense Commercial Solutions Opening, 10 U.S.C. §4022 - "Authority of the Department of Defense to carry out certain prototype projects," and 10 U.S.C. §4023 - "Procurement for Experimental Purposes." Under the Kronos Family of Systems (FoS) CSO, the Government may award proposals received in response to a general solicitation to acquire innovative products, technologies, or services based on a review of solutions by scientific, technological, or other subject matter expert peers within the program management office (PMO). "Innovative", for CSO purposes and in accordance with (IAW) 10 U.S.C. § 3458 and R-DFARS 212.70, means any new technology, process, or method, including research and development (R&D), or any new application of an existing technology, process or method, that is new as of the date of the submission of a proposal . The Government may award FAR-based or Other Transaction Agreement (OTA) awards as a result of this CSO. All awards under this CSO will be treated as commercial.

1.2 The Government is interested in a broad range of solutions spanning from foundational cloud computing services to mission-specific software applications and software development services to include, but are not limited to:

- Advanced cloud-native services
- Scalable and secure platform solutions
- Agile software development methodologies and tooling
- Mission-driven C2 applications
- Data integration, management, and visualization capabilities
- Artificial intelligence (AI), machine learning (ML), and decision-support tools
- Cybersecurity and zero-trust architectures

This CSO seeks to identify and leverage cutting-edge innovations that can enhance the scalability, flexibility, interoperability, and resiliency of the Kronos program in alignment with the evolving operational needs of the US Space Force (USSF) Command and Control (C2) mission.

2. PURPOSE

2.1 This CSO is a competitive solicitation under R-DFARS 212.70. It is focused on identifying and acquiring innovative technologies and services to support the mission of the PMO. The Government seeks commercial innovative solutions (prototypes only) that could fulfill requirements, close capability gaps, and provide potential technological advancements. The Government's Areas of Interests (AOIs) are outlined in Attachment 4.

3. CSO APPROACH

3.1 The Government encourages proposals that span a wide spectrum of possible technical

and business solutions in response to the specific AOIs. Each AOI will identify the interest for an individual program requirement or a broadly defined interest area covering a range of program requirements. The Government anticipates releasing a staggered set of Calls for each AOI, notionally in accordance with the corresponding announcement. Offerors may submit solutions in response to any open Call; however, the Government will only review submissions received during the submission period identified in the applicable Call. When issuing a Call under this CSO, the Government may provide none, one or more focus areas within the scope of a specific AOI to address emerging mission needs. The Government will evaluate solutions submitted in response to a Call based on the AOI and any focus areas identified in that Call. The Government may retain submissions for future consideration under subsequent Calls, subject to the terms of this CSO. Unless otherwise specified, all submissions received in response to a Call will be governed by the terms and conditions of this CSO.

3.2 The Government may utilize Artificial Intelligence (AI) as a tool to assist in the review and evaluation of proposals. AI will be used to support human evaluators in assessing proposals against the evaluation criteria established in the CSO documentation.

3.3 The Government anticipates making award(s) primarily using OTA authority. Where appropriate, the Government may also award FAR-based contracts. If FAR-based contracts are used, fixed-price type contracts are anticipated; incentives may be considered when supported by risk analysis.

3.4 Upon favorable review and evaluation, the Government may choose to award an OTA for Prototype phase as deemed appropriate for the transaction. The Agreements Officer will negotiate directly with the Offeror on the terms and conditions of the OTA, including payments, and will execute the OTA on behalf of the Government.

3.5 Upon completion of the prototype phase and fulfilling the defined criteria, the Government reserves the right to transition to a follow-on production phase without further competition as authorized under 10 U.S.C. § 4022(f). The decision to proceed with a follow-on production award will depend on the results of the prototype and the availability of funding. A follow-on production award is not guaranteed.

3.6 Awards resulting from this CSO will be made based on the process described in Attachment 3. The Government reserves the right to fund all, some, one, or none of the Phase 2 proposals submitted. The Government may elect to fund only part of a submitted proposal and may incrementally fund any or all awards under this CSO. All awards are subject to the availability of funds.

3.7 All coordination and communication between Offerors and the Government will be conducted as specified in Section 4.

4. GENERAL INFORMATION

4.1 *POINT OF CONTACT:*

4.1.1 CSO & AOI General Questions – General CSO Questions may be sent via email to the CSO Technical Team at SSC.BMZ.SYD85@spaceforce.mil . Due to the large amount of expected interest in this CSO, and to maintain a written record of questions, this is the only email address that will be used for general question communication.

The following shall be utilized in the email subject line: **(AOI X) Kronos CSO General Question(s)**.

4.2 *CLASSIFIED INFORMATION:* All Phase 1 and 2 submissions shall be unclassified.

For Phase 2 submissions, offerors should possess all required personnel security clearances, facility clearances, and other infrastructure requirements necessary to perform any proposed classified work in accordance with the draft Contract Security Classification Specification (DD Form 254) without reliance on Government resources.

As a wide variety of responses, as well as potential awards of diverse scope and associated classified classification levels under this CSO are possible, the Government will provide award specific security details for individual award actions as required. A draft DD Form 254 will be provided with a Phase 2 request for proposal, as necessary.

5. SUBMISSION INFORMATION

5.1 *SUBMISSION OVERVIEW:* This CSO establishes a rolling competitive solicitation framework for SSC. The Government may amend this document to set up Call(s). A Call sets the acceptance window to submit solutions against specific AOI(s) and, if applicable, the AOI's focus area. The Government may update, delete, or add AOIs by amending this CSO document.

- The Government will not reimburse companies for the costs associated with submissions for any phase.
- Submissions for all phases shall be sent electronically. Hardcopies for any phase will not be accepted.
- Offerors shall mark each page of the Phase 1, Phase 1B and Phase 2 submissions that contain proprietary information.

5.2 *TWO PHASED SUBMISSION PROCESS:* This CSO will be conducted in two phases. Phase 1 is structured to provide the Government with an initial Call for Solutions while Phase 2 captures proposal submission. The Government reserves the right to select none of the submissions.

5.2.1 Phase 1 Submissions: Phase 1A submissions will be sent to the CSO email org box by the date and time specified in the Call. If invited for Phase 1B, those submissions will be scheduled by the Government and may be conducted either by email or by a video teleconference meeting. Any documentation from Phase 1B shall be sent to the Government through DoD SAFE.

5.2.2 Phase 2 – Technical and Price Proposal: Phase 2 submissions will be submitted to the PCO/AO in accordance with the submission procedures outlined in the request for proposal. Phase 2 proposals will only be accepted from Offerors who, upon review of Phase 1 submission, have received a request from the PCO/AO to submit a full proposal (Technical and Price). Proposals

shall not be submitted to the general questions email address.

6. ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

6.1 *DATA RIGHTS:* It is the Government's intention to acquire only Technical Data, Computer Software, and Computer Software Documentation data rights necessary to satisfy agency needs. For FAR-based contracts, the Government will follow R-DFARS 252.227-7989. For OTAs, the Government will negotiate data/IP rights consistent with OTA authority.

6.2 *FOREIGN PARTICIPATION:* Foreign participation may be considered subject to export control restrictions (ITAR/EAR), national security considerations, and disclosure of any foreign ownership, control, or influence (FOCI). The research and test data produced under a resultant contract or agreement may contain Military Critical Technology List (MCTL) information whose export is restricted by Export Control Act (Title 22, U.S. Sec 2751, et seq.) or the Export Administration Act of 1979, as amended (Title 50, U.S.C., App. 2401, et seq.). Request certification and registration from the Defense Logistics Services Center (DLSC), Federal Center, 74 North Washington, Battle Creek, MI 49016-3412 as soon as possible.

6.3 *NON-GOVERNMENT ADVISORS:* In order to review submissions resultant from any phase, PROPRIETARY information may be given to Federally Funded Research and Development Centers (FFRDC), Systems Engineering and Technical Assistance (SETA), Systems Engineering and Integration (SE&I), and/or Advisory and Assistance Services (A&AS) contractors working for the Government. The non-Government advisors will have signed a non-disclosure agreement with the Government prior to reviewing submissions.

6.4 *PROCUREMENT INTEGRITY, STANDARDS OF CONDUCT, ETHICAL CONSIDERATIONS, AND CONFLICTS OF INTEREST:* All offerors shall fill out the attached Organizational Conflict of Interest (OCI) Mitigation Plan Checklist and include a plan as applicable.

6.5 *OFFEROR FEEDBACK:* For FAR-based contracts, the Government may provide debriefings in accordance with RFO 52.212-1(e). It will not include a comparison of submissions against a common Performance Work Statement (PWS) or Statement of Work (SOW) as the CSO provides no common PWS or SOW that interested parties must respond to and instead represents opportunity for submission of a variety of innovative commercial items, technologies, and/or services that represent meaningful submissions of diverse scope and price. For OTAs, the Government may provide summary feedback after each phase at the Government's discretion consistent with OTA authority.

6.6 *GOVERNMENT FURNISHED PROPERTY (GFP) AVAILABILITY:* GFP is not anticipated to be made available under any resulting contract or agreement, but a determination regarding GFP will be made for each award. In accordance with RFO

45.201(b), the contractor is responsible for all costs related to making the property available for use, such as payment of all transportation, installation, or rehabilitation costs.

6.7 *NETWORK ACCESS AND CLASSIFIED INFRASTRUCTURE:* Support will be determined for each award for testing, validation, and deployment and demonstration purposes.

ATTACHMENT 1: PHASE 1 – Initial Submission

PHASE 1: OVERVIEW BRIEFING

The function of Phase 1 is to receive initial solutions for the respective AOIs from potential offerors. Each Offeror shall submit their plans to provide an innovative solution addressing the specific AOI described in Attachment 4. The following Quad Chart must be included as the first content slide in the Phase 1 overview briefing submission. Quad Charts shall not exceed 1-page in landscape view and must follow the formatting guidelines on the slide template below. Any slides in addition to the 1-page Quad Chart will not be reviewed. All fonts must be Times New Roman ≥12pt. File size must not be greater than 10MB. Submissions shall be provided in PDF or PPT format.

UNCLASSIFIED

Company – Solution Title

Objective: Clear, concise (1-2 sentences) description of the goal of the effort. Which AOI is this addressing (≥ 12pt fount)	**Solution Approach:** Describe the approach to the proposed solution
Description of Effort: Brief description of the solution or capability's technology, process, or method. *Must describe how this capability is innovative.* (≥ 12pt fount)	**State of Solution:** Description of the current state of solution or technology proposed (e.g., technology maturation or technology readiness level). (≥ 12pt fount)
Benefits: Brief statement that identifies the advantages of proposed solution in relation to the AOI it is addressing. (≥ 12pt fount)	**Major Milestones to Capability Delivery (FY):** Bulleted list must include major milestones and anticipated delivery dates of functioning capability (≥ 12pt fount)
Integration Strategy: Describe integration strategy/approach for the proposed solution (≥ 12pt fount)	

UNCLASSIFIED

PHASE 1A – WHITE PAPER FORMAT

1. The White Paper narrative expands on the overview briefing and must be 8.5 x 11 inches with one-inch margins, no longer than five pages, single-spaced, with text in Times New Roman, and no smaller than 12-point font. Each Offeror shall describe their plans to provide an innovative solution to the individual AOI.

2. The White Paper shall contain a cover sheet containing the following information. The cover sheet will not count against the page limitation.

   (a) CSO number, AOI number, and AOI name
   (b) Project Title
   (c) Full company name and address
   (d) CAGE code
   (e) Unique Entity ID number
   (f) Business Size Classification (large, small, or other) and respective NAICS
   (g) Current Facilities Clearance Level

3. White Papers must be submitted electronically as a PDF not exceeding a file size of 10 MB. Pages exceeding the page limitation will not be read or reviewed.

4. The White Paper should provide sufficient information on the technical approach being submitted to allow for review by a technical expert. Expand as deemed necessary on the following sections of the overview briefing: Objective; Description of the Effort; Benefits of the Proposed Approach; Technical Challenges; Solution Approach; Explanation of how the solution is innovative (see below); Eligibility for OTA per statute; State of Solution; Major Milestones by Government fiscal year and month. Offeror must also disclose any foreign ownership, control, or influence (FOCI). Do not include corporate or personnel qualification, past experience or any supplemental information not requested.

5. Innovation: The White Paper must contain an opening statement that answers the following questions on how the solution is innovative:

   a. How is the proposed solution innovative? Describe the original thinking, new application of existing technology, or novel concepts, approaches, methods or capabilities that differentiate the solution from other alternatives.
   b. Has this proposed solution been submitted to any part of the Government before and if so when?
   c. Is the proposed solution currently available to the Government through a procurement mechanism? (e.g. Grant, Contract, Agreement) If so, what are those current Government mechanisms and what are their associated agencies?

PHASE 1B – PITCH SESSION AND FORMAT*

1. Offerors may be invited to a Pitch Session to expand upon the proposed concept/technology/solution. The Pitch Session is intended to have a free exchange of information and questions between the Government and the Offeror about the proposed solution. The format of the Pitch Session may be through a virtual teleconferencing (VTC) meeting or through email requesting the Offeror to send a demonstration video. The Offeror will be allowed up to 30 minutes to display a demonstration video of the proposed solution. The Government will provide additional time if needed for follow-up questions. The Government will define the technical parameters of the demonstration video when the Government sends the invitation for Phase 1B to the Offeror.

2. During the Pitch Session, Offerors shall address Government's preliminary/after-demonstration questions and provide additional detail regarding the proposed solution. The Government's questions may clarify or expand on Phase 1A's submission to include broader topics necessary for the Government to evaluate Government interest and technical validity (feasibility, integration, and risk). All Government's questions, comments, or interactions during Phase 1B are non-binding, exploratory, and provided solely to support the Government's evaluation. No statements, questions, or feedback shall be construed as direction, commitment, or an obligation to solicit, award, negotiate, or otherwise proceed with the Offeror.

***Note: The Government reserves the right to forgo a Phase 1B pitch session and go directly to Phase 2.**

ATTACHMENT 2: PHASE 2 – TECHNICAL AND PRICE PROPOSAL

The Phase 2 proposal submission shall conform to the following:

1. Cover Sheet: The following information shall be contained in a cover sheet submitted with the proposal:

(a) CSO number, AOI number, and AOI name
(b) Full company name and address
(c) CAGE code
(d) Unique Entity ID number
(e) Business Size Classification (large, small, or other) and NAICS
(f) Offeror's socioeconomic status
(g) Point of contact, name, title, phone number, and email address
(h) Current Facility Clearance Level

2. Technical Approach: The following describes the technical approach requirements:

(a) The Technical Approach shall describe the background and objectives of the proposed work, the approach, deliverables, the resources needed to execute, and additional details of data rights assertions. Include the nature and extent of the capability and how it addresses the AOI, the innovative aspect of the solution, the intended results, and address possible integration or testing needs. Include ancillary and operational considerations such as certifications, algorithms, and any engineering/software development methodologies to be used. Provide a graphic display of major program milestones. Measurable milestones should capture key activity points and should be clearly articulated and defined in time relative to the start of the effort. Submissions may refer to previously submitted information from Phase 1.

(b) Government Support Required: Identify the type of support, if any, the Offeror requests of the Government in general, such as facilities, equipment, data, and information or materials.

(c) The Government reserves the right to ask for additional technical information in the Phase 2 request for proposal.

(d) Due to the varying AOIs and potential solutions, Technical Proposal page limitations and formatting will be identified in Phase 2 request for proposal.

3. Statement of Work (SOW): The following describes the SOW requirements:

(a) The SOW must be a separate and distinct document suitable for incorporation into a contract or agreement. The SOW shall conform with the Department of Defense Handbook for Preparation of a SOW, MIL-HDBK-245E. It must be a separate and distinct document suitable for incorporation into a contract or agreement. Pages should be numbered and provide line numbers. The initial page should have a date (document date) shown under the title. Proprietary information should not be included in the SOW.

(b) The proposed SOW must accurately describe the work to be performed. The SOW must also contain a summary description of the technical methodology as well as the task descriptions, but not in so much detail as to make the SOW inflexible. The SOW should

include the following sections:

1. *OBJECTIVE:* This section is intended to give a brief overview of the project and should describe why the work is being pursued and what the Offeror intends to accomplish.

2. *SCOPE:* This section includes a statement of what the SOW covers. This should describe the AOI to be investigated, goals, and for the effort. Provide a graphic display of major program milestones.

3. *BACKGROUND:* The Offeror must identify appropriate documents that are applicable to the effort to be performed. This section includes any information, explanations, or constraints that are necessary to understand the project tasks and requirements. This section should describe the effort's relationship to previous and ongoing efforts, if applicable.

4. *TASKS AND TECHNICAL REQUIREMENTS:* This section contains the detailed description of tasks that are necessary to perform the proposed work. These tasks will represent the work to be performed in any potential contract or agreement award, and, thus, shall be considered contractually binding. This section should be developed in an orderly progression and presented in sufficient detail to establish the feasibility of accomplishing the overall program goals. The Government reserves the right to modify and negotiate the language in the SOW prior to any potential contract or agreement award.

    4.1. Task descriptions must be definite, realistic, and clearly stated. Use the phrase "the contractor shall" whenever the work that is a mandatory obligation. Use "should" or "may" whenever it is necessary to express work that is aspiration or not compulsory.

    4.2. Do not use acronyms or abbreviations without first defining them. Place abbreviations and acronyms in parentheses following the first usage of the spelled-out phrase.

(c) Due to the varying AOIs and potential solutions, SOW page limitations will be identified in the Phase 2 request for proposal.

4. Price Volume: The following describes the Price submission requirements:

(a) The Price submission must include pricing information sufficiently detailed for meaningful evaluation of the proposal. The Price Proposal does not have a page limit restriction. For FAR-based contracts, since all proposals ae considered commercial items, technologies, or services, the requirements of the Truthful Cost or Pricing Data Act are not applicable. However, if the Contracting Officer determines additional information is necessary to support a determination of a fair and reasonable price, other than certified cost and pricing data may be requested. For OTAs, Agreement Officer must ensure the Government pays a price that is reasonable relative to scope, risk, and market conditions. Data rights are

negotiated separately and not evaluated as price.

(b) The responsibility for providing adequate supporting data and attachments lies solely with the Offeror. Further, the Offeror also bears the burden of proof in establishing reasonableness of proposed prices; therefore, it is in the Offeror's best interest to submit a fully supportable and well-prepared price proposal.

(c) The Offeror shall prepare the Price submission to include an electronic version of the pricing model in a Microsoft (MS) Excel editable format. The electronic pricing model shall include active formulas demonstrating the mathematical calculation of the proposed price.

(d) The Offeror shall propose milestone phases, key deliverables, due dates, exit/acceptance criteria and payment amounts within their submitted milestone schedule. The Offeror shall include all key deliverables and sub-deliverables as identified in the Attachment 4 MPS template. Milestone payments may vary by month based on completion of priced tasks and/or deliverables. The Government will accept no more than one invoice per month. Offerors shall structure milestones to align with a monthly invoicing cadence while ensuring appropriate performance assurance.

5. Additional Proposal Submission Content:

(a) Small Business Subcontracting Plan: If FAR-based contract is indicated by the Government and the offeror is other than small business, offerors shall submit either an individual subcontracting plan and/or master subcontracting plan (if available) in accordance with RFO 52.219-9 Small Business Subcontracting Plan (Deviation Date) and R-DFARS 252.219-7997 Small Business Subcontracting Plan (Test Program) (Deviation 2026-O0037) with their Phase 2 proposal. The Offeror's small business subcontracting plan shall include, but is not limited to, details regarding the commitment/targets for each category of small business, veteran-owned small business, service-disabled veteran-owned small business, small, disadvantaged business, HUBZone, and women-owned small business concerns. The plan shall describe for each category the total value subcontracted expressed in dollars and percentage of total subcontracted value if an individual subcontracting plan. The plan shall also state the extent and nature of work to be performed by small business concerns, the method used to develop goals, the method used to locate potential suppliers, if the goals include indirect costs (if so, describe the cost allocation method) and describe the efforts the Offeror will make to assure small businesses have an equitable opportunity to compete for subcontracts. The plan shall also provide the name and duties of the contractor's subcontracting plan administrator.

If the Small Business Subcontracting Plan is not initially acceptable, the Contracting Officer may request additional information regarding the Small Business Subcontracting Plan.

(b) Organizational Conflict of Interest: Regardless of whether FAR-based contract or OTA, the Offeror shall perform an Organizational Conflict of Interest (OCI) analysis and submit the results of that analysis as part of the Offeror's Phase 2 proposal. Specifically, the Offeror shall analyze the planned acquisition for actual or potential OCI situations associated with the Offeror or any of the Offeror's proposed teammates or subcontractor's performance under any

contract or agreement the Offeror or the Offeror's teammates or subcontractors has been or may be awarded by any federal agency or other entity. The Offeror shall describe in detail the methodology used to identify actual or potential OCI issues. If the Offeror identifies any actual or potential OCIs with respect to the performance of the Offeror or the Offeror's subcontractors or teammates, the contractor shall provide an OCI Mitigation Plan to be incorporated as an attachment to any resulting contract or agreement. Any proposed avoidance or mitigation techniques shall be consistent with RFO 9.5.

(c) Responsibility: For FAR-based awards, the Offeror shall provide information that presents a brief verifiable self-assessment in the areas of responsibility as described in RFO 9.104 (Deviation Date) as supplemented by R-DFARS. Elements of responsibility to address include but are not limited to, management of government property, capability, resources, competency, capacity, credit, integrity, perseverance, tenacity, and limitations on subcontracting. For OTA awards, the Offeror shall provide similar information to aid the Government in the assessment of responsibility.

For FAR-based awards, the inability to perform in compliance with the limitations of subcontracting clause RFO 52.219-14 (Deviation Date) is a matter of responsibility for small businesses. The Contracting Officer will follow the Small Business Administration Certificate of Competency procedure at RFO 19.204 when a small business concern would otherwise be selected for award but is considered not responsible.

For OTA awards, it is the offeror's responsibility to affirmatively demonstrate in its proposal that the proposed transaction is compliant with the statutory requirements. The proposal must clearly identify and provide supporting rationale for one of the following eligibility pathways:

Pathway 1: Significant Participation by NTDC or Small Business

If the offeror asserts that it meets the requirement through the significant participation of a Nontraditional Defense Contractor (NTDC) or a small business, the proposal must:

- Identify the Participant(s): Clearly name the specific NTDC(s) or small business(es) (whether the prime or a subcontractor).
- State the Status: For each entity identified, state its status (e.g., NTDC, Small Business, Veteran-Owned Small Business, etc.). For NTDC status, the proposal must affirm that the entity has not performed any contract subject to full Cost Accounting Standards (CAS) coverage for at least one year prior to RPP's issuance.
- Justify "Significant" Participation: Provide a detailed narrative explaining why the participation is significant. The justification should focus on the importance of the contribution, such as:
  - Supplying a key technology, component, or capability;
  - Causing a material reduction in cost or schedule or an increase in performance; or
  - Providing a novel application of existing technology.

Pathway 2: Minimum One-Third Cost Contribution

If the offeror is a traditional defense contractor proposing to meet the requirement through cost-sharing, the proposal must:

- Explicitly State the Commitment: Clearly state that the offeror will provide a cost contribution of at least one-third (33.33%) of the total prototype project cost.
- Detail the Cost Share: Provide a breakdown of the total project cost, identifying the Government's share and the offeror's share. The offeror's contribution may be in cash or in-kind (e.g., labor, materials, facilities), but if in-kind, it must be auditable and directly relevant to the project.

Failure to clearly address and substantiate one of these pathways in the proposal may render the submission ineligible for award of an OTA.

(d) Space Contractor Responsibility Watchlist (CRWL): In accordance with Section 1601 of the National Defense Authorization Act (NDAA) for FY 2025 (P.L. 118-159) and DAFGM2025-63-01, the PCO/AO may not award a contract to a contractor included on the CRWL without making a determination of responsibility and obtaining the approval of the SAF/SQ. A contractor that has been notified that it has been added to the CRWL may respond to this CSO but must submit documentation describing how it has addressed the conditions that resulted in its inclusion on the CRWL and why those conditions will not impact performance on a contract resulting from this CSO. Proposed subcontractors must notify the prime Offeror if they receive notification from the SAE that they have been added to the CRWL. In order to be considered for a subcontract, a proposed subcontractor that has been added to the CRWL must submit documentation describing how it has addressed the conditions that resulted in its inclusion on the CRWL and why those conditions will not impact its performance on a subcontract to a contract resulting from this CSO. The proposed subcontractor may submit CRWL-related documentation through the prime Offeror or directly to the Contracting Officer as long as the information is received prior to the proposal due date.

Note: CRWL does not apply to operation and maintenance contracts, professional services contracts for Government support (e.g., FFRDC, A&AS).

(e) Rights in Technical Data, Computer Software, and Computer Software Documentation: For OTA awards, data rights are subject to negotiation.

(f) If the Gov cannot award OTA and must award a FAR-based, then an Offeror may provide with its submissions assertions to restrict, use, release, or disclosure of data and/or computer software and computer software documentation that will be provided in the course of contract or agreement performance. For FAR-based awards, rules governing these assertions are prescribed in R-DFARS clauses 252.227-7989 and 252.227-7990 may be accessed at https://www.acq.osd.mil/dpap/dars/classdev/DFARS_RFO/Part-227/2026-O0036_TAB_A_Deviation_Memo_Part_227.pdf. For OTA awards, data rights are subject to negotiation.

If the proposed solution relies upon patented technology or pending patent applications, the Offeror shall identify such patents and provide documentation demonstrating ownership or appropriate licensing rights sufficient to perform the prototyping effort.

ATTACHMENT 3: REVIEW, EVALUATION AND SELECTION PROCESS

Proposals are not evaluated against each other, as they are not submitted in response to a common PWS or SOW.

The Government will review and evaluate submissions in multiple phases, as described below. Progression from one phase to another, and ultimately to award, is at the sole discretion of the Government, subject to review and evaluation results and availability of funds. Solutions will be evaluated on the basis of the merit of the proposed concept in addressing the Areas of Interest and not against other vendor's solutions submitted in response to the same Area of Interest.

1. **Phase 1A – Quad Chart and White Paper Submission:**

    a. **Purpose:** The Government will identify Phase 1 submissions that demonstrate sufficient Government interest and technical merit based on the AOI's description and, if applicable, its focus area (see Attachment 4) to justify further consideration.

    b. **Review:** Phase 1A submissions will be reviewed against the factors below:
        i. **Government Interest –** Contribution to mission need and alignment of the proposed solution with the AOI description and, if applicable, its focus area. Should the Government be interested in the submission, it will then be reviewed for technical merit.
        ii. **Technical Validity -** Technical validity and reasonableness, alignment with the AOI description.
        iii. **Eligibility for OTA -** Per line 421-453, offeror will state whether pathway 1, pathway 2, or none applies to its proposed solution. The answer does not disqualify offeror from award.
        iv. **Innovation Compliance** – Provide a clear and substantiating justification demonstrating that the proposed solution meets the definition of innovative per line 11 of this CSO document. as stated in Offeror's White Paper.

    c. **Outcome:** Based on the review, offerors may be:
        i. Invited to Phase 1B (by Government Request);
        ii. Invited to submit to Phase 2; or
        iii. Notified that the submission will not be pursued.

2. **Phase 1B – Pitch Session (by Government Request):**

    a. **Purpose:** The Government may invite offeror(s) to provide a demonstration video and to address Government's question(s) regarding their submission. The Government highly encourages the offeror to address the areas of but not limited to, demonstration of technical challenges, business viability and integration potential not already addressed in the white paper.

    b. **Review:** Phase 1B pitch sessions will be reviewed against the factors below:
        i. **Government Interest –** Contribution to mission need and alignment of the

proposed solution with the AOI description and, if applicable, its focus area.

ii. **Technical Validity:** Technical validity and reasonableness, alignment with the AOI description, demonstration of an understanding of the integration environment.

c. **Outcome:** Based on the pitch session review, offerors may be:

i. Invited to submit a Phase 2; or

ii. Notified that the submission will not be pursued.

3. **Phase 2 – Proposal - Technical Price Information:**

a. **Purpose:** The Government will assess the technical, business, integration potential and cost aspects of the proposal in detail. The specific evaluation criteria for Phase 2 will be provided in the request for prototype proposal (RPP) and may include, but is not limited to, the following evaluation factors:

b. The Government will ensure vendors meet the following un-rated criteria before being evaluated:

i. **Government Interest –** Contribution to mission need and alignment with the AOI description and, if applicable, its focus area. The Government will choose the proposal(s) that best aligns with the mission priorities and has the greatest potential impact in meeting the needs identified in the AOI

ii. **Security and Accreditation Posture –** Compliance with applicable cybersecurity requirements, or demonstration of a credible path to compliance. Evaluation will consider cybersecurity maturity, risk management practices, data protection measures, and the ability to support secure operational integration

iii. **Vendor viability -** Demonstrated ability to meet current and projected program demands. The Government will choose the proposal with the best capacity, proven track record, and scalable solution that aligns with the Government's current and projected needs.

iv. **OCI Mitigation plan, if applicable –** Completed OCI checklist and mitigation plan, if applicable.

c. **Evaluation:** After meeting the un-rated criteria, Phase 2 proposals will be evaluated against the factors below:

i. **Technical Merit -** Technical executability, alignment with the AOI description and, if applicable, its focus area, compliance with modern software practices, and standards compliance. The Government will choose the proposal(s) that demonstrate technical feasibility, innovation, and alignment with engineering best practices will be favored, as these factors contribute to the long-term viability of the project.

ii. **Integration Feasibility -** Ability to integrate into existing mission operations. The Government will choose the proposal that presents a low-risk, high-impact integration plan and minimizes disruption to existing systems and operations will be prioritized.

iii. **Price –** The Government will choose the proposal that demonstrate a reasonable, affordable price that is justified and aligned with the scope and

technical merit. Pricing will not be evaluated on a lowest-price basis but must demonstrate value commensurate with scope. Vendors must also provide any proposed investment by the vendor or on behalf of the vendor for the proposed prototype solution including investment source and background information.

d. **Evaluation Method:** Scientific, technological, or other subject-matter expert peer review will be performed.
e. Proposals will not be evaluated against each other, as they are not submitted in response to a common PWS or SOW.
b. **Outcome:** The Government may:
    i. Select proposals for negotiation leading to award
    ii. Fund all, some, part of, or none of the proposals

f. Other Award Considerations

To be eligible for FAR-based awards under R-DFARS 212.70, offerors must:

- Be registered in the System for Award Management (SAM) at www.sam.gov;
- Be determined responsible under RFO 9.104;
- Have updated required representations and certifications (RFO 52.204-7)
- Comply with R-DFARS 204-76 (assessment posted in Supplier Performance Risk System (SPRS), if applicable)
- Submit a Small Business Subcontracting Plan if a large business (per RFO 52.219-9).

To be eligible for OTA awards under 10 U.S.C. § 4021 & §4022 and §4023, offerors must:

- Be registered in the System for Award Management (SAM) at www.sam.gov
- Demonstrate capability, resources and integrity to perform;
- Be in good standing (not debarred/suspended, and not on the SSC Contractor Responsibility Watchlist);
- Comply with program-specific security and cybersecurity requirements, as applicable;
- Disclose potential organizational conflict of interest. The Government may require a mitigation approach before award;

ATTACHMENT 4: AREAS OF INTEREST (AOI)

The Kronos PMO is interested in innovative products, technologies, and services related to the AOIs listed below. The level of detail provided for each AOI or the order in which each AOI appears is not intended to convey any information regarding relative priority.

Focus Area Statements (FAS)

To facilitate industry planning and engagement, the Government may publish a Focus Area Statement (FAS) within the scope of an AOI when issuing a Call. The FAS will provide additional context regarding mission needs, desired outcomes, and areas of technical interest to assist industry in preparing submissions.

AOI 01: Operational Command and Control

The Kronos PMO is seeking innovative solutions that enable end-to-end Operational C2 functionality, including planning, preparation, execution, and assessment, within a unified, interoperable framework at the operational echelon. The intended users of these capabilities are at the Echelon 2 and 3 level, notionally, the National Space Defense Center (NSDC), Combined Space Operation Center (CSpOC), and Space Force Components. Key capabilities include developing and prioritizing commanders' intent; supporting both deliberate and dynamic target development and effects-based operations; conducting capability and feasibility analysis; facilitating commander's decision-making and force assignment; monitoring real-time mission execution with adaptability to changing conditions; performing combat assessment; and providing comprehensive shared situational awareness across joint, and allied partners. The Operational C2 innovative solution must be scalable, modular, and extensible to support evolving mission needs and emerging technologies. Cloud-native design, DevSecOps practices, Artificial Intelligence/Machine Learning (AI/ML) integration, advanced data management, and zero trust cybersecurity principles are highly desired. Submissions should demonstrate how the proposed solution delivers a cohesive, resilient, and adaptable Operational C2 capability aligned with U.S. Space Force operational priorities and enables agile, data-driven decision-making across the Kronos Enterprise.

AOI 02: Battle Management

The Kronos PMO is seeking an integrated Space Attack Planning Toolkit to enable advanced effects-based planning and coordination across the Kronos Enterprise. The desired solution will support the ability to match space resources to effects-based requirements by synthesizing commander's guidance, effects, and operational priorities with real-time resource status, including tactical units and Intelligence, Surveillance, and Reconnaissance (ISR) assets. The solution should expedite C2 planning and enhance coordination between operational and tactical levels. Key capabilities include integration of tactical C2 assessment tools to enable rapid course of action development, feasibility modeling, probability of success analysis, and collateral impact assessment. The solution should support tactical C2 planning by providing real-time status, warnings, and orders to tactical units, while capturing and managing Concept of Operations (CONOPs) and Concept of Employment (CONEMPs) to ensure coherent command relationships and execution pathways. Additionally, the toolkit must enable tactical C2 monitoring and visualization of ongoing effects, support dynamic guidance updates, and facilitate responsive coordination with tactical units within established rules of engagement. The solution must be modular, scalable, and designed for seamless integration with the broader Kronos C2 architecture, with an emphasis on agility, real-time data integration, and operational relevance.

AOI 03: Space Intelligence Integration

The Kronos PMO is seeking an integrated Intelligence solution to enhance decision advantage for joint and coalition forces across the Kronos Enterprise. The desired solution must unify three core intelligence capabilities: battlespace characterization, collection operations, and targeting. Battlespace characterization should enable continuous understanding and prediction of adversary capabilities, tactics, dispositions, centers of gravity, and courses of action, with dynamic assessments that inform targeting and operational decision-making. Collection operations must support the tasking and synchronization of ISR assets and exploitation resources to acquire actionable data on the operational environment, adversary activity, and infrastructure, closing intelligence gaps and enhancing situational awareness. The targeting component must provide a continuous, analytic process to select, prioritize, and engage targets in alignment with commander objectives, integrating intelligence at every stage of the targeting cycle. The solution must facilitate seamless coordination across functional disciplines and between operational and tactical levels. Scalability, modularity, and interoperability with the broader Kronos C2 architecture are essential, with emphasis on real-time data integration, dynamic visualization, and AI/ML-driven analytic capabilities. Submissions should clearly demonstrate how the solution enhances intelligence-driven operations and supports timely, informed, and effective decision-making across the joint force.

AOI 04: Mission Support Services

The Kronos PMO is seeking innovative prototype solutions that provide infrastructure support services, mission operations support, tools, analytics, and automated test capabilities, cybersecurity engineering, and secure software enablement across the Kronos Family of Systems and the PMO. This Area of Interest is focused on the services, engineering approaches, automation, operational processes, and technical capabilities required to deploy, operate, secure, monitor, scale, and sustain mission infrastructure in support of Kronos objectives. This AOI is not intended to procure underlying infrastructure as the primary deliverable.

Proposed solutions may address site reliability engineering; platform and infrastructure operations; cybersecurity engineering and cyber operations; secure software delivery and deployment orchestration; Infrastructure-as-Code and configuration management; cloud, hybrid-cloud, and edge integration; containerized workload orchestration; observability, monitoring, alerting, incident response, automated recovery, and resiliency; continuous monitoring, vulnerability management, compliance automation, and support for operational accreditation; zero-trust implementation; and mission application hosting and integration across distributed environments, classification levels, and security domains.

Solutions should improve operational agility, reduce deployment and recovery timelines, enhance resiliency, strengthen cybersecurity posture, and support mission continuity under degraded, intermittent, limited bandwidth, or contested conditions. The Government is particularly interested in approaches using automation, DevSecOps, zero-trust principles, Infrastructure-as-Code, policy-as-code, continuous monitoring, and autonomous orchestration.

Submissions should describe the operational problem, proposed support model, required infrastructure dependencies, integration feasibility, expected mission impacts, scalability, and approach for demonstrating and refining the prototype in mission-relevant environments.