SAMPLE REQUIREMENTS EXTRACT · PUBLIC DOCUMENTS · DEMONSTRATION ONLY

Gallant Project Solutions LLC

FY27 Spaceport of the Future Infrastructure (SPOTFi) — W91278269A075 — a demonstration, on publicly posted documents, of the first step in building a project-long requirements baseline.

SBA-CERTIFIED SDVOSB / VOSB · PE & PMP · DAWIA LEVEL III · REQUIREMENTS MANAGEMENT

What this is. A partial requirements extract from the publicly posted SPOTFi solicitation package, run to demonstrate the method on a live Other Transaction procurement. **An extract is the first step in building a requirements baseline:** pulling every stated obligation out of a document set, each traced back to where it came from, then reconciling those obligations against one another. Four source documents, reconciled against one another. Every finding below is verifiable in the posted documents and is cited to its location.

What this is not. A criticism of the issuing office. These are draft documents, expressly marked subject to change through negotiation, and the items below are the ordinary consequence of several documents written by different people for different purposes. That is precisely the condition a requirements register exists to manage — and finding these now, in a draft, is the point.

SOURCE DOCUMENTS

Program Solicitation, Amendment 0001 — 10 pp. Overview, project descriptions for six facilities, PDB & OT process, selection process, special considerations.

Attachment 1 — Request for White Paper — 7 pp. Submission requirements, three evaluation factors, down-select process.

Attachment 2 — Draft Articles of OT Agreement — 50 pp, 34 articles. Scope, term, termination, changes, payment, bonding, disputes, data rights, security, precedence, PDB responsibility, design, construction.

Attachment 3 — Draft Division 01 Specifications — 42 pp, Section 01 00 00 General Requirements.

4	99 pp	6	1 of 5
Source documents reconciled against each other	Governing text in this partial extract	Conflicts, gaps and ambiguities surfaced	Delivery stages — this sample covers the first

WHERE THIS SAMPLE SITS

THIS SAMPLE	STAGE 2	STAGE 3	STAGE 4	STAGE 5
Pursuit	**Programming & Baseline**	**Design**	**Construction**	**Turnover**
Prior to award, before a design exists. Solicitation, agreement articles and Division 01 — what the offeror is obligated to.	A Design Requirements Document establishes the authoritative baseline of what the project must achieve. Register built from kick-off documents, initial traceability matrix, conflicts identified from day one.	Register updates and a Requirements Intelligence Report at the cadence the project needs — phase gates, milestones, decision points. Cycle comparison shows what closed, what opened, and what drifted.	Submittal and RFI impact analysis. Change-order requirements impact tracking. Contractor QC plan and submittals read against the contract.	Commissioning, activation and turnover verification tracked to closure, with the full document lineage behind it — every requirement and every decision made on it.

And the sample is a smaller fraction than the page count suggests. Four documents make six possible pairings. A project carrying forty governing documents makes 780. The reconciliation surface grows with the square of the document count, not with pages — which is why it stops being practical by hand, and why six findings here is not a rate to extrapolate from.

> **Why precedence findings matter most under an OT.** Article 18 establishes which document governs when two disagree. Under a FAR contract an unclear precedence clause resolves against a body of precedent. Under an Other Transaction the agreement is the only authority, so an unresolved precedence question has nowhere to go. Three of the six findings below sit in or around Article 18.

FINDINGS REGISTER — PARTIAL EXTRACT

ID	TYPE	SOURCE	FINDING AND CONSEQUENCE
F-001	Conflict	Att 2, Article 18(a) Order of Precedence	Article 18(a) gives first precedence to the main body of the Agreement and directs the reader to "see also 23.14 Specifications and Drawings." **Article 23 is Responsibility and Indemnification. It has no numbered subparagraphs and contains nothing on specifications or drawings.** The cross-reference in the governing precedence article does not resolve. A reader cannot determine what provision was intended to control the relationship between the Articles and the specifications.
F-002	Gap	Att 2, Article 18 Att 3 (entire)	Article 18 lists four tiers: the Articles, the Scope of Services, other elements of the accepted Phase 2 proposal, and design products. **Attachment 3, Draft Division 01 Specifications — 42 pages of binding general requirements — is not named in any tier.** It is Government-issued, so it is not a "design product"; it is not stated to be part of the SOS. Where Division 01 sits in the hierarchy is undetermined, and it is the document most likely to conflict with the Articles on administration, submittals and procedures.
F-003	Ambiguity	Solicitation §11.0 Att 2, p.1 contents	The Program Solicitation designates **Attachment 1 as the Request for White Paper**. The draft Agreement designates **Attachment 1 as the Scope of Services (SOS)**. Two different documents carry the same attachment number within one procurement, and Article 18 assigns the SOS second precedence by that number. Any downstream reference to "Attachment 1" is ambiguous without context.
F-004	Gap	Att 3, Section 01 00 00 para 1.3 Submittals	Division 01 requires that listed submittals — including Temporary Lighting Plans and Construction and Safety Fence shop drawings, both Government-approval "G" designated — be made **"in accordance with Section 01330 SUBMITTAL PROCEDURES." Section 01330 is not included in Attachment 3**, which contains only Section 01 00 00. A binding procedural requirement points to a document the offeror has not been given.
F-005	Ambiguity	Att 3, Section 01 00 00 heading vs para 1.3	The specification identifies itself throughout as **"SECTION 01 00 00"** (six-digit MasterFormat) while citing **"Section 01330"** (five-digit legacy format) in the same paragraph. Minor in isolation; material when a submittal register, a specification index and a transmittal log must agree on a section identifier.
F-006	Divergence	Att 2, Articles 7, 24, 27 USSF OT industry briefing	The USSF Construction OT industry briefing lists the Buy American Act, Davis-Bacon, and the Miller Act among statutes **generally understood not to apply** to DoD Other Transactions. This USACE agreement nonetheless includes Article 7 Bonding Requirements, Article 24 Compliance with Applicable Labor Laws citing Construction Wage Rate Requirements, and Article 27 Buy American Act Requirements. Not a contradiction — parties may adopt such terms by agreement — but two implementations of the same authority proceeding from opposite defaults. An offeror pricing against the briefing rather than the Articles would be wrong.

What this covers — and what a project baseline actually contains. This extract reads four procurement documents and stops at three themes: precedence, submittals and statutory applicability. Enough to show the method working. It is not a baseline.

A project baseline carries the whole requirement set — the owner's and the user's requirements, the mission need and performance objectives, the affordability cap and budget constraints, the milestone and schedule obligations, the applicable codes and criteria including UFC, IBC, NEC and ICD/ICS 705, the agreement articles and Division 01, the design documents as they develop through each submission, review comments, RFI responses, submittals, permit conditions, and commissioning and turnover requirements. Thousands of obligations rather than dozens, each traced to its source and its owner, maintained live from programming through turnover. That is the deliverable. This is a sample of how it starts.

EVALUATION FACTOR CROSSWALK — ATTACHMENT 1

The Government states the three factors are of equal importance. Below, what each factor asks for and where a traced requirements baseline supplies evidence rather than assertion.

FACTOR	WHAT THE GOVERNMENT ASKS	WHAT THE BASELINE SUPPLIES
Factor 1 Capability & Past Experience	Up to three projects within eight years, 90% complete or substantially complete with documentation. Progressive Design-Build or other collaborative delivery. Quality of work, schedule adherence, references.	Past performance is the team's to supply. The baseline contributes nothing here, and a submission that claims otherwise invites scrutiny. Stated plainly so the team spends its pages where they count.
Factor 2 Technical Approach	Understanding of objectives. Approach to PDB collaboration — how the team builds chemistry, integrates with Government stakeholders, and **provides transparency during open-book estimating**. The three biggest risks and how they will be approached. Innovative approaches.	**The strongest fit.** Open-book transparency assumes both parties share an understanding of what is being priced; a traced baseline is how that is demonstrated rather than promised. And a team that names requirements drift as one of its three biggest risks — with a method attached — is answering the question more credibly than one naming weather, labor and supply chain.
Factor 3 Management Approach	Full team structure, Prime, Designer of Record, key sub-awardees. Organizational chart with reporting relationships and lines of communication. Key personnel who become a contractual commitment. Narrative on how the team will communicate, coordinate and **resolve issues**, and the subcontractor's role in **cost validation**.	Issue resolution and cost validation are both requirements questions. An org chart shows who reports to whom; it does not show how a conflict between two documents reaches the person who can decide it. The baseline is what makes the communication narrative concrete, and it names Gallant as the sub-awardee performing it.

Note on the submission. Attachment 1 caps the White Paper at 15 pages and warns that non-conforming submissions may be disqualified. Nothing here suggests adding length. The findings above are the kind of project-specific understanding that distinguishes a submission the Government has warned it will assess with lower confidence if it reads as generic.

THE WORKBOOK — REGISTER EXTRACT

The findings on the previous page are not conclusions written up afterwards. They are rows in the register, flagged where a cross-comparison failed. Below is a 22-row extract of the workbook the report is generated from — every figure in the report computed from it, none typed. **Shaded rows carry a conflict flag.** Most rows do not: a register is mostly ordinary obligations correctly stated, which is what makes the exceptions worth seeing.

REQ ID	SOURCE	REF	REQUIREMENT (AS WRITTEN)	TYPE	RESPONSIBLE	VERIFICATION	FLAG
R-0001	Program Solicitation	§1.2	Total program funding for design, construction and commissioning may not exceed $409,000,000. Affordability cap is a material requirement.	Budget	Design-Builder	Open-book reconciliation at FFP	
R-0003	Program Solicitation	§3.3	Launch Support Facility shall contain a secure ICD/ICS 705 office space.	Security	Designer of Record	Accrediting Official approval; CSP conformance	
R-0004	Program Solicitation	§1.1	Facilities complete by April 2030 to avoid impact to launch cadence and base operations.	Schedule	Design-Builder	Integrated schedule; milestone acceptance	
R-0005	OT Agreement	Art 2.2.3	Design-Builder shall identify in writing any material assumptions, clarifications, exclusions, or deviations that may affect scope, schedule, constructability, or price.	Process	Design-Builder	Written evaluation of Project Criteria	
R-0007	OT Agreement	Art 5(a)	No oral direction, review comment, meeting discussion, or course of dealing shall modify the scope, time, or compensation under this Agreement.	Process	Both Parties	Executed bilateral modification	
R-0008	OT Agreement	Art 6.2(a)	Payments made in fixed amounts based on successful completion and Government acceptance of payable milestones in the Schedule of Milestones and Payment.	Payment	Design-Builder	AOR verification of milestone completion	
R-0010	OT Agreement	Art 18	Descending order of precedence: (a) Articles; (b) SOS; (c) other elements of accepted Phase 2 proposal; (d) design products.	Contractual	Both Parties	Governing provision	F-001 F-002
R-0011	OT Agreement	Art 21.1(a)	Design-Builder responsible for professional quality, technical accuracy and coordination of all designs; must correct errors without additional compensation.	Quality	Design-Builder	Design QA; Government review (no waiver)	
R-0013	OT Agreement	Art 25	Liquidated damages of $2,660 per calendar day for each calendar day of unexcused delay until work is completed or accepted.	Schedule	Design-Builder	Completion date vs. agreement	
R-0015	OT Agreement	Art 27	Buy American Act requirements; domestic construction material preference per 41 U.S.C. ch. 83, with designated-country waivers.	Regulatory	Design-Builder	Material certification	F-006
R-0017	Division 01	01 00 00 ¶1.3	Submittals with a "G" designation require Government approval. Listed submittals shall be made in accordance with Section 01330 Submittal Procedures.	Process	Design-Builder	Submittal register; Government approval	F-004 F-005
R-0021	Att 1 — RFWP	§2(a)	White Paper: 15 pages maximum, minimum 10 pt font, single-spaced, 1 inch margins, PDF. Non-conforming submissions may be disqualified.	Submission	Offeror	Compliance check before submission	
R-0022	Att 1 — RFWP	§2(c) F3	Key Personnel become a contractual commitment upon award; no substitution without advance written authorization from the Contracting Officer.	Management	Design-Builder	Written authorization on file	

Thirteen of twenty-two rows shown — and twenty-two rows is not a workbook. The full extract is supplied as a spreadsheet: register, conflict register, and method note. Columns omitted here for space are phase, status, conflict cross-reference and notes.

A project workbook is a different object entirely. Alongside the requirements register it carries the conflict, decision and risk registers; the traceability, verification and change-impact matrices; the append-only event and lineage logs; and the integrity tests that run against all of it before any report is generated. The Requirements Intelligence Report is generated from that workbook rather than written up separately, so every number in it traces back to the rows behind it. **Worked examples of the full report and workbook are at gallantprojectsolutions.com.**

Method. Requirements extracted from the four public documents, normalized, traced to source, and cross-compared. AI-assisted: language models perform the reading, cross-comparison and bookkeeping. A documented methodology governs how, applied identically to every document. Engineering judgment and every determination of significance remain with the licensed professional. Every finding above cites its location and is independently verifiable. **Limitations.** This is a partial extract prepared for demonstration, not a complete baseline, and not legal advice. Documents reviewed are the versions posted under Amendment 0001; later amendments may resolve any item listed. Gallant has no relationship with the issuing office and no position on the acquisition.

COMPANY DATA

UEI ESNQCFHGHXP1 CAGE 18FM1 CERTIFICATIONS SBA SDVOSB & VOSB through 03/16/2029 · SAM active
NAICS 541330 Engineering Services (primary) · 541611 · 541690 · 561210 PSC R408 · R425 · C211
PRINCIPAL PE · PMP · DAWIA Level III (Systems Engineering) · 27-year USAF civil engineering officer

Gregory A. Tuite, PE, PMP — Founder & Principal · Albuquerque, NM · Nationwide / document-based
greg@gallantprojectsolutions.com · (505) 359-4407 · gallantprojectsolutions.com