OMB Approval 2700-0042

AMENDMENT OF SOLICITATION/MODIFICATION OF CONTRACT

1. CONTRACT ID CODE	PAGE	OF	PAGES
	1		5

2. AMENDMENT/MODIFICATION NO.	3. EFFECTIVE DATE	4. REQUISITION/PURCHASE REQ. NO.	5. PROJECT NO. *(If applicable)*
Amendment Two (2)	4/9/09	N/A	

6. ISSUED BY CODE JAI:241-1

NASA-Ames Research Center
Attn: Natalie LeMar
Acquisition Division, M/S 241-1
Moffett Field, CA 94035-1000

7. ADMINISTERED BY *(If other than Item 6)* CODE

8. NAME AND ADDRESS OF CONTRACTOR *(No. Street, county, State and ZIP: Code)*

TO ALL PROSPECTIVE OFFERORS

CODE FACILITY CODE

(4) X

9A. AMENDMENT OF SOLICITATION NO. NNA09251287R

9B. DATED ***(SEE ITEM 11)*** 3/23/2009

10A. MODIFICATION OF CONTRACT/ORDER NO.

10B. DATED ***(SEE ITEM 13)***

11. THIS ITEM ONLY APPLIES TO AMENDMENTS OF SOLICITATIONS

☒ The above numbered solicitation is amended as set forth in Item 14. The hour and date specified for receipt of Offers ☐ is extended, ☒ is not extended.

Offers must acknowledge receipt of this amendment prior to the hour and date specified in the solicitation or as amended, by one of the following methods:

(a) By completing Items 8 and 15, and returning one (1) copy of the amendment; (b) By acknowledging receipt of this amendment on each copy of the offer submitted; or (c) By separate letter or telegram which includes a reference to the solicitation and amendment numbers. FAILURE OF YOUR ACKNOWLEDGMENT TO BE RECEIVED AT THE PLACE DESIGNATED FOR THE RECEIPT OF OFFERS PRIOR TO THE HOUR AND DATA SPECIFIED MAY RESULT IN REJECTION OF YOUR OFFER. If by virtue of this amendment you desire to change an offer already submitted, such change may be made by telegram or letter, provided each telegram or letter makes reference to the solicitation and this amendment, and is received prior to the opening hour and data specified.

12. ACCOUNTING AND APPROPRIATION DATA *(If required)*

N/A

13. THIS ITEM APPLIES ONLY TO MODIFICATIONS OF CONTRACTS/ORDERS, IT MODIFIES THE CONTRACT/ORDER NO. AS DESCRIBED IN ITEM 14.

	A. THIS CHANGE ORDER IS ISSUED PURSUANT TO: *(Specify authority)* THE CHANGES SET FORTH IN ITEM 14 ARE MADE IN THE CONTRACT/ORDER NO. IN ITEM 10A.
	B. THE ABOVE NUMBERED CONTRACT/ORDER IS MODIFIED TO REFLECT THE ADMINISTRATIVE CHANGES *(such as changes in paying office, appropriation date, etc.)* SET FORTH IN ITEM 14, PURSUANT TO THE AUTHORITY OF FAR 43.103(b).
	C. THIS SUPPLEMENTAL AGREEMENT IS ENTERED INTO PURSUANT TO AUTHORITY OF:
	D. OTHER Specify type of modification and authority)

E. IMPORTANT: Contractor ☐ is not, ☒ is required to sign this document and return 1 original copy to the issuing office.

14. DESCRIPTION OF AMENDMENT/MODIFICATION *(Organized by UCF section headings, including solicitation/contract subject matter where feasible.)*

This Amendment 02 to the Final Request for Proposal (RFP) is issued to respond to questions received.

(See page 2)

Except at provided herein, all terms and conditions of the document referenced in Item 9A or 10A, as heretofore changed, remains unchanged and in full force and effect.

15A. NAME AND TITLE OF SIGNER *(Type or print)*		16A. NAME AND TITLE OF CONTRACTING OFFICER *(Type or print)*	
15B. CONTRACTOR/OFFEROR *(Signature of person authorized to sign)*	15C. DATE SIGNED	16B. UNITED STATES OF AMERICA BY *(Signature of Contracting Officer)*	16C. DATE SIGNED

COMMENTS, QUESTIONS, AND RESPONSES
NNA09251287R
FINAL RFP QUESTIONS – SET 2

RFP Section, Paragraph and Page	Question/Comments	Government Response
Draft RFP Section L, L.7(a)A.2 – Key Personnel, Page 61	**Observation:** Key Personnel requirement in L.7.A.2 of the Draft RFP was eliminated. An additional sentence has been added into the Staffing, Recruiting, Retention and Training section **Question/Comment:** Why was the requirement for Key Personnel eliminated from the final RFP when it has been a critical performance evaluation factor during the current contract for purposes of award fee determination?	Response to Question/Comment: As stated in the Highlights document to the Draft Request for Proposal (RFP), the draft is issued as an acquisition planning tool and as a means of soliciting industry comments for use in developing the Final RFP. The Source Evaluation Committee (SEC) works to complete the Final RFP while the Draft RFP is out for comment. The SEC may consider comments from industry and make changes to the Final RFP. The SEC made changes to represent the key areas of importance and emphasis to be considered in the source selection decision and to support meaningful comparison and discrimination between and among competing proposals.
Draft RFP Section M, M.3 (d) – Weighting and Scoring, Page 84	**Observation:** Section M.3 (d) has been modified to eliminate the separate scoring of key personnel however the 100 evaluation points for key personnel have been stripped from Management Approach and shifted to Technical Understanding. **Question/Comment:** How will NASA evaluate the ability of an offeror to demonstrate their ability to bring qualified personnel who, through past performance, education, and skills, can effectively ensure that the performance requirements of the contract are met?	Response to Question/Comment: The SEC made changes to represent the key areas of importance and emphasis to be considered in the source selection decision and to support meaningful comparison and discrimination between and among competing proposals. As stated on Page 75 of the final solicitation: The Offerors will be evaluated and scored based on the Mission Suitability subfactors. The outline should not be construed as an indication of the order of importance or relative weighting within individual elements of the Mission Suitability subfactors as there are no discrete point values to any of the elements.
Final RFP Sections H, L, and M. H.3 on pages 24 - 25; L.4(b)(2) page 56; L.5(c) page 58, L.7(a)A.2 page 60 - 61; L.7(a)A.3 page 61; M.2(c)A.2 pages 76 - 77	Observation: Several, additional references to Key personnel are still in the RFP *(H.3, L.4(b)(2) Bullet 7, L.5(c), L.7(a)A.2 Bullet 1, L.7(a)A.3 Bullet 2 and M.2(c)A.2 Bullet 1)*. Question/Comment: Did the government intend to leave these references to key personnel given the elimination of the Key	Response to Question/Comment: The SEC made changes to the Final RFP that represent the key areas of importance and emphasis to be considered in the source selection decision and to support meaningful comparison and discrimination between and among competing proposals.

	Personnel requirement in L.7.A.2?	The Government intended the clause H.3. KEY PERSONNEL AND FACILITIES (NFS 1852.235-71) (MAR 1989) on pages 24 – 25. The Government intended the Mission Suitability Subfactors and elements that are stated in the final solicitation Sections L & M.
Final RFP Section L, L.7(a)B – Technical Understanding (Subfactor) Page 62 Attachment J.1(b)9	**Observation:** No requirement to address RFP SOW 3.10 *(Contract Management and Administration)* which describes how "the contractor shall provide overall management and administration functions to ensure that the proper resources are available and allocated, that required reports and documentation are prepared, and that the overall environment supports the requirements in this SOW". **3(a) Question/Comment:** Why, under L.7.B Technical Understand—(Subfactor), is the requirement for "specifically addressing the requirement in the SOW", 3.10, not listed given it is a Task Order under the current contract. **3(b) Question/Comment:** How would costs associated with CM&A activity that are to be documented as direct costs as described on page 1 of J.1(b)9 be evaluated when offerors are not required to specifically discuss their approach to C&MA related support?	Response to 3(a) Question/Comment: Statement of Work (SOW) Section 3.10 CONTRACT MANAGEMENT AND ADMINISTRATION is not being evaluated under the Technical Understanding Subfactor. Management Approach is a separate Subfactor that will be evaluated under the Mission Suitability Factor. Response to 3(b) Question/Comment: There are three evaluation factors for this procurement: Mission Suitability, Past Performance, and Cost/Price. A general definition of these factors may be found at NFS 1815.304, "Evaluation factors and significant subfactors." Specific information regarding each factor is provided in the final solicitation. Cost/Price will be evaluated for realism, a probable cost adjustment will be made, adversely affecting the offeror's Mission Suitability scores, if appropriate, and a level of confidence in the Probable Cost, in accordance with NFS 1815.305(a)(1), "Cost or price evaluation."
Draft RFP Section L, L.7(a)A.1 – Organizational Structure/ Partnering Approach pages 77 - 78	**Observation:** Crucial contract management requirements removed such as: subcontracting arrangements, processes and resources for managing the contract, processes and resources for managing new technology, services, facilities equipment and staff assistance beyond onsite staff, and benefits to the Government of identified resources, and developing and infusing best practices and industry standards. **Question/Comment:** Why, under L.7.A.1 Organizational	Response to Question/Comment: As stated in the Highlights document to the Draft Request for Proposal (RFP), the draft is issued as an acquisition planning tool and as a means of soliciting industry comments for use in developing the Final RFP. The Source Evaluation Committee (SEC) works to complete the Final RFP while the Draft RFP is out for comment. The SEC may consider comments from industry and make changes to the Final RFP. The SEC made changes to represent the key areas of importance and emphasis to

	Structure/Partnering Approach of the DRFP, were bullet items 3, 6, 7, 8, 9, and 10 removed from the DRFP?	be considered in the source selection decision and to support meaningful comparison and discrimination between and among competing proposals.
Final RFP Section L, L.7(b) – Past Performance Proposal (Volume II) pages 63 – 66, and L.7 (c) – Cost Volume (Volume III) pages 66 - 70	**Observation:** L.7 (b) states, ""Major subcontractors," for purposes of this solicitation, is defined as subcontracting dollars of $500,000 or more covering a performance period of five (5) years". L.7 (c) states "Cost proposals shall include the following information for the offeror as well as any subcontract valued at $1M or more". **Question/Comment:** Is the definition of a major subcontractor different for the Past Performance Volume and Cost Volume? If so, is the dollar threshold for the cost volume based upon $1M per contract year or $1M for the performance period of five (5) years?	Response to Question/Comment: Under the Past Performance Proposal Volume II "Major subcontractors," for purposes of this solicitation, is defined as subcontracting dollars of $500,000 or more covering a performance period of five (5) years. Under the Cost/Price Proposal Volume III Proposed costs will be analyzed to determine the cost/price and associated risks of doing business with the offeror. Cost proposals shall include the following information for the offeror as well as any subcontract valued at $1M or more. The $1M threshold for any subcontract is for any period of time within the five year performance period of the contract.
Final RFP Section L, L.7(b) – Past Performance Proposal (Volume II) pages 63 - 66	**Observation:** If the definition of a subcontractor is major subcontracting dollars of $500,000 or more covering a performance period of five years, multiple subs (including consultants etc.) would easily meet the $500,000 threshold and have to meet all the requirements of a major sub. **Question:** Is this the government's intent?	Response to Question: It is the Government's intent to obtain past performance information about major subcontractors. "Major subcontractors," for purposes of this solicitation, is defined as subcontracting dollars of $500,000 or more covering a performance period of five (5) years.
Final RFP Section L, L.7(b)B.2, Page 66	The final solicitation states that each Offeror and any proposed major subcontractor shall send a blank Past Performance Questionnaire to the cognizant Contracting Officer or the Contracting Officer's Technical Representative of no more than three (3) relevant contracts. Question: If I am a subcontractor under a relevant contract effort I want to reference, who do I send my questionnaire to (Government or my Prime)?	Response to Question: There is no privity of contract with a subcontractor and the Government. Therefore, as a subcontractor, you need to submit your past performance questionnaire request to your Prime contractor (Contracting Officer/Representative or Technical Representative) to complete.

All other terms and conditions remain unchanged.

(END OF AMENDMENT 2)