

CISTO-SCTS Questions Set #10

	Question/Comment	Response
1	<p>H.18 GSFC 52.242-91 ADVANCED AGREEMENT BETWEEN THE PARTIES: REQUIREMENT TO PROVIDE CONTRACT HISTORICAL DATA (MAR 2011)</p> <p>Will the historical data requested for Section J, Attachment H, CONTRACT HISTORICAL DATA be utilized exclusively for competitive solicitations for a follow-on SCTS contract effort?</p>	<p>Yes, the Contract Historical Data will be used for the follow-on to SCTS contract efforts.</p>
2	<p>H.18 GSFC 52.242-91 ADVANCED AGREEMENT BETWEEN THE PARTIES: REQUIREMENT TO PROVIDE CONTRACT HISTORICAL DATA (MAR 2011)</p> <p>Will the Contractor will be afforded an opportunity to redact data it deems is competition sensitive or proprietary?</p>	<p>No, the Contractor will be required to provide the information in Section J, Attachment H, as written, without redaction.</p>
3	<p>Attachment B Matrix #4. PRIME FIXED FEE RATE MATRIX (For All Task Orders):</p> <p>Does NASA intend to exclude all fixed fees on Hardware, software, maintenance, or supporting material without limitation?</p>	<p>NASA does intend to exclude all fixed fee on Hardware, software, maintenance, or supporting material, as defined in SOW section 4.2 without limitation.</p>
4	<p>H.3 1852.216-80 TASK ORDERING PROCEDURE (OCTOBER 1996)</p> <p>Will Task Orders be issued via Bi-lateral or Unilateral Modifications?</p>	<p>Task orders will be issued unilaterally in accordance with the procedures stated in section H.3.</p>
5	<p>16.306 -- Cost-Plus-Fixed-Fee Contracts.</p> <p>Would the Government issue CPFF Task Orders that are “Term-Form” or “Completion-Form”?</p>	<p>All task orders will be Completion-Form tasks as authorized by the Contracting Officer.</p>

CISTO-SCTS Questions Set #10

<p>6</p>	<p>RFP Section: L.18 (a) RFP Statement: Removal of the statement – “for Direct Readout Data Systems and Direct Broadcast Algorithm Development portion of this procurement only (i.e., SOW Section 11), there is no minimum average annual cost/fee size requirement. The relevancy determinations for these references will be based on content and/or complexity only. All past performance for the direct readout work shall be provided.”</p> <p>In the Draft RFP there was a statement removing the minimum average annual cost/fee size requirements for submitting Past Performance relevant to the Direct Readout Data System and Direct Broadcast Algorithm Development. This statement is not in the Final RFP and there were no questions or Government answers published regarding the planned removal of this language. We recommend that the Government restore the DRFP language back into the final RFP in order to increase competition and the ability of non-incumbent DRL contractors to provide related relevant past performance.</p>	<p>Please see the response to Question 4 (CISTO-SCTS Questions Set #5) posted on April 20, 2012 stating “The SOW reference was for Section 11, DRL requirements. These requirements were called out separately for the past performance. This separation has been removed for the purposes of providing past performance. This will be reflected in the final RFP.”</p> <p>The Government believes the requirements for submitting Past Performance information is reasonable and appropriate.</p>
<p>7</p>	<p>RFP Section L.18 Page 117 – “for the purpose of NF 533 reporting under the actual contract, offerors may propose a WBS tailored to the way the work is to be performed or to the offeror’s management or reporting systems for consideration by the Government.” Page 120 – “The Offeror shall propose a Work Breakdown Structure (WBS) at the lowest WBS Level only (WBS Level 2), in response to the RTOs.”</p> <p>Page 138 – “Offeror in estimating the quantities of labor hours/costs, other direct costs, etc. required for successful performance of each RTO at the lowest WBS Level only (WBS Level 2).”</p> <p>We assume that the offeror is to propose a contract WBS applicable to the RTOs. Please</p>	<p>Yes, Task Order is considered Level 1. Contractor can use a WBS Level 2 if applicable.</p>

CISTO-SCTS Questions Set #10

	<p>clarify the Government’s definition of WBS Level 1 and WBS Level 2 with respect to the contract and the task orders. Is the Task Order considered Level 1?</p>	
<p>8</p>	<p>RFP Section L.18 (a) RFP Section M.5</p> <p>Text in L states “For the purposes of the Past Performance Volume, a proposed significant subcontractor is defined as any proposed subcontractor that is estimated to meet/exceed an average annual cost/fee of \$2M.”</p> <p>Text in M states “A proposed significant subcontractor for this procurement is defined as any proposed subcontractor that is estimated to meet/exceed an average annual cost/fee of \$1M.”</p> <p>Please confirm the value for a “significant” subcontractor</p>	<p>Refer to the response to the 2nd question/comment of CISTO-SCTS Questions Set #7, published on May 09, 2012.</p> <p>The definition of a proposed significant subcontractor for this procurement is correctly stated in Section L.18.</p> <p>An amendment will be made to the corresponding definition in Section M.5 to correct the definition of a proposed significant subcontractor for this procurement and will be stated as follows in M.5 PAST PERFORMANCE EVALUATION FACTOR (MAR 2012):</p> <p>A proposed significant subcontractor for this procurement is defined as any proposed subcontractor that is estimated to meet/exceed an average annual cost/fee of \$2M. Note, the definition of significant subcontractor for the past performance evaluation may be different than for the cost evaluation.</p>
<p>9</p>	<p>L.18(a), pg 142; M.5, pg 162</p> <p>Text in L states “Prime Offerors shall furnish the information requested below for all of your most recent contracts (completed and ongoing) for similar efforts with a minimum average annual cost/fee incurred of \$5M that...”</p> <p>Text in M states “For a prime contractor’s contract reference(s) to be considered at least minimally —relevant, it must meet/exceed an average annual cost/fee incurred of at least \$2.5M.”</p>	<p>Refer to the response to question #4 of CISTO-SCTS Questions Set #8 posted on May 09, 2012.</p> <p>The Government believes the threshold established in the Final RFP is reasonable and appropriate for the CISTO Requirement. Therefore, the threshold will remain unchanged at \$5M.</p> <p>Section M will be amended to be consistent with Section L to read “For a prime contractor’s contract reference(s) to be considered at least minimally relevant, it must meet/exceed an average annual</p>

CISTO-SCTS Questions Set #10

	<p>Would the government consider revising Section L, changing \$5M back to the value of \$2.5M that was in the Draft RFP, and that would be consistent with Section M?</p>	<p>cost/fee incurred of at least \$5M.</p>
10	<p>RFP Section L.16 3. Mission Suitability Instruction by Subfactor, Subfactor A – Understanding the Technical Approach, Scenarios and Representative Task Orders, RTO (1) – Major Procurement and Integration, Assumptions p. 120</p> <p>“For the purposes of this RTO, proposals are to assume that: The budget for the procurement portion of this RTO is \$5M plus contractor fee associated with material and handling.”</p> <p>Is the \$5M figure provided as a “plug number” which contractors should simply fill in on Cost Exhibit 6, Material by RTO, with no breakdown required, or must Cost Exhibit 6 still provide an itemized, priced bill of material?</p>	<p>Offerors should use this as a “ plug number” with no breakdown required remembering that the \$5M must include the procurement cost for all hardware, software, maintenance, and associated vendor support for delivery, installation, and acceptance AND any material and handling fee proposed by the Offeror. The \$5M was provided to give the Offerors a representative dollar amount for a computational upgrade to the cluster so that Offerors could estimate the approximate size of the system and the associated amount of work required to fully integrate this upgrade.</p>
11	<p>L.18(b), pg 145;146</p> <p>Text in the referenced section provides a mailing address for submission of Past Performance Questionnaires</p> <p>Are email submissions of completed questionnaires from our prior customers acceptable, and if so should they be sent to Mr. Keith Long at: Keith.Long@nasa.gov?</p>	<p>Yes. As stated in Exhibit 16 Past Performance Questionnaire Instructions, return this questionnaire to NASA Goddard Space Flight Center Attn: Keith Long , Code 210.5 Greenbelt, MD 20771 Phone: 301-286-5075 FAX: 301-286-5373 e-mail: Keith.Long@nasa.gov. Questionnaires may be sent to the point of contact listed above by mail, fax, or email.</p>