

**Q126: SEC. L - INSTRUCTIONS, CONDITIONS, AND NOTICES, Paragraph L.21.4C Page L-34
Safety and Environmental Past Performance (L.21.4C first paragraph)**

When referencing “contracts performed in the last 3 years,” please clarify whether the desire is for data from ALL contracts performed in the last 3 years, just those being cited for Past Performance questionnaires per L.21.4E (i.e., work with some or all of the functions defined in the SOW), just those with a Past Performance Narrative or something else.

A126: The Safety and Environmental Past Performance referenced in L.21.4.C is required for the prime and major subcontractors for all contracts in the last 3 years for contracts that are relevant to the JETS NAICS code. See answers to Questions 55, 120 and 121.

**Q127: SEC. L - INSTRUCTIONS, CONDITIONS, AND NOTICES, Paragraph L.21.4C Page L-35
Safety and Environmental Past Performance (L.21.4C(b)(ii))**

The first line asks for records of the company’s OSHA recordable injuries and illnesses. Please clarify whether this is for ALL contracts performed in the last 3 years, just those being cited for Past Performance questionnaires per L.21.4 E (i.e., work that is relevant to this effort), just those w/ a Past Performance Narrative or something else.

A127: It is only required for contracts in the last 3 years for contracts that are relevant to the JETS NAICS code. See answers to Question 121 and 126.

**Q128: SEC. L - INSTRUCTIONS, CONDITIONS, AND NOTICES, Paragraph L.21.4C Page L-35
Safety and Environmental Past Performance (L.21.4C(b)(ii))**

The last line asks for the calculated OSHA recordable frequency rate. Please clarify whether this is the Total Case Rate.

A128: The OSHA recordable frequency rate includes three indicators: the Days Away Case Rate (DACR), the Days Away/Restricted Duty/job Transfer Rate (DART) and the Total Recordable Incident Rate (TRIR).

**Q129: SEC. L - INSTRUCTIONS, CONDITIONS, AND NOTICES, Paragraph L.21.4C Page L-34
Safety and Environmental Past Performance (L.21.4C first paragraph)**

The second line asks for the NAICS Code for each contract and POCs. Please clarify whether the POCs specified are the same customer POCs which are requested in the top paragraph of L-34 or someone different?

A129: Yes, these two paragraphs refer to the same customer POCs. According to L.21.4C first paragraph states “The Offeror shall provide a cross reference list past contracts and points of contact corresponding with Attachment L-7, Past Performance Questionnaire Template...

**Q130: SEC. L - INSTRUCTIONS, CONDITIONS, AND NOTICES, Pages L-34-35
Safety and Environmental Past Performance**

L.21.4C (b) (iv) requires workers’ compensation experience modifier calculations and loss ratios for the prime and major subcontractors showing all figures used for the computation. For a large team, this will consume a large number of pages of the Past Performance Volume.

Will the Government please consider taking L.21.4C (b) (iv) out of the volume page count?

A130: No, the Government plans to include L.21.4C (b) (iv) in the volume page count. The Final RFP has been updated with new page counts. L.21.4C (b)(iv) in the Draft RFP has been updated in the Final RFP to L.23.4 (6).

**Q131: SEC. L - INSTRUCTIONS, CONDITIONS, AND NOTICES, Paragraph L.21.4C Pages L-21 and L-36 and Attachment L-7 Page L-7-2
Past Performance Questionnaire**

Page L-7-2 => The second paragraph of the Transmittal Letter requests completed questionnaires by May 4, 2012.

Page L-36 first paragraph states to return the questionnaire on or before the Volume II due date.

Page L-21 Table L-2 has an early request Past Performance due date of May 14, 2012, while the table note has the formal due date as May 24, 2012.

Please clarify the Past Performance questionnaire due date.

A131: May 30, 2012 is the correct date to submit Past Performance Section. The Final RFP will be updated for all reference sections.

Q132: SEC. L.21.3.2, Page L-28 Government Resource Estimate (GRE)

The bottom of the first paragraph reads, "The GRE provided is not intended to influence the Offeror's proposed estimates; however, it is provided to assist Offerors in determining the general magnitude of this procurement. With the exception of level-of-effort requirements and TO13, Offerors shall develop their own estimate that support their unique proposed management and technical approaches and shall provide supporting rationale in narrative form."

The first sentence in the next paragraph reads, "The GRE is not to be considered a Government "plug number."

As the two statements above appear to contradict the level of effort portion of the draft RFP, we request clarification.

A132: For the level of effort task order, the Contractor should use the resources specified in the RFP. These resources are specified in Attachment L-3 and L-8. The Final RFP has been updated to clarify this apparent contradiction.

Q133: Section L21.3.4 1 (v) SB Requirements

Will the requirements of FAR 52.219-9 (alt II) as identified in Section L21.3.4 1 (v) be incorporated into the contract as Attachment J-7?

A133: Yes, per DRD-MGMT-13.

Q134: Attachment J- 7, Small Business Subcontracting Plan

Should Attachment J-7, Small Business Subcontracting Plan required by FAR 52.219-9 include those items identified in DRD MGMT-13, B CONTENT?

A134: Yes, DRD MGMT-13 becomes J-7.

Q135: DRD-JETS-MGMT-13

Should DRD-JETS-MGMT-13 include as its submission a Small Business Subcontracting Plan that meets the requirements of FAR 52.219-9 as a separate document and respond to the items set forth in “B Content” separately?

A135: No, there should be one integrated submission for DRD -MGMT-13.

Q136: Amendment 6 item #1 states that “the Government is making significant revisions to Attachment L-3: Task Orders. The changes will be incorporated into the final RFP. “ This was in response to numerous comments, suggestions, and questions on the Draft RFP Attachment L-3. Since the government is anticipating significant changes, we respectfully request that the revised Attachment L-3 be made available at least 2 weeks before the final RFP is released to allow potential Offerors to comment on the significantly changed items.

A136: The Government does not believe that the changes to Attachment L-3 are significant enough to warrant another period of comments. The Government will not post the Attachment L-3 Task Orders in advance of the Final RFP.

Q137: Ref: JSC Data Requirements Description (DRD) Staffing and Critical Skills Plan, MGMT - 04 Item B. 4 requires job descriptions and qualifications by proposed skill levels to be included in the plan. However, the RFP provides these Standard Labor Categories in Attachment L-2 as defined by the Government.

Question: Since Offerors will be providing a mapping of their company labor categories to the Standard Labor Categories (SLC) in the Cost Proposal, would it be sufficient to reference RFP Attachment L-2 to satisfy Item B.4 instead of including those same SLC pages in the Staffing and Critical Skills Plan, using a substantial number of pages? Alternatively, we request the Government exclude the job descriptions from the 400 page-count.

A137: It is acceptable for Offerors to reference the Attachment L-2 SLC to satisfy Item B.4 of DRD -MGMT-04.

Q138: In the Government’s answer to Question #86, it was stated that “It is not permissible to cross-reference the data provided for one sub-factor in another subfactor. The data provided for each sub-factor should stand alone and be consistent with the rest of the proposal.”

Question: Not allowing cross references would require portions of sections to be repeated,

such as the management approach (in Subfactor 1) to be repeated in Subfactor 2 when responding to the Task Orders. Would the government consider revising the restriction to state “Cross-referencing between subfactors should be maximized to reduce duplication. Each subfactor should provide only data necessary for that subfactor what is independent of the data contained in other subfactors.

A138: The Final RFP will be updated to eliminate some duplication in the Final RFP by eliminating the requirement to submit a narrative of the Technical Understanding of Requirements for Section 1 in TA2. Section 1 data for TA2 will be limited to the Basis of Estimate and Resources. It is not permissible to cross-reference the data provided for one sub-factor in another sub-factor. The data provided for each sub-factor should stand alone and be consistent with the rest of the proposal. See answers to Question 86.

Q139: L.21.3.2 C – The RFP states that “Offerors shall assume that 700 office seats (See G.8(c) Installation-Accountable Government Property), distributed among the JSC facilities, are available for the JETS Contractor.”

We request that the Government provide detailed specifications for all contractor-provided offsite facilities required for the JETS contract, inclusive of estimated office seats to accommodate staff, any specialized equipment, any needs for facility-type other than normal office space, and any requirements in terms of proximity to JSC.

A139: The off-site facility requirements are highly dependent on an Offeror’s technical approach. In the interest of promoting competition, the Government will not specify these requirements.

Q140: DRD MGMT-01 (Contract Management Plan), p. 1 of 1

The “Content” section of DRD MGMT-01 requires offerors to address processes for multiple elements, including “baseline control.” Are we correct in assuming that the reference to “baseline” should be changed to SOW Section 1?

A140: The term “Baseline Control” has been removed from the Final RFP.

Q141: DRD BP 01 (NASA Contractor Financial Management Report), p. 5 of 22 (Personal Property & Equipment); DRD BP-08 (Contractor-Held Property Reporting), p. 1 of 2; Attachment J-2, Data Requirements List, p. J-1-13

In DRD BP-01, the section “Personal Property & Equipment Reporting” requires the contractor to report personal property and equipment with a total acquisition cost \geq \$100,000 as a separate reporting category on the NF533. In DRD BP-08, the section “Monthly Property Financial Reports” requires the contractor to report WIP (personal property) of \$100,000 and over. In addition, while DRD BP-08 is included in the DRFP, the DRL indicates that DRD BP-08 is reserved.

Please clarify whether it is the Government’s intent for the JETS contractor to report WIP on two separate reports (DRD BP-01 and DRD BP-08).

A141: The DRL was correct. DRD BP-08 has been deleted in the Final RFP.

Q142: DRD BP-01 01 (NASA Contractor Financial Management Report), p. 4 -5 of 22

As mentioned in the previous question, DRD BP-01 requires the contractor to report personal property and equipment with a total acquisition cost \geq \$100,000 as a separate reporting category on the NF533. On page 4 of the DRD, a reporting category is defined as the level at which cost is reported on the NF533M. Is it the Government's intent to for the contractor to generate, accumulate, manage, and report all Data Elements (e.g., columns 7a, 7b, 7c, 7d, 8a, 8b, 8c, EAC, 9a, 9b, and 10) for each item separately, in addition to the Task Order CLIN, Sub CLIN, or WBS level? Or will only some Data Elements, such as columns 7a and 7c, be required?

A142: To clarify the statement above, the DRD requires the contractor to report personal property and equipment with a total acquisition cost \geq \$100,000, if it's determined to be capital, as a separate reporting category on the NF533. The capital determination is made by NASA Property Finance based on the completion of the NF1739 by the Program and Project Manager. If an item is determined to be capital, and a separate reporting is required, the standard NF533 data elements would apply.

Q143: DRD BP 01 (NASA Contractor Financial Management Report), p. 5 of 22

The section on "Personal Property and Equipment" in DRD BP-01 requires the contractor to obtain the NASA capitalization determination prior to costs being incurred to ensure items identified as capital are properly reported on the 533. Can the Government provide an estimate of the amount of reporting categories associated with capital items so offerors can estimate the impact to the management and administration function to ensure time-phased budgets and estimates are maintained for these reporting categories for the life of the contract?

A143: No, this is dependent upon the number of task orders associated with hardware deliverables; it may also be dependent upon how the contractor tracks costs associated with these projects such as labor, materials, testing, etc.

Q144: Attachment L-3, TO-RFP-10, 5.1-5.2, p. L-3-68 to L-3-71 and p. L-3-76

Task Order 10 prescribes Sub-task: 5.1 Analog Science Operations Management and Research which calls for: analog science operations draft plans and final plans (4 draft and final/yr); mission concepts for analog mission operations (4); traverse plans for analog mission operations (4); etc.

Also Task Order 10 prescribes Sub-task: 5.2 Science and Exploration Mission Development and Operations Management which calls for: science operation plan for planetary surface science missions (2 plans/yr); mission concepts for human and robotic surface mission operations (2); etc. Task Order 10 also defines activities under Sub-task 5.3.

Although Sub-task 5.1 seems to require 4 of each of the various plans and Sub-task 5.2 seems to require 2 of each of the various plans, the Task Order concludes with a final notice as follows(p. L-3-76, last 3 sentences):

"For the purposes of this RFP, assume the following scenario for providing the above

science operations services:

Analog Missions per year: Two Research and Technology Studies (RATS) per year.

Duration of Missions: Each mission is 3 weeks long. There will be 3 weeks of dry runs on site at JSC prior to each mission.”

This final notice seems to suggest that only Analog Missions are required for proposal purposes (Two RATS per year). This appears to contradict the “Products” sections of Sub-tasks 5.1 and 5.2, which calls for 4 of each of the Analog plans and 2 of each of the Science Exploration Mission plans, respectively. Can the Government please clarify the deliverables for Sub-tasks 5.1 and 5.2 of this TO?

A144: Task Order 10 has been deleted from the Final RFP.

Q145: Section M.4 indicates the weighting of the Management Approach to be 250 while the weighting of the Technical Approach is 500. We suggest that these two sub-factor weights should be equal. This is based on the recognition that Management will be critically important in supporting EA and JSC’s implementation of the changing paradigm from an individual large program management to a more diverse use of R&D and partnering environment. The combination of strong management and technical approach will be needed to help achieve the future vision of EA and JSC. Will the government consider modifying the weighting to make Management and Technical of equal weight?

A145: The Government has considered this request but believes that the current weighting of the evaluation factors is appropriate for a technical support contract.

Q146: Section L.21.3.2, Table L-3: IDIQ Task Orders, Pg. L-25

Reference: The Offeror shall provide: A) the specific technical understanding of the requirements; B) the basis of estimate including any efficiencies proposed; and C) provide an estimate in the form of a technical resources summary (TRST) for each Task Order in Table L-3 (with the exceptions detailed in Table L-3)

Question: The table does not identify an exception for Task Order 14 however, the Level of Effort is prescribed in Attachment L-8 IDIQ template. Should there be an exception to providing items B and C since the LOE has been prescribed? Please clarify the LOE to be priced for Task 14 is located in the template provided in the Workbook and a Basis of Estimate is not required.

A146: The Final RFP will be updated to state that for the Level Of Effort TO - Narrative for Technical Understanding and BOE are not required. The resources are provided by the Government in Attachments L-3 and L-8.

Q147: Reference answer to Question 33 and Section L.21.3.2, Part 2, TA2 Para A and Para B; Attachment L-3, TO#14, Para 5.1.a, Page L-3-105; Section H.6, Page H-3

TA2, Para A, directs the Offeror to provide a sufficient narrative detailing the technical approaches for providing products and services defined in each of the RFP IDIQ Task Orders listed in Table L-3. Para B directs preparation of a detail Basis of Estimate for each Task Order.

Section H.6 defines the task order procedures to be used to respond to a task order request.

Attachment L-3, TO#14, however indicates in Para 5.1.a, Page L-3-105, that, for proposal purposes, a task plan consistent with Clause H.6 is not required.

The government's answer to Question 33 clarifies that Part B (BOEs) and Part C, Technical Resource Summary Template, fill-ins are not required for Task Order #14.

It appears that Para 5.1.a of Attachment L-3, Page L-3-105, indicates that, for proposal purposes, the Offeror is not required to respond to the requirements of Section L.21.3.2, Part 2, Para A, as well.

Please clarify whether or not the government expects a detailed technical approach narrative as prescribed by Section L.21.3.2 Part A, for Task Order #14.

A147: See answer to Question 146.

Q148: All Questions Refer to RTO #7, STO #2 CMS System Software Sustaining Engineering:

CMSS STO:

1. Please provide:

- CRs and DRs along with their dispositions and status for this task for the last 3 years.
- Sizing information for the S/W that will be maintained under this sub task.
- A list and copies of documents to be maintained under this STO.

Advanced Radiation Instrumentation (ARI) STO:

1. Please provide:

- A list and copies of documents to be maintained under this STO.
- Sizing information for the S/W to be maintained under this STO.

2. Please clarify whether or not the IV-TEPC GTE application is included in the scope of this STO.

SAFER STO:

- 1. This upgrade is currently being performed by the incumbent contractor with a CDR scheduled for the summer of 2012. Therefore, please clarify the scope of this STO. In particular, does NASA expect a full life cycle development task plan or a plan post transition from the current contract for the ongoing SAFER upgrade project?**
- 2. Please provide the current SAFER upgrade Project Management Plan and Master Schedule. What are the milestones for avionics FSW and GTP SW and when are they planned?**
- 3. What are the NASA forums (review, panels, and boards) which control the SAFER configuration and review/approve contractor products, including handling of CRs, DRs, software loads, certification reports, etc? How do these reviews and panels tier**

up to the ISS CCB? For example, is there an ER6 pre-CCB panel which is the first level of control?

4. Were any CRs/DRs written on the USA version of SAFER. If so, what is the CR/DR history? Are any USA SAFER DRs expected to be incorporated in the ISS SAFER update
5. What is the new on-orbit checkout equipment being built? Who is building it? What is the schedule for it?
6. What are the tools provided by ER6 for FSW development? Is any of that being modified for the ISS SAFER?
7. Please provide the following ISS SAFER Project Documentation
 - Avionics (FSW) and Ground Test Processor SRS
 - Avionics and GTP Verification and Validation Document
 - Avionics and GTP Software Design Description
 - GTP to Avionics SW Interface Control Document
 - Avionics SW to FPGA ICD
 - SAFER Project Technical Requirements Specification
 - Avionics and GTP Software Test Plan, Software Test Description, and Software Test Results from prior delivery (USA SAFER) and current delivery (ISS SAFER) as available now
 - Code from USA SAFER and current for ISS SAFER if possible
 - Need the ISS SAFER development, certification, and ISS delivery schedule including GTP
 - Integration test plan, test design, and test results for USA SAFER and the same for ISS SAFER as available
 - ICD and schedule for new ISS on-board SAFER checkout system if the onboard check out system is different from the GTP.

A148:

CMSS – The Final RFP has been updated to state: “For purposes of the RFP, Offerors should assume that there will be no change requests for the software and that there is an average of one discrepancy report on the software per year.”

The documents to be maintained are either on the applicable documents list in the TO, or called out in the Applicable Documents of the SRS JSC 62816. Copies of the relevant documents are posted on the JETS Technical Library.

The SRS JSC 62816 identifies applicable documentation sufficient to obtain the size of the software components relative to this effort, as well as other documentation relative to this effort.

ARI – 1. The documents to be maintained are either on the Applicable Documents List in the TO, or called out in the Applicable Documents of the SDP JSC 64429. Copies of the relevant documents are posted on the JETS Technical Library.

The SDP JSC 64429 identifies the size of the software components relative to this effort.

2. The effort is inclusive of the IV-TEPC GTE application as it relates to any efforts that might

be required to maintain and re-certify the FSW as described in the Maintenance section of the SDP JSC 64429.

SAFER – Section 5.5 of the task order – Simplified Aid for EVA Rescue (SAFER) has been deleted from the task order in the Final RFP.

Q149: Section L.23.4 has a Major Subcontractor definition of \$5 million. Section L23.5 has the definition of \$20 million. Please clarify which definition is correct.

A149: Both are correct. The definition of major subcontractor in Section L.23.4 (>\$5M) applies to only the requirements of Section L.23.4 (the Past Performance Volume, Volume II). The definition of major subcontractor in Section L.23.5 (\$20M or more per year) applies to only the requirements of Section L.23.5 (the Cost/Price Volume, Volume III).

Q150: In Section L.23.4(1) Volume II, Past Performance on p. L-34, the RFP requires past performance information from "major subcontractors," which are further defined as having an estimated annual value greater than \$5M. In the Cost Volume instructions (L.23.5), major subcontractors are defined as having an estimated annual value of \$20M or more (p. L-38) while minor subcontractors are defined as having an estimate annual contract value at or above \$5M (p. L-42). Please clarify whether past performance information is required for minor subcontractors (at or above \$5M/annually) as well as for major subcontractors (at or above \$20M). Since the Past Performance Volume is due early (May 30), it is essential that offerors receive early direction on this requirement - ideally by May 1.

A150: See answer to Question 149. The definition of major subcontractor in L.23.4 (an estimated annual value greater than \$5M) applies to only the Past Performance Volume.

Q151: In Section L.23.3.2 (Part 2 Technical Approach) on p. L-24, the RFP requires offerors to describe their approach and rationale to meeting the technical requirements of the SOW. The requirements for TA2 further state "the offerors are required to demonstrate their understanding of the requirements of the SOW and each RFP IDIQ Task Order." The specific TA2 requirements (pp. L-24 - L-30) appear to call for a SOW Section 1 BOE and responses to each IDIQ Task Order. Are offerors also required to discuss their understanding and approach to each of the SOW elements (i.e. SOW 2.1 - 2.7)? Please note that the Government's answer to this question materially affects offerors' proposal preparation, so an early response is critical - ideally by May 1.

A151: No, TA2 does not require that Offerors discuss their understanding and approach to each SOW element (i.e. SOW 2.1 - 2.7) beyond what is required in their responses to SOW Section 1 BOE and resources and each IDIQ task order.