

AMENDMENT OF SOLICITATION/MODIFICATION OF CONTRACT			1. CONTRACT ID CODE	PAGE 1 OF 10 PAGES
2. AMENDMENT/MODIFICATION NO. Amendment No. One (1)	3. EFFECTIVE DATE See Block 16C	4. REQUISITION/PURCHASE REQ. NO. N/A		5. PROJECT NO. (If applicable)
6. ISSUED BY NASA Ames Research Center Acquisition Branch for Mission Support Moffett Field, CA 94035-0001	CODE JAC	7. ADMINISTERED BY (If other than Item 6) Jeannette Albiez, Mail Stop 241-1 Phone: 650-604-1029 Fax: 650-604-0912 Email: jeannette.albiez@nasa.gov		CODE JAC
8. NAME AND ADDRESS OF CONTRACTOR (No. Street, county, State and ZIP: Code) To All Prospective Offerors			(b) X	9A. AMENDMENT OF SOLICITATION NO. NNA12412481R
				9B. DATED (SEE ITEM 11) 1/29/13
				10A. MODIFICATION OF CONTRACT/ORDER NO.
				10B. DATED (SEE ITEM 13)
CAGE CODE	FACILITY CODE			
11. THIS ITEM ONLY APPLIES TO AMENDMENTS OF SOLICITATIONS				
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The above numbered solicitation is amended as set forth in Item 14. The hour and date specified for receipt of Offers <input type="checkbox"/> is extended, <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 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.				
(c)	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 <input type="checkbox"/> is not, <input type="checkbox"/> is required to sign this document and return ___ copy to the issuing office.				
14. DESCRIPTION OF AMENDMENT/MODIFICATION (Organized by UCF section headings, including solicitation/contract subject matter where feasible.) This amendment number One (1) is issued to amend the Final Request for Proposal and to respond to Questions received (See page 2)				
15A. NAME AND TITLE OF SIGNER (Type or print)			16A. NAME AND TITLE OF CONTRACTING OFFICER (Type or print) Jeannette Albiez, Contracting Officer	
15B. CONTRACTOR/OFFEROR	15C. DATE SIGNED	16B. UNITED STATES OF AMERICA BY 		16C. DATE SIGNED 2/15/13
(Signature of person authorized to sign)			(Signature of Contracting Officer)	

1) Section L.6.(b)(5) p 70. Change the first sentence of this paragraph to:

“The oral presentation slides and pages of each proposal volume shall be numbered and identified with the Offeror’s name, RFP number, and date (this information is exempt from font size restrictions and may be placed in header or footer).”

2) Section L.6.(b)(8) p 70. Add the following at the end of the last sentence of the paragraph:

(this information is exempt from font size restrictions and may be placed in header or footer).”

3) Section L.8.(c), p 74 The following sentence is added to the end of this paragraph:

“Snapshots of web pages are exempt from the font sizing requirement.”

4) Section L.9.(a)A.2.i) p 77 Paragraph i) is changed to read:

“Approach to inflight data capture as well as archiving at the end of the mission segment”

5) Section L.9.(b)(7) p 87 The sentence is changed to read:

“The major areas to be evaluated for the Past Performance factor are Relevant Technical Performance, Contract Management and Other Information.”

6) Section L.9.(b) A.1.h) p 88 The sentence is changed to read:

“Reserved”

7) Section L.9.(b) A.2.g) p 88 The sentence is changed to read:

“Reserved”

8) Section L.9.(b) A.3, p 89 will be changed as follows:

“For all relevant contracts identified in (b)(1) above, and for all relevant NASA contracts completed within the last three years or active for at least one year, the Offeror and major subcontractors shall:”

9) Section L.9.(b) A.3.f) p 89 Paragraph f) is deleted.

10) Section J.1.(a), Attachment 4, Government Furnished Property, Date furnished shall be changed as follows for all items:

“At Contract Start”

11) Section M.2.(a)A.2.i) p 104 Paragraph i) is changed to read:

“Approach to inflight data capture as well as archiving at the end of the mission segment”

12) M.2.(b)A.1.h) p 112 The sentence is changed to read:

“Reserved”

13) M.2.(b)A.2.g) p 112 The sentence is changed to read:

“Reserved”

14) M.2.(b)A.3.f) p 113 Paragraph f) is deleted.

15) QUESTIONS, COMMENTS, AND RESPONSES

FINAL RFP QUESTIONS – SET 1

RFP Section, Paragraph and Page	Question/Comments	Government Response
	1. Please advise on the due date for questions to be submitted on the final RFP.	The due date for questions to the Final RFP is March 4, 2013. The synopsis will be modified to reflect this.
	2. As resumes are required to be submitted with the proposal could you please let us know how many FTE'S are required for this requirement?	Please see J1(b) Attachment 1 which details the Estimated Core Technical Requirement for the first year. Offerors are also required to provide their estimates for the Core Management Requirement. Please see J1(b) Attachment 3, Pricing Template Workbook.
L.9.(a).A.2.i), Case Study 1 Page 77	3. ISS Payload Development requires offerors to provide an “approach to post flight procedures archives.” This requirement may be interpreted multiple ways, including 1) an approach to archiving procedures conducted in-flight at the completion of mission	This RFP amended to clarify this requirement.

	<p>operations or 2) an approach to archiving procedures conducted at the completion of mission operations. Will the Government please clarify the intent of this requirement?</p>	
Section L.9 (b),A.3 Page 89,	<p>4. Other Information states “For all relevant contracts identified in (b)(1) above, and for all NASA contracts completed within the last three years or active for at least one year, the Offeror and major subcontractors shall...”</p> <p>For some large businesses, this may not be a practical request given the page limit for the past performance volume. Would the government consider removing these additional contract information from the 30 page limit and revise the wording of the requirement to, “For all relevant contracts identified in (b)(1) above, and for all relevant NASA contracts (cost and scope) completed within the last three years or active for at least one year, the Offeror and major subcontractors shall...”.</p>	The RFP will be amended to include the suggested change.
Section F.2 (a), Page 14	<p>5. For pricing purposes, please provide an estimated start date for phase-in and contract start.</p>	Per NFS 1807.105(b)(20), the goal for contract award is 180 days after RFP release.
L.7.(a), Page 71	<p>6. RFP Section L.7(a) states that offerors are to submit their oral presentation materials together with their proposals. It further states that offerors shall mark their package containing their presentation material for the oral presentation with “Offeror’s Presentation Materials for Mission Suitability Oral Presentation.” Will the Government please clarify if the package containing the oral presentation materials is in</p>	<p>Yes, the package containing the oral presentation materials is in addition to and independent of the required paper and electronic copies. As stated in L.7(a) “the Government will furnish the presentation materials (in their originally sealed package) to the Offeror’s presenters immediately before the start of the presentation”. The Government will not open the sealed package so any format is acceptable. Again it is for the presenter’s use as they will not be permitted to bring any other documents or electronic media to the oral</p>

	<p>addition to and independent of the required paper and electronic copies stipulated in RFP Section L.6.(b).(1), p.68? If it is, will the Government please clarify the required contents of the package containing the oral presentation materials (e.g., one CD/DVD, one paper submission)? If the package containing the oral presentation materials is not in addition to and independent of the required paper and electronic copies, will the Government please clarify the format in which it requires the package containing the oral presentation materials (e.g., spine and cover page of copy X of 7 to be marked with "Offeror's Presentation Materials for Mission Suitability Oral Presentation")?</p>	<p>presentation.</p>
<p>L.7.(c), Page 71</p>	<p>7. RFP Section L.7.(c) states that offerors shall have the proposed Program Manager and up to 4 of the offeror's key personnel present for the oral presentation. Will the Government please clarify how many key personnel/observers offerors may bring to watch the oral presentations?</p>	<p>Only the presenters, which includes the Program Manager and up to 4 of the offeror's key personnel, may attend.</p>
<p>L.8.(c), Page 74</p>	<p>8. The RFP specifies that diagrams, charts, tables, and photographs may use no smaller than 8 point Arial font. As offerors are required to provide a sample web page (RFP Section L.9.(a).A.4.a), p.79), which may include representational or notional graphics that are not meant to be read in detail, will the Government consider that such notional graphics be exempt from the font size restriction as long as they are not used excessively?</p>	<p>We have considered your request and have decided that snapshots of web pages can be exempt from the font sizing requirement and will make the change in the RFP.</p>

<p>L.8.(a), p.74</p>	<p>9. We appreciate the Government’s page count considerations and revisions as discussed in Questions and Answers, Set 5, Answer 16 and reflected in RFP Section L.8.(a). However, the detail and number of requirements for each of the Case Studies remains significant. As such, we respectfully request the Government consider increasing the Mission Suitability page allocation from 30 to 40 pages. This slight adjustment in page count will allow offerors an opportunity to propose innovative and robust approaches to the Case Studies and assist the Government in evaluating offerors’ understanding of technical requirements and discriminating features of each offeror’s approaches.</p>	<p>We have considered your request and decided that we will leave the page count at 30.</p>
<p>L.9.(b)A.1. – A.3., p. 88-89; M.2.(b)A.1. – A.3., p. 111-113</p>	<p>10. RFP Sections L.9.(b)A.1. through A.3. and the corresponding evaluation criteria defined in RFP Sections M.2.(b) A.1. – A.3. appear to contain redundant requirements. In particular: 1) Section L.9.(b) A.1.h) requires offerors to describe “problems encountered and their resolutions” within the context of contracts identified as relevant in Section L.9.(b)(1). Meanwhile, Section L.9.(b) A.3.c) similarly requires offerors to “describe any problems encountered and the resolution of those problems” within the context of contracts identified as relevant in Section L.9.(b)(1) and for all NASA contracts completed within the last three years or active for at least one year. 2) Section L.9.(b) A.2.b) requires offerors to describe their “ability to attract and retain high-caliber key</p>	<p>Thank you, the RFP will be amended to remove the redundant requirements.</p>

	<p>personnel and technical employees to address contract objectives” within the context of contracts identified as relevant in Section L.9.(b)(1). Meanwhile, Section L.9.(b) A.2.g) similarly requires offerors to describe the “efficiency and effectiveness of the approach used to attract and retain employees” within the context of contracts identified as relevant in Section L.9.(b)(1).</p> <p>3) Section L.9.(b) A.3.b) requires offerors to “explain any schedule slips and steps taken to mitigate the impact of the slips” within the context of contracts identified as relevant in Section L.9.(b)(1) and for all NASA contracts completed within the last three years or active for at least one year. Meanwhile, Section L.9.(b) A.3.f) similarly requires offerors to “discuss any schedule slips and steps taken to mitigate the impact of the slips” within the context of contracts identified as relevant in Section L.9.(b)(1) and for all NASA contracts completed within the last three years or active for at least one year.</p> <p>Will the Government please consider consolidating these apparent redundant requirements given the limited formatting and page constraints prescribed in RFP Section L.8.(a)?</p>	
<p>J.1(b) Attachment 1 – Cost Model</p>	<p>11. Several labor categories provided in RFP Section J.1(b) Attachment 1 – Cost Model have drastically differing levels of detail for the education/experience/skill requirements. For example, the requirements provided for a Web Master supporting the Strategic Management core</p>	<p>Minimum education and experience are listed for each labor category. Additional details on the requirements of each position can be found in the subtask descriptions.</p>

	<p>requirement state not only the minimum education and experience, but also details on the ancillary skill sets necessary to successfully meet mission objectives. However, the requirements provided for all positions supporting the Space Biology core requirement do not provide similarly detailed education or ancillary skill sets to meet mission objectives. This lack of detail in requirements poses a significant challenge to industry in developing Direct Labor Rates in RFP Section J.1.(b) Attachment 3 and may result in drastically different offers from industry – resulting in an additional burden to the Government in conducting its cost reasonableness evaluation. Request the Government provide the minimum education, experience, and ancillary skill sets necessary to meet mission objectives for each Government-provided SLC.</p>	
<p>Section J.1 (a), Attachment 4, Government Furnished Property</p>	<p>12. The referenced attachment states that the GFP will be furnished to the contractor on April 1, 2013. Would the government consider changing that date to after phase-in and at contract start?</p>	<p>Yes, thank you. The attachment will be updated to state that the Date to be Furnished will be contract start.</p>
<p>Section L.9(b)7.A.3 Other Information, Page 89</p>	<p>13. For all relevant contracts identified in (b)(1) above, and for all NASA contracts completed within the last three years or active for at least one year, the Offeror and Major subcontractors shall: Describe any serious performance problems, termination for default, and any regulatory or safety violations resulting from contractor performance. Explain any schedule slips and steps taken to mitigate the</p>	<p>Please see answer to Question 3</p>

	<p>impact of the slips. Discuss any problems encountered and the resolutions to those problems. Provide examples of innovative methods implemented that resulted in cost savings to the customer. Discuss any overruns in direct or indirect overhead rates and their impact on overall performance.</p> <p>Discuss any schedule slips and steps taken to mitigate the impact of the slips.</p> <p>Is it the Government's intent for this response to be limited to all relevant NASA contracts completed within the last 3 years or active for at least one year? (We interpret relevant to mean contracts that are similar in size, scope and complexity). If not, would the Government consider making this requirement outside of the 30 page allocation for the Past Performance Volume? (The list of all as opposed to relevant NASA contracts could easily exceed 100 NASA programs that meet these criteria).</p>	
<p>Section L.9(b)A.3.f, Page 89</p>	<p>14. L.9(b)A.3.f appears to be a duplicate of L.9(b)A3.b. Will the Government consider amending the RFP to remove L.9(b)A.3.f?</p>	<p>Please see answer to Question 9.</p>
<p>Section L (L.9.b.(7)) Page 87; L.9.b.7.A.1; M.2.A.2.b.A.1</p>	<p>15. The RFP states, "The major areas to be evaluated for the Past Performance factor are Relevant Technical Performance, Contract Management, Corporate Management Responsiveness, and Other Information." The RFP specifically defines Relevant Technical Performance in Section L.9.b.7.A.1 and M.2.A.2.b.A.1, Contract Management in Section L.9.b.7.A.2 and M.2.A.2.b.A.2, and Other</p>	<p>Thank you, the RFP will be amended to delete "Corporate Management Responsiveness" from Section L.9b.(7)</p>

	<p>Information in Section L.9.b.7.A.3 and M.2.A.2.b.A.3, but does not define Corporate Management Responsiveness.</p> <p>Does the Government plan on providing specific guidance on the requirements for Corporate Management Responsiveness? If not, would the Government consider removing it from the RFP text on page 87?</p>	
<p>Section L.6(b)5 Page 70</p>	<p>16. The oral presentation slides and pages of each proposal volume shall be numbered and identified with the offerors Name, RFP number and Date. L.6.8. The offeror shall apply all appropriate markings including those prescribed in accordance with FAR 52.215-1(e) "Restriction on Disclosure and Use of Data" and FAR 3.104.-5 "Disclosure, Protection, and Marking of Contractor Bid or Proposal Information and Source Selection Information. Is it the Government's intent to have the information required in the above RFP reference be within the 14 point font limitation for the Orals Slides and 12 point font limitation for each page within the written sections?</p> <p>Recommendation: Recommend that the Government allow for this required information to be provided in the header or footer and outside the font requirements of the oral slides and written portion of the volume.</p>	<p>The offeror's name, RFP number and date and info required by FAR 52.215-1(e) and FAR 3.104-5 may be included in a header or footer in smaller font. The RFP will be amended to reflect this.</p>

16) All other terms and conditions remain unchanged.

(END OF AMENDMENT ONE)