

<b>AMENDMENT OF SOLICITATION/MODIFICATION OF CONTRACT</b>		1. CONTRACT ID CODE	PAGE OF PAGES 1   8	
2. AMENDMENT/MODIFICATION NO. 000002	3. EFFECTIVE DATE 10/17/2012	4. REQUISITION/PURCHASE REQ. NO.	5. PROJECT NO. (If applicable)	
6. ISSUED BY NASA/Goddard Space Flight Center Procurement Operations Division Code 210.P Greenbelt MD 20771	CODE GSFC	7. ADMINISTERED BY (If other than Item 6) NASA/Goddard Space Flight Center Procurement Operations Division Greenbelt MD 20771	CODE GSFC	
8. NAME AND ADDRESS OF CONTRACTOR (No., street, county, State and ZIP Code)		(x) 9A. AMENDMENT OF SOLICITATION NO. NNG12418706R		
		x 9B. DATED (SEE ITEM 11) 10/12/2012		
		10A. MODIFICATION OF CONTRACT/ORDER NO.		
		10B. DATED (SEE ITEM 13)		
CODE	FACILITY CODE			

**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 \_\_\_\_\_ copies 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 ACKNOWLEDGEMENT TO BE RECEIVED AT THE PLACE DESIGNATED FOR THE RECEIPT OF OFFERS PRIOR TO THE HOUR AND DATE 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 date specified.

12. ACCOUNTING AND APPROPRIATION DATA (If required)

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

CHECK ONE	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 \_\_\_\_\_ copies to the issuing office.

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

The purpose of this amendment is to revise the minimum average cost/fee values under clauses L.22 and M.6.

See page 2, Accordingly;

Except as 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) Lashawn K. Davis
15B. CONTRACTOR/OFFEROR	16B. UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
(Signature of person authorized to sign)	(Signature of Contracting Officer)
15C. DATE SIGNED	16C. DATE SIGNED 10-24-12

A. Clause L.22 PAST PERFORMANCE VOLUME (MAR 2012) is deleted in its entirety and replaced as follows:

**L.22 PAST PERFORMANCE VOLUME (MAR 2012)**

An Offeror's past performance record indicates the relevant quantitative and qualitative aspects of performing services or delivering products similar in size and content to the requirements of this acquisition. Content review will include the complexity of the work performed.

The Offeror shall provide, at a minimum, the following information in support of its proposal to facilitate the evaluation of the Offeror's past performance as related to the requirements of the proposed contract.

(a) INFORMATION FROM THE OFFEROR

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 \$460k that your company has had within the last 5 years of the RFP release date. Relevance of a past or current contract is evaluated for size and content to include complexity within content.

The fact that a contract meets the minimum dollar threshold for consideration (ex: \$3M) does not guarantee any particular evaluation rating/scoring for size relevance. Indicate which contracts are most related (i.e. similar in size and content) and how they are related to the proposed effort, as well as which contracts were performed by the division of your company (if applicable) that will perform the proposed contract/subcontract.

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 \$230K. The Offeror shall provide the information requested below for any significant subcontractor(s) for those similar efforts within the last 5 years of the RFP release date with a minimum average annual cost/fee incurred of at least 10% of the estimated average annual dollar value of the proposed significant subcontract.

For example (note, these example numbers may not relate to this specific procurement), if a procurement is valued at an average annual value of \$50M and a proposed significant subcontractor for the effort has a proposed average annual cost/fee of \$16M, the Offeror shall provide relevant current/past contract references that have a minimum average annual cost/fee incurred at/above \$1.6M or (10% of \$16M) for that significant subcontractor.

If a prime Offeror or significant subcontractor is submitting past performance data on a current/past contract vehicle that includes multiple tasks, orders, etc, all effort under that contract vehicle may be consolidated for the purposes of meeting the average annual cost/fee incurred in the instructions above and for the purpose of evaluating contract relevance for the proposed requirement.

The Offeror shall provide an estimated value and percentage of work to be performed on this contract by the prime Offeror and each significant subcontractor. Offerors shall estimate prime contract and significant subcontract percentages and value based on an assumption that the contract will meet the Maximum Ordering Value and performance will reflect all areas of the statement of work (Offerors shall also consider other RFP information and available historical

**Amendment #2  
RFP NNG12418706R**

performance data in this estimate). Indicate the primary functions (SOW, etc) to be performed by the prime Offeror and each proposed significant subcontractor. Indicate which contracts are most related (i.e. similar in size and content) and how they are related to the proposed effort, as well as which contracts were performed by the division of your company (if applicable) that will perform the proposed contract/subcontract.

If applicable, Offerors may provide the experience or past performance of a parent or affiliated or predecessor company to an Offeror (including a parent or affiliated company that is being otherwise proposed as a subcontractor on this effort) where the firm's proposal demonstrates that the resources of the parent or affiliate or predecessor will affect the performance of the Offeror. The Offeror shall demonstrate that the resources of the parent or affiliate or predecessor company (its workforce, management, facilities or other resources) shall be provided or relied upon for contract performance such that the parent or affiliate or predecessor will have meaningful involvement in contract performance.

**The Offeror shall provide the following information on all past/current contract references that meet the above criteria for the prime Offeror and each significant subcontractor:**

- Customer's name, address, and telephone number of both the lead contractual and technical personnel most familiar with the Offeror's performance record. *(Please verify the telephone numbers provided are current and correct).*
- Cage Code and/or DUNS Number of the contractor performing the work.
- Contract number, type, and total original and present or final contract value.
- The current contract expenditures incurred to date, the date in which the expenditures have been incurred through, and the Average Annual Cost/Fee Incurred to Date. For example (note, these example numbers may not relate to this specific procurement):

A current five year contract that you are performing has a total estimated value of \$100,000,000. As of the latest cost report which reflected cost/fee through the first 2 years and 4 months of performance, the total amount of cost/fee incurred by the Offeror over the duration of the contract was \$43,500,000.

In this example, an Offeror would provide the following:

Current Contract Expenditures incurred to Date: \$43,500,000

Date in which Expenditures have been incurred through: Insert Date of cost report that indicated cost/fee total of \$43,500,000 after 2 years and 4 months of performance.

Average Annual Cost/Fee Incurred to Date: \$18,669,528 (\$43,500,000/2.33 years)

- Date of contract, place(s) of performance, and delivery dates or period of performance.
- Brief description of contract work and comparability to the proposed effort. It is not sufficient to state that it is comparable in magnitude and scope. Rationale must be provided to demonstrate that it is comparable.
- Method of acquisition: competitive or noncompetitive.
- Nature of award: initial or follow-on. If initial, indicate whether award was preceded by a Government, customer, or Offeror financed study.

**Amendment #2**

**RFP NNG12418706R**

- Identify and explain major technical problems and how they were overcome. List any major deviations or waivers to technical requirements that were granted by the customer.
- Identify and explain completion successes and delays, including adherence to program schedules. Provide an assessment of the performance (technical and schedule) on these past programs and support these assessments with metrics such as award or incentive fees earned.
- Cost management history; identify and explain any cost overruns and underruns, and cost incentive history, if applicable.
- Average number of personnel on the contract per year and percent turnover of personnel per year.
- Recent customer evaluations of past performance including Award Fee Evaluation results, Fee Determination Official letters, Annual Performance Evaluation Forms, etc. (Excluded from the page limitation).
- List any contracts terminated (partial or complete) within the past 5 years and basis for termination (convenience or default). Include the contract number, name, address, and telephone number of the terminating officer (please verify telephone numbers). Include contracts that were "descoped" by the customer because of performance or cost problems. (Excluded from the page limitation).

(b) PRIOR CUSTOMER EVALUATIONS (PAST PERFORMANCE QUESTIONNAIRES)

The Offeror and any proposed significant subcontractor(s) as defined in paragraph (a) shall provide the questionnaires provided as Exhibit 16 to each of the above references to establish a record of past performance. The Offeror shall instruct each of its references to return the questionnaire directly to the Government in a sealed envelope. The questionnaire respondent shall be a representative from the technical customer and responsible Contracting Officer with direct knowledge of your firm's performance. If possible, the Offeror and any proposed significant subcontractor(s) shall provide questionnaires to customers from NASA contracts, other Government contracts, and commercial contracts. For proposed significant subcontractor(s), references shall concern only work performed by the subcontractor's business entity that will perform the work under this contract, if awarded.

The Offeror is responsible for ensuring that the questionnaire is completed and submitted directly to the NASA Goddard Space Flight Center Contract Specialist no later than the closing date of this solicitation designated in Block 9 of the SF 33:

NASA Goddard Space Flight Center  
Attn: Keisha Willingham, Code 210.P  
Bldg. 22, Rm. C255  
Greenbelt, MD 20771  
Telephone: 301-286-3010  
E-mail: Keisha.S.Willingham@nasa.gov

The Offeror shall include a list of those to whom the questionnaires were sent, including name of individual, phone number, organization, and contract number. Offerors shall include in their proposal the written consent of their proposed significant subcontractors to allow the Government to discuss the subcontractors' past performance evaluation with the Offeror.

(c) SUMMARY OF DEVIATIONS/EXCEPTIONS (PAST PERFORMANCE PROPOSAL)

**Amendment #2**  
**RFP NNG12418706R**

Identify and explain the reason for any deviations, exceptions, or conditional assumptions taken with respect to these Past Performance Proposal instructions.

(End of provision)

B. Clause M.6 PAST PERFORMANCE EVALUATION FACTOR (MAR 2012) is deleted in its entirety and replaced as follows:

**M.6 PAST PERFORMANCE EVALUATION FACTOR (MAR 2012)**

An Offeror's past performance will be evaluated based on FAR Part 15 and the evaluation criteria in this provision. All past performance references must meet the "recent" and minimum average annual cost/fee expenditures criteria provided below for both prime contractor references and significant subcontractor references in order to be evaluated.

For purposes of past performance, the term "Offeror" refers to a prime contractor and its significant subcontractors. Accordingly, the past performance of significant(s) subcontractors shall also be evaluated and attributed to the Offeror. The past performance of a significant subcontractor will be compared to the work proposed to be performed by that subcontractor, and weighted accordingly in assigning the overall past performance adjectival rating to the Offeror. The past performance of the prime contractor will be weighted more heavily than any significant subcontractor or combination of significant subcontractors in the overall past performance evaluation.

A "recent" contract is a contract that is ongoing or completed less than 5 years prior to the issuance of this RFP. Contracts completed more than 5 years prior to issuance of this RFP will not be considered recent and will not be considered or evaluated.

A "relevant" contract depends on the size and content to include complexity with content of the contract with respect to this acquisition.

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 \$460k. Relevance of a past or current contract is evaluated for size and content to include complexity with content. The fact that a contract meets the minimum dollar threshold for consideration (ex.\$3M) does not guarantee any particular evaluation rating/scoring for size relevance.

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 \$230k. *Note, the definition of significant subcontractor for the past performance evaluation may be different than for the cost evaluation.*

For a significant subcontractor's contract reference(s) to be considered at least minimally "relevant", it must meet/exceed an average annual cost/fee incurred of at least 10% of that portion of this procurement that the subcontractor is proposed (or estimated) to perform.

If the contract is deemed recent and meets the above minimum average annual cost/fee expenditures criteria, the Government will then determine the degree of relevance - i.e., level of pertinence - of the contract based on size and content. The term "content" means the type and

**Amendment #2**  
**RFP NNG12418706R**

complexity of services, work, or supplies, in comparison to the requirements of this solicitation. The Government may consider past quantities and periods of performance in evaluating overall relevance.

The performance evaluation will be based primarily on customer satisfaction and/or contract data in meeting technical, schedule, cost, and management requirements. Additional performance factors may include contract administration, occupational health, safety, security, subcontracting plan goals and small disadvantaged business participation targets, if applicable, and other contract requirements.

The Government may review and consider past performance information on other contracts that it is aware of or that are made available from other sources and inquiries with previous customers. These contracts (if any) must meet the above "recent" and minimum average annual cost/fee expenditures criteria to be evaluated.

As part of the past performance evaluation, the Government may attribute the experience or past performance of a parent or affiliated or predecessor company (including a parent or affiliated company that is being otherwise proposed as a subcontractor on this effort) to the proposed prime contractor and/or significant subcontractor(s) where the proposal demonstrates that the resources of the parent or affiliate or predecessor company will affect the performance of the proposed prime contractor and/or significant subcontractor(s). The Government will take into consideration whether the resources of the parent or affiliate or predecessor company (its workforce, management, facilities or other resources) will be provided or relied upon for contract performance such that the parent or affiliate will have meaningful involvement in contract performance. These contracts (if any) must meet the above "recent" and minimum average annual cost/fee expenditures criteria to be evaluated.

An Offeror shall not be rated favorably or unfavorably if the Offeror does not have a record of "recent" and "relevant" past performance or if a record of past performance is unavailable. In such cases the Offeror will receive a "Neutral" rating. However, an Offeror with favorable, recent, and relevant past performance that meets the minimum average annual cost/fee expenditures indicated above may be considered more favorably than an Offeror with no relevant past performance information.

The Government will consider an Offeror's explanation of any problems encountered on any identified contracts, and any corrective actions taken by the Offeror.

The overall confidence rating assigned to an Offeror's Past Performance (see below) will reflect a subjective evaluation of the information contained in the oral presentation, if applicable; written narrative; past performance evaluation input provided through customer questionnaires; and other references, if any, that the Government may contact for additional past performance information.

Past Performance Ratings – The level of confidence ratings set forth below will be used to evaluate the Past Performance factor for each Offeror.

Each of the adjective ratings below has a "performance" component and a "relevance" component as discussed above. As used in the ratings below, the term "pertinent" is equivalent to the term "relevant." The following adjectival rating guidelines will be used when subjectively assessing both components.

**Amendment #2**  
**RFP NNG12418706R**

Very High Level of Confidence

The Offeror's relevant past performance is of exceptional merit and is very highly pertinent to this acquisition; indicating exemplary performance in a timely, efficient, and economical manner; very minor (if any) problems with no adverse effect on overall performance. Based on the Offeror's performance record, there is a very high level of confidence that the Offeror will successfully perform the required effort.

High Level of Confidence

The Offeror's relevant past performance is highly pertinent to this acquisition; demonstrating very effective performance that would be fully responsive to contract requirements with contract requirements accomplished in a timely, efficient, and economical manner for the most part with only minor problems with little identifiable effect on overall performance. Based on the Offeror's performance record, there is a high level of confidence that the Offeror will successfully perform the required effort.

Moderate Level of Confidence

The Offeror's relevant past performance is pertinent to this acquisition, and it demonstrates effective performance; fully responsive to contract requirements; reportable problems, but with little identifiable effect on overall performance. Based on the Offeror's performance record, there is a moderate level of confidence that the Offeror will successfully perform the required effort.

Low Level of Confidence

The Offeror's relevant past performance is at least somewhat pertinent to this acquisition, and it meets or slightly exceeds minimum acceptable standards; adequate results; reportable problems with identifiable, but not substantial, effects on overall performance. Based on the Offeror's performance record, there is a low level of confidence that the Offeror will successfully perform the required effort. Changes to the Offeror's existing processes may be necessary in order to achieve contract requirements.

Very Low Level of Confidence

The Offeror's relevant past performance does not meet minimum acceptable standards in one or more areas; remedial action required in one or more areas; problems in one or more areas which, adversely affect overall performance. Based on the Offeror's performance record, there is a very low level of confidence that the Offeror will successfully perform the required effort.

Neutral

In the case of an Offeror without a record of relevant past performance or for whom information on past performance is not available, the Offeror may not be evaluated favorably or unfavorably on past performance [see FAR 15.305(a) (2) (ii) and (iv)].

(End of provision)

**Amendment #2**

**RFP NNG12418706R**

C. All other terms and conditions remain unchanged

(End of Amendment)