Q81: L.18.5.h; The Governments response to Question #66 submitted by industry regarding draft Request for Proposal (document posted to SMAEC website under the link titled "Questions and Answers (10/31/12)". A large business may have several thousand contracts on which the RFP requires an individual POC and NAICS code. Large businesses track NAICS codes primarily for the purposes of small business reporting, not at the prime contract level. Gathering this data will require lengthy research and thousands of phone calls to identify current points of contact and NAICS codes. Additionally, meeting this requirement will add hundreds of pages per each copy of the proposal. Comparatively few of the total number of contracts would be directly relevant to this procurement, making the evaluation extremely time-consuming. Suggest the requirement for NAICS Code and POC for each contract be adjusted to one of the following contract subsets: Past Performance contracts cited in the proposal, contracts relevant to this effort with special emphasis on those within the performing organization, or only NASA related contracts relevant to this effort.

A81: Provision L.18.5(h) has been revised to require applicable NAICS Codes, Environmental Data, and Safety Data for all contracts performed in the last three years that are relevant to the SMAEC effort.

Q82: TO-RFP-06 Subtask 2 section 4.5 page 24: SSP 50030 is referenced, and it may be a typographical error. Should it be SSP 50038?

A82: Yes, Attachment L-1, Representative IDIQ Task Orders; TO-RFP-06; Subtask 2; Section 4.5 has been corrected to reference SSP 50038.

Q83: TO-RFP-01, paragraph 4.1, Management, pg L-1-2 and L-1-3: Paragraph 4.1 Management, Subparagraph 6, lists items a., b., and d. Is item “c” missing?

A83: Attachment L-1, Representative IDIQ Task Orders, TO-RFP-01, paragraph 4.1, Management, has been revised to list items a., b., and c.

Q84: L.18.2, pg L-21: The RFP says that “Microsoft Excel spreadsheets shall be submitted in Microsoft Excel format, and not in a scanned Microsoft Word or Adobe PDF file”. Typically Offerors will provide an electronic version of the proposal that is an electronic version of the printed document, which embeds spreadsheets into a Word document format for easier printing. In addition to this, Offerors will also provide Microsoft Excel spreadsheets in their native format on the CD. Is this acceptable to the Government?

A84: Providing an electronic version of the proposal that is an electronic version of the printed document, which embeds spreadsheets into a Word document format is acceptable, provided that the Offeror also provides Microsoft Excel spreadsheets in their native format on the CD.

Q85: Qs&As released on 9/14/12 (Modification 3, Question and Answer 30): In the Qs&As released on 9/14/12 (Modification 3, Question and Answer 30) its states: “Except for Volume III, Cost/Price Proposal, all volumes shall be prepared and submitted using a non-compressed Times New Roman font with single-spaced 12 point text printed on both sides of the sheet. This font requirement applies to all information required in Volumes I, II, IV, V including pages numbers cover page information, tables, charts, graphics, plans, figures, diagrams and schematics.” Please confirm that the Excel spreadsheets required in Volume III, Cost/Price, do not have to meet the Times New Roman 12 point requirement or the 1” margin requirement. Also, please confirm that the Offeror may consider printing the cost volume single sided. Third, please confirm that the title pages will have to be in Times New Roman 12 point.

A85: Section L, Provision L.18.2, Proposal Arrangement, Page Limitations, Copies, and Due Dates has been revised to clarify that the IDIQ Workbook (Attachment L-8) and the Other Supporting Data

Workbook (Attachment L-9) to be submitted as part of Volume III, Cost/Price Proposal, are not required to comply with the font type, font size, or margins stated in the provision and may be printed in a single-sided or double-sided format. The Government confirms that title pages are subject to the formatting requirements at Provision L.18.2, and therefore must be submitted in Times New Roman font.

Q86: In the Qs&As released on 9/14/12 (Modification 3, Question and Answer 30): In the Qs&As released on 9/14/12 (Modification 3, Question and Answer 30) states: "Headers and footers included on pages that contain information that can be construed as proposal information must comply with the formatting requirements set for in L.18.2." If headers and footers only contain volume numbers or titles, RFP number, or other information that does not convey information that would constitute a response to RFP requirements, is a font size less than Times New Roman 12 allowed?

A86: Headers and footers that only contain volume numbers or titles, RFP number, or other information that cannot be construed as proposal information are not required to comply with the formatting requirements set forth in L.18.2. This answer supersedes the statement found in the final sentence of paragraph 3 of A30, the Government's answer to Question 30, which was posted on 9/14/12, and addressed formatting requirements for headers and footers.

Q87: DRD 010, LL Program Plan Attachment L-1 and Attachment J-2: First Submittal wording inconsistent. "30 days after start of phase-in period…" in 8. Required DRDs (page L-1-5) Vs. "6. At contract start (first day of the period of performance)" in Attachment J-2, line item 10 block 9. Which is correct?

A87: The first submission date for DRD 010, Lessons Learned Plan, is the first day of the period of performance of the contract (October 1, 2013 per clause F.3 of the solicitation). Attachment L-1, TO-RFP-01, Section 8, Required DRDs and Attachment J-2, DRL and DRDs, line item 010, Lessons Learned Plan, Block 9, have been revised to provide further clarification regarding this due date.

Q88: L.18.5i, pg L-35: Small Business Past Performance. Will the government consider excluding this requirement from the page count limitation for the Past Performance Volume? Although a comprehensive response from Offerors is desirable, it will consume limited pages that might be better devoted to responding to the other page-limited requirements.

A88: No, the Small Business Past Performance required by Provision L.18.5(i) will not be excluded from the page limit stated in Provision L.18.2, Table L-1: Overview of Proposal Volumes and Page Limitations, for Volume II, Past Performance. However, in order to ensure there is adequate opportunity to discuss Small Business Past Performance within the Past Performance Volume II, the total page limitation for Volume II in Provision L.18.2, Table L-1: Overview of Proposal Volumes and Page Limitations, has been increased from 100 pages to 110 pages.

Q89: L.18.5j, p. L-35 and Attachment L-3, PPQ: This paragraph states that PPQ submissions are required for the proposed PM. The PPQ form itself is worded in a way that is very specific to a contract reference and does not lend itself well to personal evaluation. In the event that a past performance example for a PM is not a contract, is it necessary to submit a corresponding PPQ?

A89: As required per L.18.5(j), Past Performance Questionnaires, the Offeror shall provide their customer references with an electronic version of Attachment L-3, Past Performance Questionnaire, for the Program Manager associated with the offer. As stated in Attachment L-3, Past Performance Questionnaire, Section II, Past Performance Evaluation, if the request is for the proposed Program

Manager evaluation, references are asked to answer any pertinent questions in the listed topics as well as those in Section D, Proposed Program Manager.

Q90: Attachment L-3, Past Performance Questionnaire: Included in the questionnaire are tables regarding cost breakdowns, cost over- and under-runs, and small business goals and actuals. To request such details in the PPQ may put a burden so great on the Government's questionnaire respondent that he or she might not be able to complete the questionnaire. Suggest revision of PPQ form to exclude specific cost and small business participation data.

A90: Attachment L-3, Past Performance Questionnaire, will not be revised to exclude specific cost and small business participation data.

Q91: Attachment L-1, TO-02, ST 4.1: Subtask states that the Contractor shall provide integrated Change Requests, perform evaluations of change requests, provide disposition recommendations, and represent at TCMs, but does not specify number of CRs to perform these tasks on. For the purposes of developing a BOE for these tasks, how many CRs should we consider and at what frequency?

A91: Attachment L-1, TO-RFP-02, Section 6, Products, has been revised to add the following statement, "*For the purposes of developing a Basis of Estimate in accordance with Section L of the solicitation, the Offeror shall assume 10 Change Requests per week and 100 FMEAs per month."

Q92: Attachment L-1, TO-02, ST 4.2: Subtask states that the contractor shall establish schedules, track, integrate, provide statistics, and ensure product review as required for FMEA reviews, but does not specify volume of FMEAs nor frequency. For the purposes of developing a BOE for these tasks, How many FMEAs should we consider and at what frequency?

A92: Attachment L-1, TO-RFP-02, Section 6, Products, has been revised to add the following statement, "*For the purposes of developing a Basis of Estimate in accordance with Seciton L of the solicitation, the Offeror shall assume 10 Change Requests per week and 100 FMEAs per month."

Q93: Attachment L-1, TO-02, ST 4.5: Subtask states that the contractor shall assess products for CoFR and STRR in accordance with SSP 50231, SSP 50108, and SSP 50231. Is this last SSP a typo and if so, what is the correct reference document?

A93: Attachment L-1, TO-RFP-02, Section 4.5 has been corrected to remove the extra reference to SSP 50321.

Q94: Attachment L-1, TO-02, ST 4.9: In reference to the task requirement associated with the Big 12 FRAT, the quantity specified is 12 total per the FRAT schedule. For the purposes of developing a BOE for this task, should we estimate based on 12 Big 12 anomalies in the period of one year?

A94: No, the Government is not expecting a need to support 12 Big 12 anomalies per year. The solicitation requires offerors to propose their assessment of the Big 12 anomalies and their associated pre-planned procedures. All 12 of the anomalies are expected to be assessed in the first year of the contract. Actual anomalies will be handled in real time as they occur.

For reference, the "Big 12" are major anomalies that bring the station to within a single failure away from a total loss of the vehicle. The Government has determined a need to put in place generic pre-planned responses to these anomalies. This effort includes engineering analysis of the scenario, Neutral Buoyancy Lab simulations, and pre-planned procedure development. All of this effort is planned for all 12 scenarios over the first year of the contract. Safety and Mission Assurance (S&MA) Directorate's role in this effort is to assess each scenario for safety impacts, provide S&MA input to the development of operational products, complete an overall risk assessment of the anomaly response, and provide S&MA expertise to the engineering and operations teams. The deliverables for this task are the overall risk assessments.

The Big 12 anomalies are:

1. External Thermal Control System (ETCS) Pump Module (PM) Remove and Replace (R&R)
2. Flex Hose Rotary Coupler (FHRC) R&R
3. Interface Heat Exchanger (IFHX) R&R (not applicable for Node 3 IFHXs)
4. Bearing Motor Roll Ring Module (BMRRM)/Electronics Control Unit (ECU) R&R
5. Ammonia Tank Assembly (ATA) R&R
6. Nitrogen Tank Assembly (NTA) R&R
7. Main Bus Switching Unit (MBSU) R&R
8. External (EXT) Multiplexer/Demultiplexer (MDM) Remove and Replace (R&R)
9. Direct Current (DC) to DC Converter Unit (DDCU) R&R (S01A, S02B)
10. R&R of External Remote Power Control Modules (RPCMs) S01A_C, S02B_C, S01A_A, S11A_D, S02B_A, and P12B_D
11. Ammonia (NH3) Leak Isolation and Recovery
12. Loss of Module due to Micro Meteoroid Orbital Debris (MMOD) Penetration

Q95: Attachment L-1, TO-06, ST 4.4: In TO-06 Subtask 1, Task 4.4.b, the requirement states support and expertise for Technical Forms (not forums). Please confirm that the Government intends this to read "Forums."?

A95: Attachment L-1, TO-RFP-06, Subtask 1, Section 4.4.b. has been revised to replace the word "Forms" with "Forums."

Q96: Attachment L-1, TO-06, ST 4.4: In TO-06 Subtask 1, Task 4.4.b, the requirement states support and expertise for Technical Forms in section 4.3, but there are no technical forms or forums identified in Section 4.3. Could you please clarify the requirement?

A96: Attachment L-1, TO-RFP-06, Subtask 1, Section 4.3 has been revised to state that "…S&MA subsystems expertise shall be provided by performing technical and requirements compliance assessments of associated Safety, Reliability & Maintainability (R&M), and Operations products **to the associated Technical Forums**."

Q97: Page L-19, Table L-1, Volume No. II states: "Request for Previous Contract Statement(s) of Work, Statement(s) of Objectives, or Performance Work Statement(s) (not to be included in 100 page count) to be submitted in native format." Is one integrated PDF file to include all Previous Contract SOWs, SOOs, and PWSs acceptable? Also, due to the voluminous size of this requirement for Volume II (e.g., one of our Relevant Contract's SOWs is 118 pages), would it be acceptable to deliver 1 hard copy of this requirement (Copy 1 of 6) and be excluded from the 5 remaining hard copies?

A97: Yes, it is acceptable, although not mandatory, for Offerors to submit one integrated PDF file to include all Previous Contract Statements of Work (SOWs), Statements of Objectives (SOOs), and Performance Work Statements (PWSs) provided that each deliverable included in the integrated PDF file is clearly marked and distinguishable from the other deliverables within the file. No, it is not acceptable to deliver 1 hard copy of this requirement as several members of the evaluation team will be reviewing the proposals simultaneously and will require separate copies. Six (6) total copies of the entire Volume II, Past Performance, shall be submitted in accordance with Provision L.18.2, Table L-2: Proposal Copies and Due Dates.

Q98: Request for Consent Letters, Environmental Data, and Safety Data: Due to the varied native formats of the requested data, are native files and one integrated PDF to include all required information acceptable? Due to the potential voluminous size of this requirement for Volume II, would it be acceptable to deliver 1 hard copy of this requirement (Copy 1 of 6) and be excluded from the 5 remaining hard copies?

A98: Provision L.18.2, Table L-1: Overview of Proposal Volumes and Page Limitations will be revised to state that the required electronic format for the Consent Letters, Environmental Data, and Safety Data shall be the native format of the deliverable. It is acceptable, although not mandatory, for Offerors to submit one integrated PDF file to include the Consent Letters, Environmental Data, and Safety Data provided that each deliverable included in the integrated PDF file is clearly marked and distinguishable from the other deliverables within the file. No, it is not acceptable to deliver 1 hard copy of this requirement as several members of the evaluation team will be reviewing the proposals simultaneously and will require separate copies. Six (6) total copies of the entire Volume II, Past Performance, shall be submitted in accordance with Provision L.18.2, Table L-2: Proposal Copies and Due Dates.

Q99: Page L-33, Past Performance factor, paragraph (h) states: “Offerors shall provide the following performance data with explanatory remarks on all contracts performed in the last three years. Offerors shall identify the applicable North American Industrial Classification System (NAICS) Code for each contract and shall include points of contact for each contract. If a joint venture or prime-subcontractor relationship is proposed, the same information shall be provided for each company proposed. Explanatory statements shall be included, as appropriate.” Please confirm that the requested Environmental Data and Safety Data is only required from the prime and major subcontractors.

A99: If a joint venture or prime-subcontractor relationship is proposed, the information required at Provision L.18.5(h) shall be provided for the prime contractor, each major subcontractor, and/or each joint venture partner. Past performance information is not required to be submitted for minor subcontractors below $1,000,000 per year. Provision L.18.5(h) has been revised to exclude minor subcontractors from this requirement.

Q100: Page L-31, para 1 states: “The Government is not providing a GRE for off-site facilities or off-site workstations. As a result, Offerors are required to provide the adequate supporting documentation in support of these cost estimates. The Offeror shall propose offsite facilities costs based on their proposed management and technical approach and shall be consistent with their disclosed accounting and estimating practices. Additionally, the Offeror shall provide supporting rationale for estimated travel costs. The NLR GRE does not include application of any indirect expenses such as material handling or G&A expenses, nor does it include fee.” Please elaborate on the type of supporting documentation the Government desires in support of off-site facilities or off-site workstations, and travel. Also, please confirm that it’s acceptable to include this supporting documentation in the Cost Volume.

A100: Offerors shall provide adequate supporting rationale for the type and quantity of non-labor resources. For example, but not limited to: Off-site facilities - Offerors shall provide the price per square foot and lease agreements, (if available); Off-site workstations - the number of workstations and associated costs; Travel - if a different estimate from the GRE is proposed for travel, then Offerors are required to provide the number of trips, airfare, destination, purpose of trip, and per diem for travel. It is acceptable to include supporting documentation for all non-labor resources proposed in the cost volume related to how the proposed cost was derived. However, any information related to the usage of the off-site facilities or the number and type of resources that will occupy the off-site facilities shall be included in the technical volume.

Q101: Page L-40 under the Cost Template Instructions for “Contractor Specific Template (ICST)” the last sentence in the 3rd paragraph states: “On the “Incumbent Retention %” column, the Offeror shall provide the percent of incumbent workforce they intend to be retained by SLC.” There is no column for Incumbent Retention % on the ICST. Please confirm that “Incumbent Retention %” is not required on the ICST Tab.

A101: No, the incumbent retention % is not required on the ICST. The incumbent retention % is only required on the Technical Resources Summary Template (TRST) worksheet. The section entitled “1. IDIQ Rates Development – Contractor Specific Template (ICST) - Required for both Firm-Fixed Price and Cost Reimbursement Fully-Burdened Rates” included in the IDIQ Cost Template Instructions at Provision L.18.6, has been updated to reflect this change.

Q102: Page L-41, Section 4., para 1, states: “The title “Average Contract Incumbent Retention %” is included for the offeror to show the average percentage of the incumbent workforce intended to be retained at the total contract level.” The template indicates incumbent percentage by labor category, not at the total contract level. Please confirm that incumbent retention percentage only needs to be provided at the total contract level and not by individual labor category.

A102: The Offeror shall provide the incumbent retention percentage for each individual standard labor category as indicated on the Technical Resources Summary Template (TRST) worksheet. Provision L.16, IDIQ Cost Template Instructions, 4. Technical Resources Summary Template (TRST) and Attachment L-8 – IDIQ Workbook, Tab “TRST” have been updated to reflect this change.

Q103: Attachment L-1, Page L-1-10: The task description in Paragraph 4.2 of TO –RFP -03 EVA Projects Support states: “Identify potential critical items, and list failure modes, causes, and effects indicators of verification, and acceptance rationale. (SOW Reference 2.3, Program and Project Support)” Should the SOW reference for paragraph 4.2 of TO-RFP-03, be SOW 2.1, Analyses, Assessments, and Trade Studies, instead of 2.3?

A103: No, the SOW reference for paragraph 4.2 of TO-RFP-03 should not be SOW 2.1, Analyses, Assessments, and Trade Studies, instead of SOW 2.3, Program and Project Support. SOW 2.3, Program and Project Support, is the appropriate reference as the task described in TO-RFP-03, Section 4.2 is in direct support of the EVA Project Office.

Q104: Attachment L-7, Page L-1-4, Table L-7-5, the Government provided Non-Labor Resources for Travel for CY1. Should these values be utilized for each of the other contract years past CY1?

A104: No, Offerors are only required to provide a Non-Labor Resources (travel, off-site facilities, off-site workstations, etc.) estimate for CY 1. Non-labor resources estimates for CYs 2-5 are not required.

Q105: Attachment L-8, TRST Tab: Formulas used to sum staffing levels for each TO only add rows 32:40. Please confirm that the sum should be rows 13:40.

A105: Yes, the formulas used to sum staffing levels for each TO should sum rows 13 through 40. Attachment L-8, IDIQ Workbook, Tab “TRST” has been revised to reflect this change.

Q106: Attachments L-8 and L-9, Multiple Tabs: We have been unable to locate instructions for what should be entered in the “Ref.” columns that can be found on several tabs within the “IDIQ” and “Other Supporting Data” workbooks. What information would the Government like entered in the “Ref.” columns?

A106: The Ref. column should only be used if applicable to reference information provided in other volumes of the Offeror’s proposals that are linked to the Cost proposal. For example, the Technical Resources Summary Template, which is linked to the Basis of Estimate provided in the Technical Volume.