

Q15: Is it the Government's intent to make a single award?

A15: Yes, the Government intends to award a single award Indefinite Delivery/Indefinite Quantity contract.

Q16: In reference to provision M.4.8, how will the Government view Organizational Conflicts of Interest related to engineering work at JSC. Is it acceptable to use firewalls?

A16: In accordance with provision L.18.7, Other Proposal Requirements (Volume IV), offerors will be required to submit DRD 020, Organizational Conflicts of Interest (OCI) Mitigation Plan, as part of their proposal. As part of this DRD, offerors will be required to describe the actions they intend to take to mitigate the OCIs identified in the RFP. If using a firewall, offerors shall explain how these actions will operate to successfully address the conflict without adversely affecting performance of the contract.

In accordance with provision M.4.8, Other Proposal Requirements (Volume IV), the Government will perform an analysis to ensure an OCI issue that cannot be mitigated does not exist. The OCI information will be assessed to verify the Offeror is eligible for award. If it appears an OCI issue does exist that the Offeror's plan failed to mitigate, the Government must notify the Contractor, provide the reasons therefore, and allow the Contractor a reasonable opportunity to respond. The SLPT will make the final determination if the OCI issue exists and can be mitigated.

Q17: Is it possible to clear offerors before the final RFP and add Contracting Officer advisory letters in the proposal?

A17: As stated in A16 above and in provision M.4.8, Other Proposal Requirements (Volume IV), if it appears an OCI issue does exist that the Offeror's plan failed to mitigate, the Government must notify the Contractor, provide the reasons therefore, and allow the Contractor a reasonable opportunity to respond. The Contracting Officer will not be issuing advisory letters nor clearing offerors of their OCI issues before the final RFP.

Q18: What is the order of issuing and awarding technical task orders versus the firm-fixed-price (FFP) contract management task order?

A18: Per the Statement of Work, the Contract Management task order will be negotiated prior to the start of each contract year. Generally Technical Services task orders and Institutional task orders will be issued simultaneously with this Contract Management task order. However, the Government reserves the right to issue and revise task orders at any time during the period of performance of the contract.

Q19: Do you anticipate an early submission of the past performance volume?

A19: All volumes of the Offeror's proposal, including the Past Performance Volume (Volume II), will have the same due date. This due date will be specified in the Final RFP in Table L-2, Proposal Copies and Due Dates, located within provision L.18.2, Proposal Arrangement, Page Limitations, Copies, and Due Dates.

Q20: The Draft RFP outlines proposal requirements that are very similar to other recent JSC full and open competition procurements which were not streamlined. Please elaborate on the difference between a traditional JSC procurement and a streamlined procurement.

A20: The major difference between the Source Evaluation Board (SEB) procedures listed in NASA FAR Supplement (NFS) 1815.370 and the JSC Streamlined Procurement process is the source selection technique utilized. The SEB procedures require the acquisition team to use a mission suitability factor, numerically score, and use the procedures in NFS 1815.370. The JSC Streamlined Procurement process utilizes a Performance Price Tradeoff (PPT) for source selection. This PPT is a simplified best-value source selection strategy that permits a tradeoff between price and past performance in reaching the award decision.

Proposals will first be evaluated to determine acceptability in accordance with NFS 1815.305-70, Identification of Unacceptable Proposals. All unacceptable proposals will be eliminated from further evaluation. The remaining proposals will be evaluated against the Technical Acceptability requirements. All Technically Acceptable and Potentially Acceptable Offerors will then be evaluated against past performance and cost/price criteria. For those Offerors who are determined to be technically acceptable, tradeoffs will be made between past performance and cost/price with past performance being significantly more important than cost/price. Further detail regarding the PPT proposal evaluation process is included in provision M.4.3, Past Performance Price Tradeoff (PPT) Proposal Evaluation, and throughout Section M, Evaluation Factors for Award.

Q21: Is the requirement for HBCU inclusive of MI as well?

A21: Yes, the goal stated in the Draft RFP for Historically Black Colleges or Universities (HBCU) includes Minority Institutions (MI).

Q22: Will there be a separate wage determination for the White Sands Test Facility (WSTF)?

A22: Yes, there will be a separate wage determination for the White Sands Test Facility (WSTF). Attachment J-13 to the Draft RFP includes Wage Determination 2005-2516, Revision 15, which applies to JSC in Harris County, Texas, as well as Wage Determination 2005-2512, Revision 16, which applies to WSTF in Dona Ana County, New Mexico.

Q23: Can we take pictures of the RITF during the tour?

A23: Yes, photos may be taken during the site tours of the Receiving, Inspection and Test Facility (RITF).

Q24: Please provide the formal guidance JSC uses to evaluate proposals using a performance price tradeoff model.

A24: Please see [A20](#) above. Also, please reference Section M, Evaluation Factors for Award, for further information on the Past Performance Price Tradeoff (PPT) Proposal Evaluation process.

Q25: RFP Section M, Evaluation Factors for Award, provides very few details on what constitutes a technically acceptable proposal response (particularly overall management approach). Would the Government consider elaborating on defining the minimum standard for a technically acceptable proposal?

A25: Please reference provision L.18.1, Introduction, of the Draft RFP, which states that the Technical Acceptability proposal shall comprehensively explain how the Offeror proposes to comply with the applicable specifications, as well as the techniques and procedures the Offeror proposes to implement. Per provision M.4.1, Introduction, the Offeror's proposal will be evaluated for a demonstration of the Offeror's competence and capability to successfully complete the SMAEC requirements.

The Offeror shall follow the instructions at provision L.18.4, Technical Acceptability (Volume I), of the Draft RFP and submit all of the required deliverables listed in the provision. In accordance with provision M.4.4, Technical Acceptability (Volume I), in order to be considered technically acceptable, all Technical Acceptability subfactors must be passed. The Offeror's management approach will be evaluated for overall demonstrated understanding, effectiveness, innovation, completeness, feasibility, efficiency, and reasonableness where associated risks do not jeopardize an acceptable level of contract performance. In accordance with provision M.4.4 (b), Technical Approach, the Offeror's response to the requirements outlined in the Representative IDIQ Task Orders (TOs), Attachment L-1, the Offeror's approach (narrative only) to performing functions listed under SOW Section 3.2 Pressure Systems, and the Offeror's proposed labor and non-labor resources in Attachment L-4, Technical Workbook, will be evaluated for overall demonstrated understanding, effectiveness, innovation, completeness, feasibility, efficiency, reasonableness, consistency with the overall management approach, and that associated risks do not jeopardize an acceptable level of contract performance.

Q26: Does the Government assigned NAICS code apply to all small business subcontractors?

A26: The only NAICS code that the Government has assigned is to this SMAEC procurement, which is 541330, Engineering Services, with a size standard of \$35.5 million under the exception for Military and Aerospace Equipment and Military Weapons. NAICS codes assigned to subcontractors are assigned by the Prime Contractor according to the type of work being subcontracted.

Q27: What benefits has the Government derived from the revised property management FAR clauses?

A27: The benefits the Government has derived from the revised property management FAR clauses are as follows:

1. Previously, both the requirements for the Government and for the Contractor were combined in one section within FAR 45.5. In June 2007, the requirements were consolidated into separate new sections of the FAR. The Government requirements are now included in FAR 45 and the Contractor requirements are included in FAR 52.245-1. This has helped to reduce the confusion of the previous FAR version.
2. The FAR as of June 2007 gave the Contractor more flexibility on how to meet the requirements of the FAR. It is now more outcome-driven as opposed to details-driven. The previous FAR version instructed the Contractor on how to accomplish specific requirements. The current FAR tells the Contractor what is expected of them, but leaves the details on how to accomplish it up to them.

Q28: Does the Government anticipate any obstacles to delay the release of the Final RFP on November 10, 2012?

A28: The Government plans to release the Final RFP on November 9, 2012 and does not anticipate any obstacles at this time which would delay that release date.

Q29: Will the Government ensure that concise page counts are made for each volume by separating out any plans/DRDs? Especially since there are a large number of DRDs due with the proposal.

A29: Please reference Table L-1 in provision L.18.2, Proposal Arrangement, Page Limitations, Copies, and Due Dates, for the page limitations set forth for each proposal volume. The Page Limits column of the table specifies whether or not each DRD required to be submitted with the proposal is included within the page limitation for the associated proposal volume and if there is a page limitation for the specific DRD. Specific page limitations will not be provided for each individual plan or DRD.

Q30: In reference to the new requirements under M.4.2, please define "proposal content." Items recently questioned for font/page count issues are:

1. Covers that use other than stated font
2. Signature pages/revision history pages
3. Headers/footers with only solicitation number and date but not in correct font.

Will all pages be returned if a proposal contains these for the SMAEC contract?

A30: "Proposal Content" refers to all information required in Volumes I, II, III, IV and V in accordance with provision L.18. All information required in Volumes I, II, III, IV and V must comply with the page limitations and formatting requirements set forth in provision L.18.2; Proposal Arrangement, Page Limitations, Copies, and Due Dates.

Any page that does not contain information that can be construed as proposal information is excluded from the page count limitations specified in provision L.18.2. For example, title pages, tables of contents, cross-reference matrices, glossaries, acronym lists, page tabs, and section dividers that do not contain information that can be construed as proposal information are excluded from the page counts specified in provision L.18.2.

Signatures are considered to be proposal information and therefore are subject to the page limits and formatting requirements set forth in provision L.18.2. Headers and footers included on pages that contain information that can be construed as proposal information must comply with the formatting requirements set forth in provision L.18.2.

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 page numbers, cover page information, tables, charts, graphs, plans, figures, diagrams and schematics.

Pages that do not comply with the page limitations and formatting requirements set forth in provision L.18.2 will not be evaluated by the Government and will be returned to the Offeror.

Q31: Please address the recent trend toward returning proposals for resubmittal for page count/font issues. Three recent procurements at JSC returned proposals for font/page count. Will the SMAEC contract set firm requirements for font/page count so offerors do not get a second chance or additional time to improve their proposals or deliver a compliant proposal?

A31: Provisions L.18.2; Arrangement, Page Limitations, Copies, and Due Dates and M.4.2; Proposal Arrangement, Page Limitations, Copies, and Due Dates; have been updated since the release of the Draft RFP to address this concern. In the Final RFP, M.4.2 will include the statement: "Instructions for proposal arrangement, page limitations, copies and due dates are specified in Section L.18.2. Offerors shall submit their proposals in accordance with those instructions. Pages and foldouts not conforming to the definition of a page will not be evaluated by the Government and will be returned to the Offeror. Pages submitted in excess of the limitations specified will not be evaluated by the Government and will be returned to the Offeror." The Government intends to strictly enforce these requirements.