

AMENDMENT OF SOLICITATION/MODIFICATION OF CONTRACT

1. CONTRACT ID CODE	PAGE OF PAGE(S)
	1 12

2. AMENDMENT/MODIFICATION NO. 1	3. EFFECTIVE DATE See Block 16C	4. REQUISITION/PURCHASE REQ. NO.	5. PROJECT NO. (If applicable)
------------------------------------	------------------------------------	----------------------------------	--------------------------------

6. ISSUED BY National Aeronautics and Space Administration Langley Research Center Hampton, VA 23681-2199	7. ADMINISTERED BY (If other than Item 6)
--	---

8. NAME AND ADDRESS OF CONTRACTOR (No. Street, County, State and ZIP Code) TO ALL CONCERNED	(4)	9A. AMENDMENT OF SOLICITATION NO. NNL10276610R
	X	9B. DATED (SEE ITEM 11) 12/08/2009
		10A. MODIFICATION OF CONTRACT/ORDER NO.
		10B. DATED (SEE ITEM 13)

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 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.

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

(4)	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 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:

- (1) Revise the Request for Proposal (RFP) as set forth herein.
- (2) Answer additional questions received regarding the RFP.

(Continued on Page 2)

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) ROSEMARY C. FROEHLICH
15B. CONTRACTOR/OFFEROR (Signature of person authorized to sign)	16B. UNITED STATES OF AMERICA BY  (Signature of Contracting Officer)
15C. DATE SIGNED	16C. DATE SIGNED 1-13-10

(1) The changes provided in this amendment are hereby incorporated into the RFP as follows:

1. Incorporate the following in FAR 52.216-22, INDEFINITE QUANTITY (OCT 1995), RFP Section I, Clauses Incorporated by Reference: Fill in: (d) 12 months from the end of the contract period of performance.
2. Delete NFS 1852.223-72, SAFETY AND HEALTH (SHORT FORM) (APR 2002), from RFP Section I, Clauses Incorporated by Reference.
3. Remove highlighting from (URTA3) Quality, RFP Section L.19, VOLUME I – TECHNICAL PROPOSAL: FACTOR 1 – MISSION SUITABILITY, as this highlighting was inadvertently included when the Final RFP was posted.
4. RFP Clause L.19, VOLUME I – TECHNICAL PROPOSAL: FACTOR 1 - MISSION SUITABILITY, Subfactor 3, paragraph (a)(iv) is deleted in its entirety and the following is substituted in lieu thereof:

“(iv) The Plan submitted with the proposal shall be incorporated in Section J, Exhibit D, in the resulting contract. The requirements for a Plan must flow down to first tier large business subcontracts expected to exceed \$550,000 {See Section I, Clause 52.219-9, paragraph (d)(9)}.”

5. RFP Clause L.20, VOLUME II - BUSINESS PROPOSAL: FACTOR 2 – COST/PRICE, paragraph (h), Other Direct Costs (ODCs), is hereby revised to incorporate the following as sub-paragraph (2), and the originally numbered sub-paragraphs (2), (3), and (4) are hereby re-numbered as sub-paragraphs (3), (4), and (5):

(2) ETOS

The offeror shall propose all costs for development and implementation of the ETOS to include all maintenance and support fees. If these costs are not proposed as direct costs, identify where these proposed costs are included in the indirect costs.

6. Exhibit B, LITES CONTRACT DOCUMENTATION REQUIREMENTS, is changed as follows:
 - a. Section (H), Safety Plan, is amended to delete the following sentence: “The Contractor shall submit the Safety and Health Plan for Contracting Officer approval no later than 30 calendar days after award.”
 - b. Section (X), Electronic Task Order System, is deleted in its entirety and the following is substituted in lieu therein:

X. Electronic Task Order System: The Contractor shall deliver a data schema and data definition table within 30 days after contract start date. If any changes throughout the contract performance period to the ETOS application require a new data schema and data definition table, the contractor shall deliver the new data schema and data definition table. Also, at contract end, or by Government request at any point during the contract performance, the Contractor shall deliver a complete data file containing all task data for the period of performance in a file format compatible with either an Oracle database or standard relational database format. Any portions of ETOS developed at Government expense shall be delivered by the Contractor with unlimited rights under FAR 52.227-14 as modified by NFS 1852.227-14.

7. Attachment 3, LITES Estimated Staffing is revised and a replacement version is provided (6 pages):

- a. Delete "Sheet 1".
- b. For contractor information purposes, the WYE totals have been summed for a On-Site Government Facility WYE subtotal of 100 and a Off-Site Contractor Facility WYE subtotal of 70, for a Grand Total WYE of 170.

8. Attachment 4, Cost Forms, is revised and a replacement version is provided:

- a. ETOS has been added as an Other Direct Cost on Cost Form A, Summary.
- b. The "Exempt/WD" Column has been deleted in Cost Forms F1-F5.

9. The Government posted the Final RFP with the "Track Changes" feature in an attempt to make it easier for offerors to see the changes that had been made from the Draft RFP to the Final RFP. However, the offeror has the responsibility to review the Final RFP carefully and not rely on "Track Changes" to reflect all changes made. For instance, changes were made to Attachments 2 and 3, which are shown in final form without "Track Changes". In short, the offeror is cautioned to carefully review the Final RFP in its entirety.

10. All other terms and conditions of the subject Request for Proposal remain unchanged.

(2) The following Questions and Answers are provided regarding the LITES RFP:

1. **QUESTION:** RFP Reference LITES Draft Request for Proposal Questions and Answers, Question #19: In reviewing the questions and answers posted for the subject RFP, the answer to question #19 states that the "successful offeror's LITES Safety and Health Plan shall be submitted for Contracting Officer approval no later than 30 calendar days after award." However, Exhibit H, Safety and Health Plan, still indicates that the Plan is to be completed by Offerors. Please clarify.

ANSWER: The response provided to LITES Draft Request for Proposal Questions and Answers, Question #19, is incorrect. In accordance with NFS 1852.223-73(a), Safety and Health Plan, offerors shall submit a detailed safety and occupational health plan as part of their proposals. The successful offeror's Safety and Health Plan shall be incorporated at contract award. In Amendment 1 to the RFP NNL10276610R, Exhibit B, Contract Documentation Requirements, Section (H), Safety Plan, has been changed to delete the following sentence: "The Contractor shall submit the Safety and Health Plan for Contracting Officer approval no later than 30 calendar days after award."

2a. **QUESTION:** RFP Reference Draft Request for Proposal Questions and Answers, Question #42: Question #42 asked if the Compensation Plan and the Subcontracting Plan would be included as part of the page limitation for Volume 1 as each plan could be 20 to 25 pages. We noticed that you stated that the Subcontracting Plan would be excluded from the page limitation for Volume 1. The Compensation Plan was not addressed. Please address the Compensation Plan as to whether it will be included or excluded from the Volume 1 page limitation of 70 pages?

ANSWER: The Compensation Plan is included in the Volume 1 page limitation of 70 pages.

2b. The prime contractor and its significant subcontractors are requested to submit a Total Compensation Plan for their employees as part of the Management Approach (Section L.19, MA6). Given the proposal page limitations, is it acceptable to present a plan summary in Volume I: Technical proposal and then provide the details of each firm's plan in Volume II: Business Proposal?

ANSWER: No, the Total Compensation Plan should be included in Volume 1.

2c. **QUESTION:** RFP Reference L.19 (MA6): This paragraph requires that "Significant subcontractors over \$1 Million shall submit individual compensation plans if their employees are not covered by the prime offeror's compensation plan." Since subcontractor compensation plan details contain information that companies consider proprietary, is it acceptable for these plans to be submitted as part of subcontractor sealed packages along with the required pricing information?

If this is not acceptable, please clarify whether or not the subcontractor compensation plans are subject to the page limit specified for Volume I, Technical Proposal.

ANSWER: The Subcontractor Compensation Plans are included in the page limitation. If a subcontractor refuses to share the details of its compensation plan with its prime, prospective subcontractors may submit this data directly to NASA no later than the date and time specified in the instructions for receipt of offers in this solicitation.

3. **QUESTION:** RFP Reference J, Attachment A, Statement of Work, Section 4.6, Paragraph c.: This paragraph requires a 2-hour response time to user problems. Please clarify if this is required on a 24X7 basis. Also, please clarify if this is for all LITES Customer Support calls or as specified in individual Task Orders.

ANSWER: The 2-hour response is not required on a 24X7 basis. The 2-hour response time is required during the prime shift of 8 hours per day, Monday through Friday; for example, if the prime 8 hour shift is 8 a.m. to 4:30 p.m. and a user problem is received at 3:30 p.m., the contractor is required to respond to the user problem by 9 a.m. the following day. The 2-hour response time is required for all LITES Customer Support calls unless more rigorous requirements are specified in individual task orders.

4. **QUESTION:** RFP Reference Exhibit F, DD-254. On the DD-254, Section 13, Item 3, states that anyone working on this contract must be eligible for a secret clearance based on an investigation completed within the past 5 years. Can you verify that all contractor staff working on this contract will need to be secret clearance eligible? Further, can you clarify that the investigation requirement you are imposing is within the previous 5 years as opposed to the usual 10-year requirement for a secret clearance?

ANSWER: Not everyone working on the LITES program must have a clearance. It is estimated that approximately three employees will require a clearance.

The investigation requirement only applies to those personnel that have been identified by the company as filling a billet that will be supporting a classified program. The 10 year requirement only applies to collateral classified information. If access to any Special Access Required (SAR) or Sensitive Compartmented Information (SCI) programs is required, the investigation requirement is shortened to 5 years to ensure a more in-depth and frequent background review.

5a. **QUESTION:** RFP Reference L.16 (a); and LITES Draft Request for Proposal Questions and Answers: This paragraph states "The Phase-In Plan has a separate page limitation of 10 pages." However, in the response to Question #5 in the LITES Draft Request for Proposal Questions and Answers document, a page limitation for the Phase-In Plan is specified as 5 pages. Is the page limit for the Phase-in Plan 5 or 10 pages?

5b. **QUESTION:** The answer to Question #5 on the Draft RFP states that the Phase-In Plan will be limited to 5 pages. Section L.19 (MA1) of the final RFP states that the Phase-In Plan will be limited to 10 pages. Is it accurate to assume that the 10 page limitation is correct?

ANSWER: The answer provided to Question #5 in the LITES Draft Request for Proposal Questions and Answers regarding the Phase-in Plan page limitation is incorrect. The page limitation for the Phase-in Plan is 10 pages.

5c. **QUESTION:** Will there be any on-site office space at LaRC made available to the contractor to support the Phase-in?

ANSWER: No.

5d. **QUESTION:** Will any on-site office space at LaRC be made available for the Program Manager of the contractor awarded the LITES contract?

ANSWER: No.

5e. **QUESTION:** How many task orders should we expect to be issued for response during the Phase-In period? Will these be issued all together at the start of phase-in, or will they be staggered throughout phase-in?

ANSWER: There are currently approximately 90 tasks on the current contract, therefore, it is anticipated that about that number will be defined and initiated during the phase-in period and will be staggered throughout the phase-in period. These tasks will be issued by the contracting officer with an effective date no earlier than the first day of the contract period of performance.

6. **QUESTION:** RFP Reference L.16 (d): This paragraph indicates that “Eight (8) point font size is acceptable for captions to graphics and captions to figures.” Due to the 70-page limitation, we request that font sizes between 8 and 12 be allowable within the graphics/figures themselves.

ANSWER: No, the font requirement remains at 12 point font size within the graphics/figures themselves.

7. **QUESTION:** RFP Reference L.19, Volume I – Technical Proposal: Factor 1 – Mission Suitability, Subfactor 3, Paragraph (a)(iv): This paragraph requires that requirements in the LITES prime contractor’s Small Business Subcontracting Plan “must flow down to the first tier large business subcontracts.” This appears to directly conflict with the response to Question #40 in the LITES Draft Request for Proposal Questions and Answers document where you clearly discourage second tier contracting. By virtue of flowing down the Small Business Subcontracting Plan requirements to the first tier large business subcontracts, we are effectively requiring our large business subcontractors to subcontract to small business subcontractors thereby creating second-tier subcontracts. Please clarify.

ANSWER: See changes herein to L.19, Subfactor 3, paragraph (a)(iv).

8. **QUESTION:** RFP Reference SOW Section 4.5. Is there a current process and software product for IT problem notification, work assignment, scheduling, etc.? What is the trouble report ticketing system identified in Section 4.5.5 (b)?

ANSWER: This question references Section 4.5.6(b) of the SOW. There is not a required process or software product across the contract for IT problem notification, work assignment, scheduling, etc. Any trouble report ticketing system required will be specified in individual task orders.

9. **QUESTION:** RFP Reference SOW. What is the LITES Contractor's responsibility for maintenance of the LaRC Local/Wide Area Network?

ANSWER: These services are not within the scope of this contract. See Exhibit A, LITES SOW, Section 1.

10a. **QUESTION:** RFP Reference SOW Section 4.3. Can the government identify all software types, applications, tools, supporting datasets, test data associated that have been used or will be used in current or past task orders?

10b. **QUESTION:** RFP Reference Bidder's Library. Can the government place in the technical library any documentation (specification, user guide, procedures, etc) on software, tools, test hardware, etc.?

10c. **QUESTION:** RFP Reference SOW Section 6, Work Area Specific Services. We understand that the successful offeror on this LITES procurement will assume responsibility for a number of software systems that have been developed and maintained at Government expense to support NASA's mission. In order to provide the best offer to the Government and in order to maximize the efficiency of the transition process, we request that NASA: (i) identify the list of software systems that the successful offeror will be required to maintain; (ii) supply pertinent information such as ownership status, licensing requirements, source code language, approximate lines of source code, and available/releasable documentation on these software systems for review by the offeror during the proposal development process; and (iii) provide access to the source code of all software systems that the selected LITES contractor will be required to maintain. Is it possible for NASA to grant these requests?

10d. **QUESTION:** RFP Reference SOW Section 6, Work Area Specific Services. What is the total hardware and software product inventory for which the LITES contractor is responsible?

ANSWER: LITES is an IDIQ task order procurement. The hardware and software product inventory for which the contractor will be responsible will be as specified in Task Orders to be issued after contract award. The Government has placed in the Bidders'

Library all current task assignments as well as other relevant and available information for the offerors' information. Available information on the current hardware and software product inventory is provided in the Task Assignments posted in the Bidders' Library.

14. **QUESTION:** Will the LITES Contractor be responsible for asset/property management for Government IT equipment/software for which it is assigned responsibility? If so, is there a product currently being used for this application? Will the Contractor be responsible for providing information to NASA property management systems, i.e., NEMS, NPROP?

ANSWER: The LITES Contractor will be responsible for asset/property management of Government property provided in accordance with RFP Clause G.6, INSTALLATION-ACCOUNTABLE GOVERNMENT PROPERTY (ALT I) (DEVIATION) (NFS 1852.245-71), paragraph (c) (3), Property Listed in Individual Task Orders. The LITES Contractor will be listed as the equipment user in NPROP. Equipment users are required to submit any changes in equipment location (building and room number), equipment user name, and any excess property in NPROP.

15. **QUESTION:** Will the LITES Contractor be responsible for purchasing equipment and/or consumables for its on-site activities? If so, is a DCAA-approved purchasing system required?

ANSWER: The LITES Contractor will be required to provide anything not specified as Government Furnished which is required to perform the contract. Purchasing system reviews/approvals are governed by FAR 44.3.

16a. **QUESTION:** RFP Reference SOW Section 3, Electronic Task Order System. Who will be the ultimate owner and user of the ETOS System? Is it the government's intent that the ETOS system would remain with the Government at the termination of the contract?

ANSWER: The ETOS is only a deliverable under the contract to the extent that its development is funded under the contract; however, see last paragraph of Section 3, Exhibit A, LITES SOW. The Contractor shall provide to the Government a data schema and data definition table for the application. Exhibit B, LITES Contract Documentation Requirements, paragraph (X) has been amended to specify the delivery of the complete data file and portions of ETOS developed at Government expense as specified in Section 3 of Exhibit A, LITES SOW.

16b. **QUESTION:** RFP Reference SOW Section 3, Electronic Task Order System. Does the Government prefer to have ETOS set up for itself to manage with contractor role-based access for inputs/updates or have it be contractor-managed with the NASA role-based access as specified in the RFP? In the case of the latter, NASA could still have the ability to initiate task orders, enter data/append files, register approvals,

conduct searches, access the document repository and view a dashboard (visualization) of relevant real-time information for NASA oversight/information.

ANSWER: NASA desires ETOS to be Contractor managed with role-based access as specified in RFP Exhibit A, LITES SOW, Section 3.

16c. **QUESTION:** RFP Reference SOW Section 3, Electronic Task Order System. Please clarify the following:

- Is the contractor provided ETOS required to run in the NASA infrastructure on NASA provided equipment?
- Is the contractor provided ETOS permitted to run in the NASA infrastructure on NASA provided equipment?
- Is a contractor provided ETOS that runs in a secure environment outside of the NASA infrastructure an acceptable solution?
- Must a contractor provided ETOS that runs in a secure environment outside of the NASA infrastructure comply with NASA EA-STD-0001?

ANSWER: Although it is not required that the ETOS run in the NASA infrastructure on NASA provided equipment, it may be difficult to meet all of the ETOS requirements (such as authentication) if it is not in the NASA infrastructure and it will be permitted to be run by the contractor in the NASA infrastructure. NASA EA-STD-0001 does apply to the ETOS.

17. **QUESTION:** RFP Reference SOW. The PWS outlines specific areas such as high performance computing where the requirement calls out for Subject Matter Expertise to provide expert consultation support; however, the government's estimate (second tab) does not show any WYEs under the Subject Matter Expert labor category. Consultant type experts are typically highly compensated employees, and it will be difficult for a service provider to meet that requirement without some of the high level labor categories. Please indicate NASA's intent.

ANSWER: An incorrect sheet titled "Sheet 1" contained in Attachment 3 has been deleted. Attachment 3, "LITES Government Estimated Staffing", specifies total of nine (9) Subject Matter Experts in the "Master" and "Senior" categories.

18a. **QUESTION:** RFP Reference Cost Excel File Attachment 3-134529-SOL-001-015 LITES Government Estimated Staffing – The 1st worksheet is labeled "Govt Estimated Staffing – CY1-CY5" with 170 WYEs. A 2nd worksheet was also found and simply labeled "sheet 1" with 230 WYEs. Are bidders expected to price out the 230 WYEs in the cost model worksheet or only base its price on the 170 WYE estimate?

ANSWER: Contractor should bid on 170 WYE; the Cost Forms have been corrected.

18b. **QUESTION:** RFP Reference Attachment 4, Cost Forms F1-F5. The first column is entitled "Exempt/WD." However, there is no Wage Determination included in the Prime Solicitation that identifies the exempt labor categories for the chosen place of performance. Please clarify the requirement

ANSWER: The "Exempt/WD" Column has been deleted in the attached corrected Cost Forms F1-F5. There is no Wage Determination for this procurement.

19. **QUESTION:** RFP Reference Exhibit B, Contract Documentation Requirements, Section V. Exhibit B, Section I, requirement (V) On and Near Site Staff Reporting, states: *The contractor shall break out the On-site and Near-site WYE by skill category using the following categories: Scientist, engineer, technician, administrative professional, and clerical.*

The reporting categories do not match the labor categories provided in Section J, Exhibit I and Attachment 3. Will NASA provide a labor category mapping between these two requirements or will NASA consider utilizing the labor categories in Section J for WYE on and near-site reporting?

ANSWER: The On-site and Near Site Staffing Report is a center-wide support service contractor report; therefore the categories are generic. The contractor should categorize all WYE into the closest of these generic categories for that post-award report.

20. **QUESTION:** RFP Reference Exhibit D, Small Business Subcontracting Plan Goals. Can a Prime Contractor submit its Master (Corporate level) Subcontracting Plan in addition to Exhibit D entitled "Small Business Subcontracting Plan Goals"?

Can a Prime Contractor submit its own Individual Subcontracting Plan format in lieu of Exhibit E, provided that the Subcontracting Plan it meets all the requirements of Exhibit E, Subcontracting Goals.

ANSWER: Offerors may submit a Master Subcontracting Plan in accordance with FAR 52.219-9(f); however the offeror shall also submit Exhibit D to reflect the goals for this procurement.

21a. **QUESTION:** RFP Reference Attachment 2, LITES Past Performance Questionnaire. Please reference the Past Performance Questionnaire. The instructions currently say "Please send the completed form directly to the address below or to the Secure Fax as listed below."

Would it be possible to e-mail the completed questionnaires? If so, (a) who should they be sent to; and (b) is there any specific wording to be included in the subject line of the message?

21b. **QUESTION:** RFP Reference L.21(d); RFP Attachment 2, Past Performance Questionnaire. The Section L instruction requires that references “return or fax this questionnaire within the timeframe specified in this solicitation to the address or fax number provided in the questionnaire.” The actual Past Performance Questionnaire instructions indicate that the questionnaire should be mailed to the address provided or faxed. As we followed up with our references, one of them indicated that he has emailed the completed questionnaire to Robert Rice instead of mailing or faxing it. Is this delivery using email acceptable, or do we need to direct our reference to mail or fax it?

ANSWER: From the standpoint of safeguarding the information, the Government recommends the questionnaires be submitted to the secure fax number provided in the RFP or via postal mail. We have accepted those completed Past Performance Questionnaires submitted via e-mail and will not reject any questionnaires that are received at the following e-mail address: Robert.J.Rice@nasa.gov. It is requested that the Subject Line for e-mail submissions state “Past Performance Questionnaire for (insert Offeror’s name).”

21c. **QUESTION:** What assurance can NASA provide to protect the information contained in the past performance narrative and questionnaire, i.e., non-disclosure beyond the SEB”?

ANSWER: The completed Past Performance Questionnaires are considered source selection information and NASA protects them from disclosure in accordance with FAR 3.104-4(a) and (b), Disclosure, Protection, and Marking of Contractor Bid or Proposal Information and Source Selection Information. The contracting officer and source evaluation board utilize secure locations, procedures and training to ensure the proper protection of all source selection information. Adverse past performance information and relevancy of past performance may be the subject of clarifications with an offeror and it may be discussed with the offeror to whom it relates in accordance with FAR 15.306. {15.306(a)(2); 15.306(b)(1)(i); 15.306(d)(3) and 15.306(e)(4)}

22. **QUESTION:** RFP Reference B.4(c)3, Performance Incentive. Please provide definitions and objective measures for overall task performance, quality, timeliness, responsiveness, and overall satisfaction with work performed.

ANSWER: The metrics referenced in B.4(c)3 will be specifically detailed in each task order issued as they pertain. The objective measures and acceptance criteria will also be detailed for each task order as it is issued.

The following definitions are provided:

Quality: Quality shall include evaluation of such elements as how well the SOW and task order requirements are met, how user friendly the deliverable/solution is, how robust the solution is, how complete and thorough the documentation is, how effectively and efficiently resources are used, how innovative the solution is (i.e., does it consider and appropriately incorporate new ideas and technology), how effectively the solution leverages earlier work or work from other areas to create approaches that result in cost and time savings, how compliant the solution is with current standards, and how efficiently the system(s) are operated and maintained to allow completion of productive work.

Timeliness: Timeliness shall include evaluation of such elements as how well schedules are met, how up to date the maintained item is, and how quickly problems are resolved.

Responsiveness: Responsiveness shall include evaluation of such elements as how well SOW and TO responsiveness requirements are met, how effectively the contractor communicates with the NASA Technical Monitor (TM), how effectively changes in requirements are handled, and how easy it is for the TM to reach the contractor point of contact.

Overall Satisfaction: Overall satisfaction will be based on the combination of the elements of quality, timeliness, and responsiveness