

Decadal Study Questions and Responses

11/03/2009

1.Question: In order to expedite the process, can the past performance references submit the completed questionnaires electronically to GFSC?

Response: The past performance questionnaires may be electronically submitted. Section L.8.B, Past Performance, is amended to specify that the offerors may submit questionnaires electronically to Lisa.A.Mullen@nasa.gov. Amendment 1 to the RFP revises Section L.8 B.

2. Document- Past Performance Questionnaire. Section IV - Statement being questioned: "...participate in a study to develop a spacecraft bus design"

Question: The past performance questionnaire topics relate to the performance of studies, however, RFP Section L.8.B, page 38, requests experience in "building multiple satellites". Please clarify if the past performance should be for the performance of studies or hardware contracts.

Response: Section L.8 B, Past Performance, is amended to delete the statement "building multiple spacecraft on a continuing schedule basis" and is replaced with the statement "Completing studies directed at resolving issues and developing plans related to building multiple spacecraft on a continuing basis". Amendment 1 to the RFP revises Section L.8 B.

3. Document- Past Performance Questionnaire. Section II - Statement being questioned: "Does a... business relationship exist between the firm being evaluated and your organization"?

Question: We suggest this language be clarified to state that on-going contracts for services do not qualify as a business relationship.

Response: The Past Performance Questionnaire provides the Government information and insight into the relationship that the evaluator has to the company being evaluated. The language stands as written in the solicitation.

4. Document- Past Performance Questionnaire. Section II- Statement being questioned: "During the contract performance being evaluated, this firm was the: Prime Contractor..."

Question: We suggest this language be clarified to request whether the firm fulfilled a role equivalent or greater than that of a prime contractor for the spacecraft bus and integration. An evaluator may consider this role as either being a subcontractor or a team member depending on the program structure.

Response: This section asks the evaluator to state the relationship between the evaluating company and the company being evaluated so there should not be a concern.

5. Document- RFP. Section L.8- Statement being questioned - "Using the SF 33 as the cover sheet, submit one (3) originals"

Question: We assume this should read one (1)

Response: This was an error in L.8. Proposal Content and L.8 Proposal Content is amended to read "submit one (1) original and three (3) hard copies. Amendment 1 to the RFP revises Section L.8.

6. Document- RFP. Section- L.8. Statement being questioned: "Using the SF 33 as the cover sheet....The signed SF 33 and the pages with the fill-ins must be submitted"

Question: Please clarify if the SF33 is to be used as the front piece of the three ring binder requested on page 39. Does this requirement preclude the use of cover art?

Response: It is not our intention to have the SF33 used as the front insert of the three ring binder. You may use cover art on the front of the binder if you wish.

7. Document- RFP. Section L.8. Statement being questioned: "All SF 33s require original signatures"

Question: Page 39 requests one original and 3 copies. Please clarify.

Response: Section L, L.8, Offeror's Proposal, Proposal Content, paragraph (a) of the RFP is amended to specify that one submittal of the SF 33 requires an original signature, the additional three (3) requested copies of the SF 33 do not require an original signature but merely a copy of the original signature.

8. Document- RFP. Section L.8- Statement being questioned: "Include a statement of acceptance of the anticipated contract provisions"

Question: Where in the proposal should this statement be included? Can this be included in the cover letter?

Response: The offeror(s) may include an acceptance statement anywhere in the proposal as long as it is clearly identified.

9. Document- RFP. Section L.8 A.3- Statement being questioned: "The Offeror shall give the Government insight into the estimating though processes and methodologies used by the Offeror in identifying the appropriate labor categories, estimating the quantities of labor hours, other direct costs, etc. required for successful performance of this study".

Question: The request for BOEs for the study seems inappropriate as the request is for a firm-fixed price bid against a defined scope of work. We suggest deletion of this requirement and replacement with a discussion of the estimating methodologies to be used to generate ROM costs during the study.

Response: The language stands as written in the solicitation. NASA wants to be able to see a comprehensive skill mix to determine whether the Contractor will be able to properly fulfill the requirements of the study.

10. Document- RFP. Section L.8 A.3- Statement being questioned: "At a minimum, include the following information in a Basis of Estimate (BOE).."

Question: The volume of data requested by this section is incompatible with the 15 page limit for the Technical Approach section and is inappropriate for a Firm-fixed Price contract. We suggest deletion of this requirement.

Response: The language stands as written in the solicitation. The RFP is amended to increase the page limit from 15 to 20.

11. Document- RFP. Section- L.8 A.3- Statement being questioned: "The Offeror shall give the Government insight into the estimating thought processes and methodologies used by the Offeror in identifying the appropriate labor categories, estimating the quantities of labor hours, other direct costs, etc. required for successful performance of this study."

Question: Section M suggests that the Government intends to evaluate the experience of the contractor's staff in performing studies. We suggest that the Government request a description of the contractor's engineering, program management, and integration and test staff rather than full BOEs which must include staff required for admin functions, travel cost etc.

Response: The language stands as written in the solicitation.

12.Document- RFP. Section L.8 B- Statement being questioned: "Specifically, the offeror shall provide information regarding experience in : Building multiple spacecraft on a continuing schedule basis.."

Question: The requested past performance descriptions do not align with the criteria and questions listed in the past performance questionnaire. Please clarify.

Response: Section L.8 B of the RFP is amended in order to offer clarity. Amendment 1 to the RFP revises L.8 B, Past Performance.

13. Document - RFP. Section L.8 B

Question: Please provide a definition of "Critical Operational Systems"

Response: Section L.8 B, is amended to delete "Critical Operational Systems". Amendment 1 to the RFP revises Section L.8 B, Past Performance.

14. Document- RFP. Section L.8 C- Statement being questioned: "A completed SF 33 must be submitted with this offer. At a minimum, include the following information..."

Question: The proposal instructions request SF33 and the contract fill-ins (including price B1 and B3) be included at the start of the proposal. However, the instructions for C. Price contain nothing more than the SF33 and clauses B1 and B3. Should these excerpts from the contract be included in C. Price? Please clarify.

Response: The SF 33 should be included in Section I of the binder and clauses B.1 and B.3 should be included in Section IV Price.

15. Document- RFP. Section L.8- Statement being questioned: “Sections I,II and III shall be submitted in one 3-ring binder”.

Question: There are no instructions of the submission of the SF33 and contract fill-ins. Should these be in the same binder?

Response: L.8, Proposal Page Limitations, Validity Date and Other Requirement Information is amended to specify that the proposal component for the Standard Form (SF) 33 and Sections B-J of Model Contract including Representations and Certifications is Section I of the proposal. Technical Approach, A.1, A.2, and A.3 are Section II of the proposal. Past Performance is Section III of the proposal and Price is Section IV of the proposal. Amendment 1 of the RFP revises L.8.

16. Document- SOW. Section 2.2- Statement being questioned: “The contractor shall support a Kick-off meeting, a Mid-Term Review, a Final Review”

Question: Please indicate a location for each of these and whether these are face-to-face or by electronic means.

Response: The kick-off, mid-term and final review meetings may be face-to-face meetings at Goddard Space Flight Center or a telephone conference with documentation available electronically. In each case, the Government will comply with the contractors’ preference. Amendment 1 to the RFP incorporates a revision to the Government Statement of Work, paragraph 2.2. Please note: bidders are reminded that they must specifically propose whether meetings will be in – person or by telephone, and price their proposal appropriately.

17. Document- SOW. Section 2.2- Statement being questioned: “...evaluate the potential impacts and cost reductions if the Class B requirements are changed to Class C”.

Question: Will GSFC be providing a Class C Mar for evaluation?

Response: The Government does not plan to provide a Class C MAR.

18. Document- RFP. Section L.8 B- Statement being questioned: “Specifically, the Offeror shall provide information regarding experience in:...Ground Software Development...”

Question: There is no mention of ground software development scope in the statement of work. Please clarify scope envisioned.

Response: The language has been removed from paragraph L.8 B, Past Performance. Amendment 1 to the RFP revises L.8 B, Past Performance.

19. Document- SOW. Section 2.1

Question: The SOW does not define the number and phasing of contracts, contract types, CDRLs required, or acceptance terms to be assumed during the study. Although this information is not required to prepare the proposal, these drive the contractor's cost and risk and must be factored into ROM estimates.

Response: The government is not going to presume to know the contract type, etc. that could be used to procure the common spacecraft hardware in the future. The Offeror is at liberty to make assumptions and factor those into the ROM. If assumptions are made that affect the ROM estimates they shall be identified.

20. Document- SOW. Section 3- Statement being questioned: "an accounting of funds expended and remaining"

Question: This is not appropriate for a FFP contract. We suggest deletion of the requirement.

Response: The Government Statement of Work, Section 3 is revised to delete the statement. Amendment 1 to the RFP incorporates a revision to the Statement of Work.

21. Major Business Parameters:

Question: The design operational life is not provided for ICESATII or DESdynl (appears to be a typo)

Response: The Parameters Table is revised to provide the operational life for ICESAT II and DESdyn1. Amendment 1 to the RFP incorporates the revised Parameters Table.

22. Major Business Parameters:

Question: Although not required for proposal preparation, the date each instrument is delivered to the contractor for Observatory integration and the date the launch vehicle for each mission is determined drive schedule and cost and should be provided to the contractor.

Response: The date each instrument is to be delivered is to be defined in the optimized schedule and factored into the ROM cost. The launch vehicle is to be determined no later than 36 months prior to the Launch Readiness Date (LRD).

23. Question: Attachment C- DCM Parameters (File: 137163-SOL-001-005.xlsx) lists the "Design Operational Life" (Row 13) for ICESAT-11 and DESDynl as "Absolute, spectrally- resolved interferometer..." Please clarify in years the design lifetime for both observatories.

Response: The Parameters Table is revised in Amendment 1 to provide the operational life for ICESAT II and DESdyn1.

24. Question: Under FAR 52.244-2 Subcontracts, NASA will require the successful Offeror to obtain the Contracting Officer's written consent before placing any subcontracts for "professional and consultant costs as defined in FAR 31.205-33(j)." Paragraph (j) does not exist in this clause. Is this meant to be FAR

31.205-33(a)? Further, if costs for professional and consultant services, as defined in FAR 31.205-33(a) are included and fully supported by a price analysis in the successful Offeror's proposal, will government consent still be required prior to issuing a subcontract, or does NASA intend to insert the Offeror's subcontractors in the following sentence: "Paragraphs (c) and (e) of this clause do not apply to the following subcontracts which were evaluated during negotiations:"?

Response: Clause 52.244-2 Subcontracts (Jun 2007) is amended as follows:

52.244-2 SUBCONTRACTS. (JUN 2007) {paragraph (d) is "Professional and consultant costs as defined at FAR 31.205-33" and paragraph (j) is "None".}. Amendment 1 to the RFP revises 52.244-2.