**AMENDMENT OF SOLICITATION/MODIFICATION OF CONTRACT**

1. CONTRACT ID CODE

PAGE 1 OF PAGES 5

2. AMENDMENT/MODIFICATION NO. 000001

3. EFFECTIVE DATE 06/17/2010

4. REQUISITION/PURCHASE REQ. NO.

5. PROJECT NO. *(If applicable)*

6. ISSUED BY CODE LARC

NASA/Langley Research Center
9B Langley Blvd., Bldg. 1195B
M/S 126
Hampton VA 23681-2199

7. ADMINISTERED BY *(If other than Item 6)* CODE LARC

NASA/Langley Research Center
9B Langley Blvd., Bldg. 1195B
M/S 126
Hampton VA 23681-2199

8. NAME AND ADDRESS OF CONTRACTOR *(No., street, county, State and ZIP Code)*

CODE

FACILITY CODE

(x) 9A. AMENDMENT OF SOLICITATION NO. NNL10310923R

x 9B. DATED *(SEE ITEM 11)* 06/04/2010

10A. MODIFICATION OF CONTRACT/ORDER NO.

10B. DATED *(SEE ITEM 13)*

**11. THIS ITEM ONLY APPLIES TO AMENDMENTS OF SOLICITATIONS**

[X] The above numbered solicitation is amended as set forth in Item 14. The hour and date specified for receipt of Offers ☐ is extended, [X] 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 7 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 update Attachment VI of the Solicitation. STARSS II Q&A document has two additional questions (12 & 13) with the Government's response.

The proposal due date remains unchanged and the request for submission of the Past Performance Volume remains unchanged.

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)* Richard Siebels

15B. CONTRACTOR/OFFEROR

*(Signature of person authorized to sign)*

15C. DATE SIGNED

16B. UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

*(Signature of Contracting Officer)*

16C. DATE SIGNED 6/17/10

# Science, Technology and Research Support Services II
# Draft RFP Questions

1) Page 24, Section H.2 (b)(c) Within 5 calendar days after receipt of the Contracting Officer's request, the Contractor shall submit a task plan conforming to the request.

   Question: Should calendar days be business days?

   Answer: Calendar days will be changed to business days; however, refer to Final Solicitation for any changes.

2) Page 61, Section L.13 explicitly indicates: "Do not include cost information in the Technical Proposal." whereas the Statement of Work for Sample Problem #1 states "The contractor should provide a preliminary schedule, costs, descope options and risks and expect to participate in on-going reviews to evaluate readiness and performance." [Note that Sample Problem #2 does not have such a statement requiring "cost" information]. Please provide clarification of what information is required in the response to Sample Problem #1, and in particular whether the response should include any cost information.

   Answer: No cost information will be requested in the Sample Problem #1. The last two sentences from the Sample Problem #1, paragraph 3. Statement of Work will be deleted; however, refer to the Final Solicitation for any changes.

3) Page 73, Section L.21.3.A indicates that bidders must "Include a list of relevant contracts that the Offeror, as well as any significant subcontractors (over $11.5M), presently providing support and has performed within the past three years for requirements that are similar in size, scope, and complexity to the requirements of this solicitation. Offerors shall provide the information below for five relevant contracts for the Prime Contractor and three relevant contracts for each of the significant subcontractors." Given that this is a Small Business set-aside opportunity for offerors with 1000 or fewer employees, we respectfully recommend that the Government extend the period for cited references to the past five years. Our suggestion is based on the notion that most small businesses that meet the NAICS size standard may not have five contracts relevant in size, scope and complexity to STARSS-II within the narrow three year window.

   Answer: The Government will keep the three year period in the Final Solicitation as it is specified the NASA FAR Supplement, (1815.304-70).

4) Section L.16, MGMT-3 and Section M.3 say that the off-site facility should accommodate 175 people whereas Section L.20 says 130 employees. Please clarify?

Answer: Section L.20 will be changed from 130 to 175 people; however, refer to the Final Solicitation for any changes.

5) Section L.8 of the RFP designates Page Limitations;

Question: Given the requirement that the technical volume address a management plan, a response to SOW elements, and the RTO responses, would the government consider increasing the page limit from 35 pages to 75 pages so that there is adequate space to address each of technical volume components?

Answer: The Government has reconsidered the Technical Volume page limit and has increased it from 35 pages to 50 pages; however, refer to the Final Solicitation for any changes.

6) In the interest of readability, would the government consider allowing font size 10 for tables and figures?

Answer: The Government will maintain the 12 point font type (including graphs, charts, tables etc.).

7) Safety and health of the employees is a critical issue, would the government consider increasing the Safety and Health Plan page count to 75 pages?

Answer: The Government has reconsidered the Safety and Health Plan page count from 25 pages to 50 pages; however, refer to the Final Solicitation for any changes.

8) DRFP, Section L, page 64, Factor 1, Subfactor 2, MGMT-3 states that the phase-in plan should address housing of approximately 175 off-site personnel. Section L, page 70, item 9 states that the offer shall provide an offsite facility to house approximately 130 personnel. Please clarify.

Answer: See response to question #4.

**Additional Questions after May 21, 2010**:

9) The Draft RFP (L.21, paragraph 3, page 73) allows offerors to submit up to five contracts for past performance consideration. Considering that some offerors' corporate experience relevant to the STARSS II scope may extend beyond five contracts, would you consider explicitly allowing offerors to submit Past Performance information on contracts beyond the five primary contracts cited?

Answer: The Government has limited the number of relevant past performance information to five for the prime contractor and three for each significant subcontract

listed in paragraph 3. A. The Government considers the current limit will provide the appropriate amount of information to accomplish the past performance evaluation.

10) We suggest not increasing the maximum limit of 5 "primary" contracts a prime offeror can submit, but in addition to the five "primary" contracts (which require the completion and evaluation of questionnaires) allow offerors the option to provide information on "other" relevant contracts beyond the five primary contracts. We further suggest not requiring the completion of questionnaires for these "other" contracts, but requiring that offerors submit a table of contact and administrative data on these additional contracts so that the evaluation team has the ability, if desired, to contact the offerors' customers to assess the contractors' performance.

    Answer: The past performance evaluation by the definitions and the evaluation is comprised of two components, "pertinence" and "performance". The Source Evaluation Board voting members assess both parts to arrive at a subjective evaluation on the basis of the definitions listed in the RFP for each Offeror. The Government in accordance with the RFP may obtain other information independently outside from which the Offeror provided which may or may not impact the Evaluation Board's level of confidence in future performance. The Government is not requesting past performance information beyond that specified in the RFP.

11) The Past Performance requirements listed under Section L.21.3.A of the DRFP include a requirement that "Offerors shall provide the information below for five relevant contracts for the Prime Contractor and three relevant contracts for each of the significant subcontractors."

    The corresponding evaluation criteria under Section M.3.C of the DRFP indicate that "Offerors without a record of relevant past performance, or for whom information on past performance is not available, shall receive a neutral rating. Offerors are cautioned that omissions or an inaccurate or inadequate response to this evaluation factor will have a negative effect on the overall evaluation."

    Given that STARSS-II is a Small Business set aside opportunity and that most companies interested in responding to the solicitation as Prime Offeror are unlikely to have five contracts that are fully relevant to STARSS-II in all three size, scope, and complexity categories, would the Government please elaborate on how the evaluation process would penalize offerors who might have fewer than five cited contracts, or who might have some contracts that are fully relevant to STARSS-II in all three size, scope, and complexity categories, but others that are similar to STARSS-II in only some but not all three categories.

    Moreover, the Government might want to consider adjusting the statement in Section L to require information on "up to five relevant contracts for the Prime Contractor" to allow greater flexibility in showcasing fully relevant Past Performance information.

Answer: Regarding the evaluation process, the Source Evaluation Board (SEB) will evaluate in detail Volume III, Past Performance for each proposal in accordance with Section M.3 Paragraph C of the RFP. The SEB will determine a consensus rating considering relevance and performance for each Offeror utilizing the definitions stated on page 80 of the DRFP and the information acquired during the evaluation process as stated in the RFP. The Government is revising the language to "up to five relevant contracts for the Prime Contractor" to clarify its intent. Please refer to the Final Solicitation for any changes.

**Additional Questions after June 14, 2010**

12. Section C, SOW, H&S Plan
Langley internal STARSS process documents provide information and insight as to how Langley conducts business on a daily basis. Examples of these documents include Langley's risk management process and safety and health documents. We request access to the STARSS library of current documentation.

Answer: There are no Langley internal STARSS process documents as to how Langley conducts business on a daily basis. There is a link in the SOW paragraph 2.0 http://nodis3.gsfc.nasa.gov/main_lib.html which will take you to the NASA Online Directives Information System (NODIS) Library. The NPR for risk management processes and other safety references are listed there for further guidance. Also, the Safety and Health Instructions are listed as Attachment III of the solicitation which provides guidance for the development of the Safety and Health plan. Also, you may refer to information provided under Section L.11 of the Solicitation for FOIA releasable information if you have not already check there.

13. L.8 (b)
This paragraph limits the font in graphs, charts, and tables to 12 point font. This large font can overpower graphics and charts making their use ineffective or impractical. Would the Government consider relaxing this requirement to allow smaller (but legible) fonts be used in graphics in charts? This is particularly helpful for a page constrained proposal such as STARSS.

Answer: See response to question 6 above.