White Sands Test Facility (WSTF)

TEST (Test Evaluation and Support Team) Contract

DRFP Question and Answer List

Question 1:
Is NASA WSTF Physical Security and Emergency Services – Fire/Safety within the scope of the NASA WSTF TEST contract; or is it separate now part of the NPS contact?
Answer 1:
Please refer to Section C of the Draft RFP and the requirements under part 4.0, Emergency Services

Question 2:
Since FOSC was a 100% small business set aside and now with the TEC and FOSC contracts being combined there will be less total work for small business even with the ECO contract being set aside. Would NASA consider increasing the small business goals in the TEST contract to make allowance for this?
Answer 2:
The government has determined the appropriate goals for this contract. These goals were coordinated through NASA and the Small Business Administration Office. These goals were determined to be very challenging and appropriate, given the current uncertainty of the Space Agency environment.

Question 3:
Document Reference: DRD-TEST-PM-03
Please provide details of the functionality and interfaces of the NASA SPICE System, including its current use and expected future enhancements. Please place this information in the Technical Library.
Answer 3:
The Statement of Work has been modified to delete references to SPICE and those references were replaced with the terminology "NASA Provided Contracting Software."

Question 4:
Document Reference: SOW 2.13
Please provide 2005-2009 data which baselines the site's utility systems such as natural gas, electricity, water and fuel. Please place this information in the Technical Library
Answer 4:
The Government has posted baseline site utility data for FY 2009 to the TRL.

Question 5:
Document Reference: SOW 3.1.4
Please provide Occupational/Industrial Safety data on WSTF accident frequency and severity. Please place the information in the Technical Library.
Answer 5:
The information requested is past performance of the current contractors and is not publically available.

Question 6:
Document Reference: SOW 3.2.7
Is there an existing system for Discrepancy Record (DR) and Corrective/Preventive Action Request (C/PAR)? If so will be transferred over to the new contract?
Answer 6:
Yes there is an existing system for DR's and C/PAR's and these systems will be transferred over to the new contract. DR processing is described in WSI 13-0001,"Discrepancy Record (DR)" located in the MSM folder of the Technical Resource Library. A DR tracking database is government provided and contractor operated/maintained. C/PAR processing is described in the Corrective and Preventive Action Infrastructure

Process found in the MSM folder of the TRL.

Question 7:
Document Reference: H-15
Please provide the contract and supplier for all required ACAs.
Answer 7:
The Government has not provided the contract and supplier, however clause H.15 currently provides an overview of services and contract name (as known at the time) for the minimum number of required ACAs. In accordance with H.15, "The contractor shall, at a minimum develop, maintain and adhere to the ACA's with any other interfaces the Contractor deems necessary to avoid negatively impacting the WSTF Mission."

Question 8:
Document Reference: SOW 5.8
What is the current status and overall plan to transition pressure systems over to the new pressure systems certification program and, what are the governing standards and guidelines?
Answer 8:
Governing standards and guidelines are identified in WSP 09-0011, WSI 09-SW-0024 and WSI 09-SW-0011. The transition plan for the legacy systems can be found in WSI 09-SW-0024, Attachment O.

Question 9:
Document Reference: SOW 5.9.2
The SOW states the contractor will operate the NASA/WSTF Video Teleconference System (ViTS). Please provide information on the current maintenance contractors(s).
Answer 9:
Attachment L-10 includes details on the contract that supports maintenance of ViTS.

Question 10:
Document Reference: SOW 5.10.3
The RFP states, “The WSTF Supply System is scheduled to be integrated to the Integrated Enterprise Management (IEM) SAP® supply system and will be used by the Contractor to manage stores stock and program stock” Please provide the schedule for transition, and confirm that the TEST contractor will use the system. Please also confirm that the TEST Contractor will not maintain the computers/operating systems/database/application software.
Answer 10:
The schedule for transition is April/May 2011. The TEST contractor is not responsible for maintenance of the system.

Question 11:
Document Reference: L-6
Please modify Table 2, adding a column for standard labor categories.
Answer 11:
The IGE provided in Table 2 is provided at the level of detail deemed appropriate by the Government. It is not broken out as to standard labor category since that information is be proposed by the Offeror per the instructions in Section L.

Question 12:
Document Reference: L-6
Please modify Table 3 to provide separate columns for fixed price, cost reimbursable and total FTE counts.
Answer 12:
The IGE provided in Table 3 is provided at the level of detail deemed appropriate by the Government. As stated in Attachment L-6 Table 3 is an estimate of the overall staffing for the entire statement of work.

Question 13:
Document Reference: SOW 5.12; J-4
The SOW states, “Radio towers and associated antennas and equipment are located in 10 remote locations.” Please provide the equipment list by location.
Answer 13:
Additional information has been provided in fixed price task order 1TCRADO (L-2) related to system description, equipment type, and to clarify maintenance requirements.

Question 14:
Document Reference: J.2.12
Please provide a list of active and planned projects that will extend into the Phase In Period.
Answer 14:
Offerors should anticipate transitioning between 50 - 75 cost reimbursable IDIQ task orders during phase-in. The exact number and work content is unknown at this time. However we anticipate that there will be task orders associated with every major element of the WBS/SOW.

Question 15:
Document Reference: B.7
Is it correct to assume that the Fee cell on this table for OFI is to be indicated as a percentage?
Answer 15:
This has been changed to be TBD (to be determined).

Question 16:
Document Reference: B.9
This clause states that the fully burdened rates will not be subject to equitable adjustment. Will the government consider adjusting the rates in this table in the event there is an updated DOL Wage Determination and/or Collective Bargaining Agreement?
Answer 16:
The government shall not adjust the rates in this table in the event of an updated DOL Wage Determination and/or Collective Bargaining Agreement. The offeror is responsible for estimating the anticipated escalation for both exempt and non-exempt personnel taking into account anticipated market conditions, annual merit increases, DOL wage determinations and collective bargaining agreements. The offeror may also want to consider that some contractors perform annual performance appraisals that coincide with the start of the contract, which in the case of TEST may result in rate increases immediately preceding contract award.

Question 17:
Document Reference: J-1 Section V.6
Please provide the performance standard for the contractor proposed innovations for cost savings, efficiencies or green initiatives.
Answer 17:
Per Attachment J-1 paragraph V.A.6, this area is reserved for the offeror to propose areas that they'd like to have the government consider for Innovations and efficiencies performance incentive fee (I&E PIF).

Question 18:
Document Reference: J-1 Section V.3
The Government requires all critical skills with no single point failure. Please provide clarification on the scale of acceptable performance with respect to timing, duration of single point failures and quantity of critical skilled positions maintained.
Answer 18:
Per Attachment J-1, the critical skills retention will be measured against the staffing plan provided per DRD-TEST-CM-09. Identification of critical skills and the mitigation plan for maintaining critical skills are due at

contract start + 60 days, as outlined in the updated DRD.

Question 19:
Document Reference: J-1 Section V.4
Please define successful and possibly degrees of success and corresponding performance criteria earned instead of an all or nothing performance measure without success defined.
Answer 19:
Per Attachment J-1 paragraph V.A.4, this area is reserved for the offeror to propose areas that they'd like to have the government consider for Innovations and efficiencies performance incentive fee (I&E PIF).

Question 20:
Document Reference: J-1 Section V.5
The performance measure is defined for 100%, 80%, and 60% of goal established in ECP. Please provide evaluation percentages for the full scale of performance.
Answer 20:
J-1, V.5. has been updated to clearly identify ranges.

Question 21:
Document Reference: L-4
Most of the exempt categories state that a Bachelor's degree is "typically" required – is it permissible to recognize relevant experience in lieu of a degree? (e.g. Bachelor's degree OR 8 years related experience)
Answer 21:
The Government has provided guidelines for each Standard Labor Category in Attachment L-4. It is the offerors responsibility to acquire an understanding of the complexities of the work and to decide what qualifications the offeror deems necessary to successfully meet the requirements of the contract using the Standard Labor Categories as a guide.

Question 22:
Document Reference:
Please provide a complete list of all maintenance/vendor agreements associated with this contract or relevant to the follow on.
Answer 22:
Answer Pending

Question 23:
Document Reference: L-3
The RS 34 engine was tested at WSTF in support of the Constellation Program; the incumbent contractor will have knowledge of the propellant valve interface, valve driver properties as well as the materials used in the injector and valve. This detailed knowledge is not available in the public sources. This information is necessary to do accurate test planning for thrust stand design and define the number and type of materials compatibility testing. Will the government supply this information so that all of the bidders have the same information that is available to the incumbent contractor?
Answer 23:
The Sample task order has been updated to genericize the engine that is analyzed and tested. Assumptions have been added on the number of materials and components that require analysis and testing. The amount of detail given represents a typical preliminary customer requirement.

Question 24:
Document Reference: M.3; MA5
Please confirm that the intent of the ECP is to capture net new business for WSTF, and does not include shuttle retirement tasks such as forward RCS, AFT RCS PODS, and APU decontamination etc. that can only be done at WSTF.

Answer 24:
Yes it is the intent of the External Customer Plan to capture net new business for WSTF.

Question 25:
Document Reference: DRD-TEST-BP-02
DRD-TEST-BP-02 Block 8, c, I, 4 calls out "small disadvantaged 8(a)" as a small business category, The Clause at H-10 does not include 8(a) as a goal. Will the government evaluate offeror's small business plan against DRD-BP-02 stated goals or H-10 stated goals?
Answer 25:
The goals stated in Clause H-10 are correct; DRD-TEST-BP-02 has been updated to match the goals stated in H-10.

Question 26:
Document Reference:L.19.5
L.19.5 (B) (ii) states that Records of the company's OSHA recordable injuries and illnesses be provided as part of the Past Performance and that the "records shall include, for each worksite, as a minimum, 1 copy of each year's OSHA logs (Forms 300 and 300A)…". Question: To meet the privacy requirements mandated by HIPAA (Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act), will NASA accept OSHA 300/300A forms with just the initials of injured employees vs. full given names to protect employee privacy?
Answer 26:
All data provided by the offerors must comply with HIPAA requirements. It is acceptable to redact or mark out the names of injured employees that appear on the OSHA Forms 300/300A.

Question 27:
Document Reference: L.19.3.2
L.19.3.2 states, "For each of the 12 Fixed price Task Orders the government requires: Detailed approach, assumptions, needed functions including enabling and facility support requirements, and cite the appropriate reference to the SOW of the contract to demonstrate the Offeror's approach and rationale in executing the Task Order requirements … and "For both fixed price and cost reimbursable task orders describe the processes used to accurately identify, monitor, and control technical risks associated with each specific Task Order. Identify those specific technical risks that the Offeror believes should be addressed relative to performance of work under all sections of the SOW and discuss plans to mitigate or accept each risk and Technical Resources Templates (TRT) "… Technical Resources Template Fixed Price (TRTFP), and submit a printed copy of the TRTCR or TRTFP with the response to the given task order. The TRT shall agree with the BOEs. The TRT shall reconcile to the cost volume. The rollup summary table shall reconcile with the details and shall reconcile with the cost proposal as indicated in the cost proposal instructions for a pricing model. Note that the TRT templates are also submitted as part of Volume IV, Cost/Price"
Question / Recommendation: In order to be compliant with Section L - Each task order must be completed in its entirety as directed above. Several of the smaller fixed price Task Orders may consume several pages if required to adhere to the guidance individually, i.e. description, assumptions, work flow, identification, monitor and control of risks, etc. We recommend a higher WBS roll up of the smaller tasks to conserve page count and avoid duplication of information for the evaluators.
Answer 27:
The Government requires sufficient detail to evaluate the technical understanding and the basis of estimate for each task order as required in L.19.3.2. The amount of detail provided should be only that required to address the specific task order. The last sentence of paragraph A. under TA2 was changed to read "Identify those specific technical risks that the Offeror believes should be addressed relative to performance of work under all applicable sections of the SOW ..." to clarify this point. Paragraph B already states: "Include sufficient narrative discussion to convince the Government that the proposed resources are realistic for the proposed technical and management approach." In addition Paragraph B was changed to read: "For the

Cost Reimbursable IDIQ Sample Task Orders, include with your narrative discussion a schedule and critical path for the proposed effort." As stated in Table L-1 the technical resource worksheets contained in the cost volume are not part of the page count.

Question 28:
Document Reference: DRD-TEST-CM-03
The DRD information states that the Contract Risk Management initial submission is contract start +15 days. Section L.19.4 states that the Contract Risk Management Plan is due at proposal submission. Please clarify.

Answer 28:
DRD-TEST-CM-03 has been updated so that the plan is due with Proposal.

Question 29:
Document Reference: L.19.3
Please confirm that the full text of the DRD is not required in the sub-factor to be compliant.
Answer 29:
The full text of the DRD is to be submitted in Volume II of the proposal and not as part of the response to the sub factors in Volume I. The narrative response to the sub-factor is to be included in Volume I and should reference the DRD and explain how the information in the DRD addresses the narrative discussion. The full text of the DRD is to be included in Volume II. It is not the Government's intent that the text of the DRD appear in Volume I. Note: both Volume I and Volume II comprise the offerors full response to the Mission Suitability sub-factors.

Question 30:
It is our estimate that the requirements of the individual Plans to be included in Volume II may require the full page count allotted. May we exclude the required cover page and table of contents from the page count for the individual plans?
Answer 30:
Changed L.8 to read: "Title pages, cover sheets, tables of contents, acronym listings (or a glossary of abbreviations), and requested cross reference lists are excluded from the page counts specified in paragraph (a) of this provision."

Question 31:
Document Reference: C.2.6; L.19.3.1; M.3.1
In order to provide a level understanding of reimbursable work at WSTF, please provide a complete list (from 2006 to year to date (YTD)) of reimbursable tasks with description, dollar value, duration, customer and other relevant data
Answer 31:
The Government will post to the TRL a list of reimbursable projects, with a short description and the dollar value.

Question 32:
Document Reference: H.3
Subparagraph (i), states that "Contractor shall submit task/delivery order progress reports in accordance with SOW 2.7.3…" there is no SOW paragraph 2.7.3. Please clarify.
Answer 32:
H.3 has been updated in the Final RFP to reflect the latest SOW reference, which is now 2.7.2

Question 33:
Document Reference: DRD-TEST-PM-02
Contract costs will be reported on a weekly basis. Are subcontractor costs required to be reported weekly along with the prime contractor's weekly costs? (Due to the possible limitations of the accounting systems of the smaller (Small Business) subcontractors, we feel that weekly reporting may not be realistic.)

Answer 33:
The minimum reporting requirements are outlined in DRD-TEST-PM-02, and include weekly cost reporting of all costs including subcontractor costs.. The government has determined that this level of reporting is necessary for adequate cost control.

Question 34:
Document Reference: J-2, DRD-TEST-PM-03,
Indicates that "the contractor will develop and maintain a resource-loaded schedule for each approved task order". P. J-2-55 indicates "all performance and variance analysis reporting shall be traceable to the RLS [resource loaded schedules]". C-11 directs the contractor to "provide data that communicates the project status to the Government with respect to …schedule." Please indicate if the reconciliation to resource-loaded schedule and variance analysis will be a contract deliverable. If so, what are the deliverable requirements and timeline?
Answer 34:
Reconciliation of the Task Order Plan to the actual performance data is a contract deliverable. Deliverable requirements and timeframe for this reconciliation are described in the "Performance Assessment" section of DRD-TEST-PM-02. The Basis of Estimate and Resource Loaded Schedule (provided per the Task Order Plan, DRD-TEST-PM-03) outlines the contractor's approach to meeting the task order requirements, including resources, schedule and technical assumptions. All project reporting that is provided per DRD-TEST-PM-02 should be based on the currently approved Task Order Plan. If the work performed in a reporting period varies from the approved Task Order Plan the contractor is expected to report on the discrepancy, including identification of impacts and a plan for recovery (i.e. variance analysis),

Question 35:
Document Reference: G-1
The RFP, Attachment J, p. J-2-34 states the NF533M report must be delivered "not later than 10 working days following the close of the contractor's monthly accounting period or the 10th calendar date of the month, whichever comes first" (the RFP also references the Workload Reports (p. J-2-25) are due at the same time as the NF533M). The NASA Financial Management manual (section 3.3.1.1) refers to a 10 Working Day report submittal requirement. The recommended change is to remove the phrase "or the 10th calendar date of the month, whichever comes first".
Answer 35:
The government has determined that the requirement as written is appropriate in DRD-TEST-BP-04.

Question 36:
Document Reference: J-2-34
...includes the statement "for NF553M due/delivered in the months of December, March, June, and September, the NF533M must reflect an estimate through the end of the calendar month, not the contractor month end". There are two issues related to this statement:
a. This RFP requirement contradicts the NASA Contractor Financial Management Reporting which states direct labor costs are to be reported on the NF533 as incurred, and accruals for direct labor are to be made through the end of the contractors' accounting period. Please provide a clarification regarding calendar month end reporting versus the contractor's accounting month end.
b. The RFP statement requires any 533 "due/delivered" in the months of December, March, June, and September to contain an estimate through the end of the calendar month, not the contractor month. The NASA Financial management Reporting requirements indicate a NF533 is due not later than 10 working days following the close of the contractor's monthly accounting period. Thus, a contractor submits the February NF533 in March, the May NF522 is submitted in June, and August NF533 is submitted in September, and the November NF533 is submitted in December. Does the RFP requirement therefore require the February NF533 – which would be delivered in early March- to include an estimate of cost

incurred through the end of March? Please provide a clarification.

Answer 36:

The reference to the need to report through the end of the quarter is in NPR 9060.1, Section 1.2.10.1.1(c). It states, "Contractors' accounting periods commonly differ from the calendar month basis used for NASA accounting. Monthly accruals, however, need not include an estimate for the cost to be incurred during the period from the end of the contractor's accounting period to the end of the month, except at the end of each quarter and the end of the fiscal year.

a. The calendar month end is for the Current Month Estimate. There is no contradiction to the reporting of the direct labor accruals as incurred.

b. The word "due" was deleted. Therefore, the NF533 "delivered" in March, will have the accurate incurred costs for February, and an estimate through March 31st. As stated in the sentence above the due dates in the DRD, "...outlined in Chapter 3 of NPR 9501.2D, but have slightly changed for this DRD". Also, in the appendix of the NPR, under the heading "Submission" it states, "... unless otherwise specified in the contract".

Question 37:

Document Reference: J-2-36

Indicates an initial 533Q will be required and utilized for baseline purposes. No subsequent 533Q reports will be required. The NASA Financial Management requirements indicate a contract with a value greater than $1,000,000 and longer than 1 year in length are required to have a NF533Q report. This requirement may be waived by the NASA Contracting Officer, the Center Chief Financial Officer, and the cognizant Project Manager. A NF533Q waiver is mentioned on page J-2-37. Is this waiver intended to be explicit and include the concurrence of the three roles indicated, (i.e.: is the 533Q formally waived after the initial submittal)?

Answer 37:

Yes, the subsequent 533Q's are waived

Question 38:

Document Reference: J-2-38

Indicates the contractor is required to submit the NF533 electronically in Excel format. NASA Contractor Financial Management reporting (9501.2D) contains the phrase "NASA strongly encourages the use of electronic contractor cost reporting, where it may benefit the Agency or the contract" but does not refer to a required electronic Excel report. We request the customer clarify the requirement to provide an Excel-based NF533 (i.e.: values only).

Answer 38:

Per DRD-TEST-BP-04 - NF533 Cost and Data Reporting, paragraph, Electronic NF533 Requirement, "The data shall be submitted via email using the Government prescribed flat file format in Microsoft Excel …" TEST requirements specify that Excel shall be used for the purposes of 533 reporting.

Question 39:

Document Reference: C.3.2

A reference is made to Figure 1. Will Figure 1 be provided?

Answer 39:

The Figure is provided. The Figure was moved to L-10 paragraph 3.1 Figure 1. The language in C.3.2 was clarified.

Question 40:

Document Reference: H.27

In the first paragraph, you state "The Contractor may determine a need to procure supplies and services from outside vendors which are incidental to performing this SOW and associated task/delivery orders."

The second paragraph states “Any material or service procurements conducted in performance of this contract (including task/delivery orders) are not subject to any burdened costs and/or indirect rate costs including but not limited to: ODCs, Fee, G&A, material handling fees, SREs, or any other rates, costs, fees, or a combination thereof associated with the performance, management and oversight of procurement functions.”
In the spirit of FAR 52.215-23, limiting of pass-through charges in situations where the prime or subcontractor ultimately ends up performing less than 30 percent of the contract/subcontract work, it is our assumption that the material or service procurements not subject to burdened cost or fee in the second paragraph are those outside “incidental” past-through procurements that may be required to address specific contract requirements. We have also assumed that paragraph two only applies to outside provider, “incidental”, past-through procurements, and does not apply to inside “major subcontractors” supporting your direct labor requirements. Is this a correct assumption?

Answer 40:

All procurement functions are covered and burdened rates paid for through fixed price task order 1TABPRO - Business Processes. Since one of the requirements of this task order is a purchasing function, clause H.27 is an agreement by the offeror and the Government not to burden a function (the procurement activity) which has already been burdened and paid for through 1TABPRO.

Question 41:

Document Reference: J-3

Attachment J-3 identifies a CBA with IAM&AW, Local 392 for Emergency Services personnel. Please provide the current CBA.

Answer 41:

The requested CBA has been added to the TRL.

Question 42:

Document Reference: L.8

The RFP states that 11 x 17 foldouts shall count as two (2) pages. For easier review of multiple 11 x 17 cost forms, will the Government consider allowing Government-provided Cost forms to only count as one page since the Cost forms are out of page count? This will allow the Cost forms to be page numbered directly in the Excel file and template provided. Excel does not allow double page numbering (e.g., page 1/2); therefore, if 11 x 17s counts as two pages, the electronic version cannot include page numbers.

Answer 42:

As Stated in Table L-1 the technical resource worksheets contained in the cost volume are not part of the page count therefore they would not count as two pages against the page count provided the other provision of L.8 (b) was followed and they only contained information applicable to the cost proposal.

Question 43:

Document Reference: L.19.5

Section L.19.5.A states that copies of OSHA Forms 300 and 300A should be included as part of Volume III, Past Performance. Companies having a significant number of relevant contracts could potentially exceed the 85 page limit by merely providing the required copies of the OSHA logs (Forms 300 and 300A). If we include 3 years of OSHA logs (300 and 300A Forms) for 7 to 10 prime contracts, these forms would require approximately 60 pages of the 85 page limit. The number of pages will be even larger as major subcontractors OSHA logs are included. We request that the OSHA forms be excluded from the Volume III page limitations, and that the Past Performance Volume III page count be set at 35 pages to adequately address Past Performance requirements.

Answer 43:

Changed L 19.2 Table L-1, Volume III Past Performance to read "Past Performance Attachments Note: OSHA Forms 300 and 300A are not subject to page limitations"

Question 44:
Document Reference: L.8; L.19.2
In addition to the items listed in this paragraph, are we correct in assuming that the transmittal letter, cross reference lists, cover sheets, and glossary of abbreviations are also excluded from the proposal page limitations?
Answer 44:
Provision L.8 has been changed to read: "Title pages, cover sheets, tables of contents, acronym listings (or a glossary of abbreviation), and requested cross reference lists are excluded from the page counts specified in paragraph (a) of this provision." The transmittal letter is not subject to the page limit provisions of Section L as it is not substantively part of your proposal.

Question 45:
Document Reference: L-1
May offerors alter the layout of the Key Personnel Resume Form to more efficiently utilize the space as long as all of the requirements are addressed and the proposal font specifications are met?
Answer 45:
The Government has determined what information is necessary for key personnel to be included on the resume and has provided a form such that there is consistency in the way in which that information is presented. Deviations from the format presented may result in key information not being readily identified during the review of the Offeror's proposal.

Question 46:
Document Reference: L-2-20
Requirement number 17 references Section 4.4d. Section 4.4d appears to be an invalid reference. Please clarify.
Answer 46:
The listed reference was incorrect and has been updated in L-2. The correct reference is item #7 within L-2.

Question 47:
Document Reference: L.19.4
The link in this section http://www.arnet.gov/References/sdbadjustments.htm appears to be obsolete. Should the website listed below be used to determine if the corresponding 1987 SIC is under-represented?
https://www.acquisition.gov/references/sdbadjustments.htm
Answer 47:
http://www.arnet.gov/References/sdbadjustments.htm is the correct link - this section has been updated to incorporate this link.

Question 48:
Document Reference: B.9
Discussion: This requirement for pricing Cost Reimbursable Task/Delivery Orders requires use of pre-established rates throughout the life of the contract. If actual rates vary during contract performance, it is not clear that establishing task-order estimated cost using obsolete rates is in the best interest of the Government. The results would be either an artificially inflated estimate or a built-in overrun.
Question: Doesn't this requirement impose an unnecessary administrative burden on both the Government and the contractor to adjust funding based on actual rates after the estimated cost is established?
Answer 48:
The Government has historically used this method. It does require the offerors due diligence in proposing these rates. Additionally per section B.9 there will be no equitable adjustments upward or downward in the event of an updated DOL Wage Determination and/or Collective Bargaining Agreement. The offeror is responsible for estimating the anticipated escalation for both exempt and non-exempt personnel taking into account anticipated market conditions, DOL wage determinations and collective bargaining agreements.

Question 49:
Document Reference: B.9.1, B.10.1
How are “overtime hours exercised” in the pricing of a task order
Answer 49:
In accordance with section B.9.1 and B.10.1, "The rates in this table shall only be used in the pricing of all IDIQ task/delivery orders once overtime hours are exercised. Overtime is only applicable to non-exempt employees."

Question 50:
Document Reference: SOW 6.2.2; SOW 6.2.6
What current CMMS tools does the site use now? Who owns those, with what maintenance licenses
Answer 50:
The NASA-owned CMMS tool is MAPCON Jemms by Mapcon Technologies, Inc. (MTI), Clive, Iowa. WSTF has 9-seat license.

Question 51:
Document Reference: F.1
Discussion: Article F.2 contemplates at least some deliveries may be made “F.O.B Origin.” There is no clause incorporated defining that term.
Suggestion: It is suggested that FAR 52.247-49, “F.O.B. Origin,” be added to the list of clauses incorporated by reference in Article F.1.
Answer 51:
The Government anticipates that all deliveries will be FOB destination; therefore the FOB Origin clause is not necessary.

Question 52:
Document Reference: H.3
Paragraph (b) (3) (i) reads: “… this shall merely restate Government’s requirements….”
Question: Is the statement correct as written?
Answer 52:
There was an error and it has been corrected to read: "…this shall NOT merely restate Government's requirements…"

Question 53:
Document Reference: H.3
Is the value of (6), “other resources,” included in the “maximum dollar amount” of (5)?
Answer 53:
Yes. The "maximum dollar amount" should include any and all cost associated with the pricing of the task/delivery order. The "maximum dollar amount" should represent the Government’s maximum financial liability as it relates to completing requirements of that task order. "Other resources" shall have the cost associated with other resources however the "maximum dollar amount" shall be the total.

Question 54:
Document Reference: H-15
Who are all of the other (non-TEC, non-FOSC) site contractors to NASA, and what is the scope/term of their contracts? Information is required to develop/scope ACAs)
Answer 54:
Clause H.15 currently provides an overview of services and contract name (as known at the time) for the minimum number of required ACAs. In accordance with H.15, "The contractor shall, at a minimum develop, maintain and adhere to the ACA's with any other interfaces the Contractor deems necessary to avoid negatively impacting the WSTF Mission." Attachment L-10 contains a list of current contracts that support

the site and a description of the approximate scope of the support given.

Question 55:
Document Reference: H-17
Discussion: For non-government use of WSTF facilities (and including Space Act types of activities, FRAs, etc.), the Draft RFP (section H-17) states that activities may be allowed "if found appropriate by the Government."
Question: What are the rules that define "appropriate" uses so that we can effectively plan and propose external business during the proposal process?
Answer 55:
These will be determined on a case by case basis and in accordance with the offerors proposed External Customer Plan as non-government use of WSTF facilities occurs.

Question 56:
Document Reference: DRD-TEST-PM-01
Discussion: Without some minimum description of the Government's expectations as described below, the incumbent has an unfair advantage have this information available about the expectations.
Question: What standardized/regular metrics does the government expect to see as a course of normal business from any offeror?
a. Are there minimum metrics or formats that the site prefers for management of the site? What are those?
b. What does WSTF use today as Performance Metrics for the contract?
Answer 56:
Offerors are expected to propose methods and tools for tracking progress in DRD-TEST-PM-01. Minimum reporting requirements are outlined in DRD-TEST-PM-02, but this is not intended to lead offerors towards a specific tracking approach. Current requirements for performance reporting on TEC and FOSC are semi-monthly cost and schedule earned value, and monthly earned value variance explanations.

Question 57:
Document Reference: H.27
Discussion: FAR 52.215-23, "Limitation on Pass-Through Charges," limits application of indirect costs to subcontracts when the prime contractor does not "add value". Paragraph (a) states:
"Added value" means that the Contractor performs subcontract management functions that the Contracting Officer determines are a benefit to the Government (e.g., processing orders of parts or services, maintaining inventory, reducing delivery lead times, managing multiple sources for contract requirements, coordinating deliveries, performing quality assurance functions).
Since the functions that add value, as defined in the clause, are specifically required by the SOW, it would appear that H.27 is in conflict with the intent of FAR 52.215-23. Additionally, since all indirect costs would need to be absorbed in labor burdens, the clause would appear to distort the allocation with no net savings to the Government.
Question: Would NASA consider deleting clause H.27 and the corresponding references to it in Section B?
Answer 57:
The Government has determined that the purchase of a service and/or material is covered through all the burdened rates associated with the fixed priced task order. As such the purpose of this clause is to allow both the Government and Contractor (including the prime and any and all subcontractors) to enter into this agreement, whereby fully burdened rates are not placed on top of fully burdened rates for procurement functions.
To avoid any confusion of the intent of H.27 and 52.215-23, the reference to 52.215-23 has been removed.

Question 58:
Document Reference: H.34
Discussion: The second sentence appears to impose significant and broad liability on the contractor

unrelated to the subject matter of the clause and in conflict with the cross waivers of Clauses H.5 and H.7, and with Section I, FAR 52.228-7, “Insurance Liability to Third Persons;” 52.246-24, “Limitation of Liability – High Value Items;” 52.246-25, “Limitation of Liability – Services;” and 52.245-1, “Government Property.” Additionally, the phrase “…of the person’s fault…” has no clear referent.
Suggestion: We suggest the second sentence be deleted from this clause.

Answer 58:

The requirements of this clause pertains only to business licenses, permits, and certifications required for conducting business with the Federal Government and necessary for the successful performance of the SOW requirements. If the contractor choosing to perform requirements without the proper training and/or certifications and licenses, they pose a significant liability to the Government and as such will be responsibility for the damages in accordance with H.34.

Question 59:

Document Reference: I.1

Discussion: Article G.7 (et al.) invokes requirements set forth in FAR 52.245-1. FAR 52.245-1 is not included in the RFP.
Suggestion: We suggest FAR 52.245-1, Government Property, be added to Article I.1 or elsewhere in the RFP.

Answer 59:

52.245-1 has been added to section I

Question 60:

Document Reference: L.8

Discussion: The current font size limitation of minimum 10 point Arial for tables, charts, graphics and figures will severely limit the offerors’ ability to provide meaningful graphic information.
Question: Will the Government allow a minimum font size of 8 point Arial on graphics, which is still easily readable, for charts, graphics and figures?

Answer 60:

The Government has determined the minimum font size limitation of Arial 10 point is adequate and shall be used for tables, charts, graphics and figures.

Question 61:

Document Reference: L.19.1.1

Question: For the RFP, does “Contract Start” refer to the start of the Phase-In or to the start of the Base Period

Answer 61:

Contract Start is May 1, 2011 - the start of the contract. Phase-In refers to the phase-in period March 1, 2011 - April 30, 2011.

Question 62:

Document Reference: L.19.2

Discussion: Requirement is for a Cross Reference List in each volume. Exemption from page limitation is not addressed for the list.
Question: Will the Government allow the Cross Reference List to be excluded from all volumes page limitation.

Answer 62:

Changed L.8 to read: "Title pages, cover sheets, tables of contents, acronym listings (or a glossary of abbreviation), and requested cross reference lists are excluded from the page counts specified in paragraph (a) of this provision."

Question 63:

Document Reference: L.19.5

Discussion: The Section states: “Offerors shall provide the following performance data with explanatory remarks on contracts performed in the last three years…. For all work performed during the past three years, Offerors shall provide….” Since OSHA logs are required for each company location
Question: Will the government allow the safety data to be limited to the contracts that questionnaires are sent to or allow the safety data to be excluded from the volume page limitation? , not just company, this RFP requirement could result in large amounts of OSHA forms which will consume most of the page allocation for Past Performance volume. This would severely impact an offerors’ ability to respond to the other requirements in the Past Performance volume within the allowed 85 pages.

Answer 63:

In the Final RFP L 19.2 Table L-1, Volume III Past Performance, will be changed to read "Past Performance Attachments Note: OSHA Forms 300 and 300A are not subject to page limitations"

Question 64:

Document Reference: L.19.5

Discussion: Section requires multiple safety data forms including OSHA citations, logs, lists, and insurance letters for the offeror and all teammates. This requirement is currently page counted for the volume and may use most of the volume page allowance. Example: If the team consists of 10 companies and each company is required to submit OSHA logs (2 pages each for form 300 and 300A) for the last three years, this could require over 60 pages to respond. Adding any required
OSHA citations, insurance carrier letters and other safety data could easily consume over 80 pages. This would severely impact an offerors’ ability to respond to the other requirements in the Past Performance volume within the allowed 85 pages.
Question: Will the government allow the safety data to be excluded from the volume page limitation?

Answer 64:

In the Final RFP L 19.2 Table L-1, Volume III Past Performance, will be changed to exclude OSHA Forms 300 and 300A from the page limitations, all other information is subject to the page limitations stated.

Question 65:

Document Reference: L.19.5

Discussion: The first sentence of the above passage clearly requires that “…each company (including joint-ventures and subcontracts)…” provide customer references with a Past Performance Questionnaire (Attachment L-8). However, it is unclear whether the second sentence of the second paragraph of item D (page L-40) requires a combined total of “at least three contracts” from all parties, or “at least three contracts” from each party (including joint-ventures and subcontracts).
Question: Are we to provide customer references with at least three questionnaires total, or at least three questionnaires from each company (including joint-ventures and subcontracts)?

Answer 65:

The Offeror is to provide at least three questionnaires for each company (including joint-ventures and subcontracts) if such experience exists.

Question 66:

Document Reference: L.19.5

Discussion: The third sentence requires customer references to “fully complete the questionnaire in accordance with the instructions on the form and to return it in accordance with the instructions in Clause L.17, Communications Regarding This Solicitation.” The instructions in Clause L.17 state to email communications, which contradicts instructions on the questionnaire cover letter to use regular mail and fax.
Question: Are we to instruct customer references to email as the questionnaire as stated in Clause L-17, in addition to the cover letter provided instructions to mail and fax?

Answer 66:

In the Final RFP Paragraph L.19.5 D will be changed to read: "…accordance with the return instructions on the form, on or before the Volume III due date." and changed the instruction in the past performance

questionnaire to instruct the reference to return them to Irene Garcia via e-mail or Fax.

Question 67:
Document Reference: L.19.5
Discussion: The second paragraph of item D reads: “For each company (including joint-ventures and subcontracts [sic]) associated with this offer, excluding minor sub-contracts [sic] below $1M per year, the Offeror shall provide their customer references with an Attachment L-8, Past Performance Questionnaire Template.”
Question: Are the terms “subcontracts” and “sub-contracts” used in this section a typo which should read “subcontractors”?
Answer 67:
The RFP was corrected to read "subcontracts.”

Question 68:
Document Reference: J-4
Discussion: Attachment J-4, especially the Installation Accountable Property List (J-4.1) seems to include property that may not be assigned to the TEST contract (such as various weapons, medical equipment in the clinic, etc.).
Question: Can NASA provide an updated Attachment J-4 (all sections) that covers only property directly assigned to the TEST contract for responsibility and accountability?
Answer 68:
All installation accountable property at WSTF is accountable to the TEST Contractor and shall be inventoried, managed and reconciled in accordance to the terms of the contract. Property accounts shall be created for the Test contractor, NASA and other contractor organizations working under the confines of the White Sands Test Facility. Property accounts shall be indentified and assigned by each contractor organization including NASA held custodial accounts. The Test contractor is responsible for performing annual inventories of all installation accountable property with the responsible contractor or NASA custodians and report results and losses to the Contracting Officer and the NASA Property Administrator. A comprehensive and complete J-4 list will be provided to the TEST contractor by the NASA Property Administrator upon award. The IAP inventory shall be validated by the incoming and outgoing contractors prior to acceptance by the NASA Property Administrator. Note the following Installation Accountable Property Custodial Accounts: 1) Test Contractor; 2) NASA; 3) ECO Contractor; 4) Security Contract; 5) Other small contracts may have custodial accounts assigned as deemed necessary by the Contracting Officer.

Question 69:
Is there a listing of equipment that must be excessed/disposed of?
Answer 69:
There is no list of equipment that has been dispositioned as excess. Items that are dispositioned as excess are accounted for and reported by the TEST contractor on the NASA DSPL System.

Question 70:
Question: Will the government provide historical data to offeror in order to trend past quantities of specific work for use in formulating basis of estimates?
Answer 70:
The government has provided workload sizing data for all fixed price task orders and performance requirements for areas within the statement of work. It is the offerors responsibility to understand the complexity of work and to formulate an appropriate basis of estimate.

Question 71:
Question: What Project Management tools and software does WSTF use now? Please provide examples of

what you use now to estimate, plan, authorize, and control projects so that we can better understand your needs and goals.

Answer 71:

The Project Management tools used across site for estimating, planning and controlling vary, but in general, the data that is provided to the government is in a MS Office format (Excel and/or Project). Authorization of task orders, including contractor-provided estimates and plans, is performed through a web-based contract management tool provided by the government (SPICE).

Question 72:

Question: Do you believe the WSTF solicitation will be impacted by the NASA agency-wide initiative to consolidate Emergency and Security Services?

Answer 72:

At this point in time, the Government is not able to provide any insight into why/if/how the NASA agency-wide initiative to consolidate Emergency and Security Services may impact the TEST procurement.

Question 73:

Document Reference: B.7

Observation: The tables that define the contract value by year include columns for total price for fixed price and cost and fee for cost reimbursable. This contract is subject to New Mexico Gross Receipts tax (NMGRT).

Question/Comment: Where will the NMGRT value and funding be included? Will the government add an additional column for the tax?

Answer 73:

Please refer to the note below the tables in B.7, "The value of this contract is the total value of task/delivery orders issued/ amended. IDIQ costs will be periodically updated unilaterally as IDIQ task/delivery orders are issued/ amended. During the intervals between periodic updates of this clause, there may be some discrepancy with the total amount for the IDIQ task/delivery orders issued and those listed in clauses B.4, B.5 and B.8."

A column for tax is not necessary as the value and funding will be updated as a total based on the task/delivery orders issued.

Question 74:

Document Reference: SOW 2.2.2

Observation: The SOW area is part of a fixed price portion of the contract. The amount of effort required for purchasing is dependent upon the number and complexities of procurements. The government has provided workload metrics in Attachment L-2-3 however it is noted the metrics will not become part of the contract. The government has the option of issuing the fixed price task orders as proposed by the contractor.

Question/Comment: Will the Government maintain the workload metrics in the contract in order to quantify the amount of work to be performed within the fixed price task order? If not, how will the amount of work be quantified and limited under the fixed price TO?

Answer 74:

The Government does not intend to maintain the workload metrics. All offeror-provided information regarding the fixed price task order will be included in a task order plan as outlined in DRD-TEST-PM-03. Per the paragraph in L-2-3, the government expects the offeror to use the workload sizing as a basis for estimate in the response to the fixed price TO.

Question 75:

Document Reference: SOW 2.2.5

Observation: The second paragraph states that the services centers are allocated to cost reimbursable (CR) Task Orders. However the government has indicated its desire to convert CR task orders to fixed price

(FP).
Question/Comment: How will the allocation of service centers be handled as task orders are converted from CR to FP? Will the remaining CR task orders absorb the entire allocation of the service centers?
Answer 75:
Service Centers accrue reimbursement based on usage by the requesting activity. While the conversion of task orders from CR to FP is not currently planned a consideration for such conversion would be the usage by that activity of Service Centers. Service center allocations will come from CR task orders.

Question 76:
Document Reference: SOW 2.9
Observation: The first sentence of the third paragraph seems to be missing a word(s).
Question/Comment: Will the Government clarify the first sentence?
Answer 76:
Sentence should read: "Provide support as needed to WSC **for** the purposes of pressure system certification."

Question 77:
Document Reference: J-4.1
Observation: Pages 111 through 114 contain numerous Guns and Rifles. These items would be utilized by the security contractor.
Question/Comment: Why are the guns and rifles included on the accountable property list for this procurement? Are these items related to SOW Area 3.1.7
Answer 77:
All installation accountable property at WSTF is accountable to the TEST Contractor and shall be inventoried, managed and reconciled in accordance to the terms of the contract. Property accounts shall be created for the Test Contractor, NASA and other contractor organizations working under the confines of the White Sands Test Facility. Property accounts shall be indentified and assigned by each contractor organization including NASA held custodial accounts. The TEST contractor is responsible for performing annual inventories of all installation accountable property with the responsible contractor or NASA custodians and report results and losses to the Contracting Officer and the NASA Property Administrator. These items are not related to SOW Area 3.1.7.

Question 78:
Document Reference: SOW 3.2
Observation: The first paragraph makes reference to Figure 1 however there is no Figure 1 in Section C.
Question/Comment: Will the government please provide the referenced figure?
Answer 78:
Figure was moved to L-10 paragraph 3.1 Figure 1. Language in C.3.2 was clarified.

Question 79:
Document Reference: SOW 4.0
Observation: The RFP states “Specific requirements are located in the Emergency Services Fixed Price Task Order in Section L”. Section L will not be part of the final contract therefore no specific requirements will be outlined in the SOW.
Question/Comment: Will the government update the RFP to include the specific requirements in the SOW?
Answer 79:
Refer to page L-22 section L.19.3 Volume I – Mission Suitability, Part 4 paragraph 4. "The Government reserves the right and intends to award the IDIQ Fixed Price Task Orders (Attachment L-2) as proposed.”

Question 80:
Document Reference: SOW 5.8; SOW 2.9
Observation: These seem to be the same work.

Question/Comment: Will the government consolidate/combine these two SOW areas?

Answer 80:

The government does not intend to consolidate these two SOW areas. While SOW 2.9 utilizes the enabling expertise described in SOW 5.8 it also includes the management and maintenance of the pressure vessel activity.

Question 81:

Document Reference: SOW 5.10.3

Observation: The SOW requires the contractor to implement processes for receipt and accounting of the stock supplies into IEM SAP.

Question/Comment: Will the government provide any additional information regarding the required system interfaces to enable the offeror to determine the appropriate approach to the interface?

Answer 81:

Answer Pending

Question 82:

Document Reference: SOW 5.11.3

Observation: The SOW requires the contractor to provide all supplies and services necessary unless specifically provided by the government. The next sentence states materials provided by the contractor includes trashcan liners and restroom supplies.

Question/Comment: Will the janitorial supplies be provided to the contractor as part of store stock or will the contractor be required to provide these supplies?

Answer 82:

The contractor will be required to provide these supplies and may elect to warehouse the supplies as store stock.

Question 83:

Document Reference: SOW 6.2.7

Observation: The SOW does not include a requirement to track and report the usage of the vehicle fuel, propellants and pressurants. With the increase in external customers utilizing the facility it would seem tracking of the commodities to the end user would be a significant activity required by NASA.

Question/Comment: Will NASA have a requirement to track and report usage of the commodities by customer? If so, will the government add the reporting requirements to the RFP to provide the contractor and understanding of the requirement?

Answer 83:

All fuels used to support GSA and Government owned vehicles shall be tracked by the Test Contractor transportation operations in accordance with the SOW. This includes the tracking and consumption of unleaded fuel, E-85, and Diesel. Propellant and pressurant usage and ordering is tracked by the NASA Property Administrator. The L-2 fixed price task order "1TCTRNS" was updated to state that the GSA vehicle data will include tracking of unleaded, E-85, and diesel fuels (see item 12 in task order). There is currently not a requirement to provide commodity tracking to the customer-level.

Question 84:

Document Reference: SOW 9.0

Observation: The performance standard is schedule, coordinate and report on all service(s) outages with all WSTF users and WSTF customers. The acceptable quality level is no negative impacts to any WSTF user or customer. Unforeseen service outages not within the control of the contractor could potentially have a negative impact on the WSTF user or customer.

Question/Comment: Will the government reword the standard to cover only planned outages?

Answer 84:

Performance standard updated to indicate that this performance standard applies to "requested" outages.

Question 85:
Document Reference: SOW 9.0
Observation: Performance standards have been defined for some but not all SOW areas.
Question/Comment: Are there common performance standards defined for WBS 7.0 and 8.0 or will all Performance Standards be defined in the respective task orders?
Answer 85:
The government intends to provide performance standards within task orders that are performed under WBS 7.0 and 8.0. Examples of performance standards may be found in the CR IDIQ Sample Task Orders in L-3.

Question 86:
Document Reference: SOW 9.0
Observation: The acceptable quality level is to respond to work requests in a timely manner such that test schedules are not adversely impacted. This measurement is a subjective rather than objective measurement.
Question/Comment: Will the government revise the acceptable quality level to be an objectively measurable metric?
Answer 86:
The Acceptable quality level will not be changed. The performance standard is intended to ensure that the TEST contractor understands that the ordered services provided within these sections are often on the critical path of test projects and a standardized acceptable quality level is not appropriate for this type of service.

Question 87:
Document Reference: G.7
Observation: An Item (4) supply from stores stock is not checked.
Question/Comment: Is it the government's intention to require the contractor to provide all supplies, including PPE, required to complete the statement of work, even if they are available within NASA's store stock?
Answer 87:
The contractor is responsible for managing a supply system of items that have a recurring demand for and for program stock (system spares) that are required to support WSTF system or project requirements. PPE that has a recurring demand (such as safety glasses, gloves and other items that are currently held in stock) will continue to be maintained and supported by the contractor. Any items that are held in the WSTF Stores Stock system shall be issued from stock and should not be purchased separately by the contractor. Contractor Logistics is responsible for reviewing all contractor purchases to verify if items that are being purchased are not held in stock.

Question 88:
Document Reference: H.3
Observation: The task/delivery order procedure requires a proposal response from the contractor within 5 business days unless negotiated with the Contracting Office and another time frame is explicitly and expressly states in the task order.
Question/Comment: Does the government mean task order or should it be task request?
Answer 88:
The government is referring to the response time required for task orders.

Question 89:
Document Reference: H.15
Observation: ODIN is not list as a contractor for IT support services at WSTF.
Question/Comment: Will desktop support services be provided by a separate contractor or will the offeror

be responsible for the support under this contract?

Answer 89:
The TEST contract is not responsible for desktop support under this contract.

Question 90:
Document Reference: H.23
Observation: The contractor is required to notify the Contracting Office of "payroll issues". This term is vague. A payroll issue could be as small as the wrong deduction amount withheld or it could be as substantial as an error with a direct deposit file causing payroll deposits to be late.
Question/Comment: Will the government clarify its requirement as it relates to payroll issues? Does the government intend to be notified if a large scale payroll issue occurs or for every individual payroll issue that might arise?
Answer 90:
The following language has been added to make the intent of this clause clearer, "… (which may affect employee morale and/or impact performance on the TEST Contract)…"

Question 91:
Document Reference: H.27
Observation: The government is citing FAR Part 31 as justification for indirect costs on procurements to be considered unallowed costs under the TEST contract. In accordance with Part 31, contractors are required to treat like expenses in like circumstances in the same manner. If a contractor treats procurement activities as a direct expense and includes all the supplies and materials in their G&A base (or Material Handling base), the government is requesting that the contractor violate the FAR to comply with this contract clause.
Question/Comment: Would the government revise clause H.27 to disallow fee on the procured supplies and services but allow the appropriate indirect costs as per the contractor's disclosure statement?
Answer 91:
The cost of the procurement system is covered under the cost of the Fixed Price task order. When entering into this advance agreement the Offeror shall take the appropriate steps to ensure their disclosure statement complies with the terms of the contract.

Question 92:
Document Reference: H.27
Observation: The government is utilizing FAR 52.215-23- Limitations on Pass-Through Charges to require an advanced agreement with the contractor to agree that indirect rates are unallowable charges to this contract for material, service and all other procurement mechanisms. FAR 52-215-23 allows a Contracting Officer to determine that procurement is provided by the Contractor with no value added. During the Cost Break-out Session of the Pre-Proposal Conference, the government stated that all support related to procurement was charged direct to the contract. The government has required that the Contractor provided the procurement system. By providing the procurement system, the Contractor is adding value to the procurement. In addition, the placement of purchase orders and the receipt of items, which are included in the SOW, are not only activities required to procure supplies and materials. The supplier invoices must be processed and paid; these functions are not included as a portion of the statement of work and therefore are also value added activities provided by the contractor.
Question/Comment: Will the government remove clause H.27 as it is not applicable in this situation?
Answer 92:
The costs associated with any and all procurement functions (this includes pre-initiation of a procurement, initiation, post award and administration activities, and closeout) shall be included in pricing the Business Processes fixed priced task order 1TABPRO. The reference to 52.215-23 has been removed from this clause to avoid any confusion between the two clauses.

Question 93:
Document Reference: J-3
Observation: The expiration dates of the CBA may not be accurate.
Question/Comment: Will government ensure the expirations dates are accurate and the most recent CBAs are posted in the technical library?
Answer 93:
The current CBA has been posted to the TRL.

Question 94:
Document Reference: J-2, DRD-TEST-CM-05
Observation: Table 1 outlining the Cost Savings to WSTF contains TBD rather than firm dollar amounts.
Question/Comment: Will the government be providing targeted cost savings or should the DRD be modified from TBD to OFI?
Answer 94:
All instances of TBD in the DRD were replaced with OFI

Question 95:
Document Reference: J-2, DRD-TEST-CM-08
Observation: In paragraph C.4 there seems to be some missing text. The RFP contains "what co-pays are required and the offeror's, the effective date of coverage …"
Question/Comment: Will the government clarify the requested information in paragraph C.4?
Answer 95:
Typo in C.4 of DRD-TEST-CM-08 was corrected.

Question 96:
Document Reference: J-2, DRD-TEST-BP-04
Observation: The DRD contains a requirement for a baseline 533 utilizing the NF533Q format. The report is due 30-days after authorization to proceed has been granted. The contract is an IDIQ type of contract therefore the baseline of the contract report only the task orders that have been authorization at the due date and would not have relevance as the contract period of performance proceeded. Theoretically the contract value is modified each time a task order is issued and therefore the baseline should be revised each time the contract value changes.
Question/Comment: Will the government reconsider the requirement for the baseline and determine the appropriate reporting requirement?
Answer 96:
Answer Pending

Question 97:
Document Reference: J-2, DRD-TEST-PM-02
Observation: There seems to be a discrepancy within the DRD. Paragraph C.a requires the actual costs to be provided weekly. Paragraph F.iv. states the frequency is at least monthly.
Question/Comment: Will the government require a frequency of the DRD such that all TOs actual costs will be reported weekly?
Answer 97:
It is the government's intent to require actual costs on a weekly basis. Performance assessment reports will be provided on a monthly basis. DRD-TEST-PM-02 updated to clarify this frequency in (f).

Question 98:
Document Reference: J-2, DRD-TEST-EN-02
Observation: Paragraph F states the submission date is 2014.
Question/Comment: Will the government provide a more specific submission requirement for the DRD?

Answer 98:
The exact due date to EPA is not known, but will most likely occur at the end of Q2 CY14 based on previous submissions. DRD-TEST-EN-02 updated.

Question 99:
Document Reference: J-2, DRD-TEST-LS-01
Observation: Paragraph C states the following three reports will be required on a quarterly basis however only two reports are listed; Shelf Life Inventory Report and Contractor-Acquired Material Report.
Question/Comment: Will the government please clarify the requirement as the two reports listed or identify the additional required report?
Answer 99:
DRD-TEST-LS-01 was updated to remove the word "three" from the report description above c.3 and c.4.

Question 100:
Document Reference: J-2, DRD-TEST-LS-04
Observation: The line above paragraph C.2 states the reports are due on a bi-annual basis however the report description and due dates indicate reports are semi-annual in frequency.
Question/Comment: Will the government clarify the frequency of the report?
Answer 100:
DRD-TEST-LS-04 was updated to replace "bi-annual" with "semi-annual".

Question 101:
Document Reference: J-2, DRD-TEST-MO-02
Observation: Paragraphs C.2.1.4, C.2.1.7 and C.2.2.4 require reporting of number planned and number actual.
Question/Comment: Will the government clarify the number to be reported? Is it number of work tickets? Pieces of equipment?
Answer 101:
Report to the number of work tickets. Note that Work tickets are linked to pieces of equipment and systems.

Question 102:
Document Reference: J-2
Observation: There are significant requirements for reporting of activities in the Logistics and M&O areas however there are no deliverable requirements for the laboratories and propulsion areas. In order to develop a comprehensive management approach the reporting requirements of all SOWs must be understood.
Question/Comment: Will the government provide reporting requirements for all areas of the statement of work?
Answer 102:
Programmatic reporting for maintenance hardware in Labs and Propulsion is identified within the series of DRDs titled DRD-TEST-MO-01 through 08. Additional reporting activities will be identified in individual cost reimbursable task orders.

Question 103:
Document Reference: J-2
Observation: The current NTEC and FOSC contracts have reporting requirements that are not included in the TEST DRD list. Specifically the current DRD titled TO/DO Award Fee Summary Sheet. The SOW area supporting these types of reports are fixed price and the requirements need to be clearly defined in order to determine the required resources.
Question/Comment: Will the government ensure that all DRDs required under the TEST contract are properly defined within Attachment J-2?

Answer 103:
DRD-TEST-BP-06, "Task Order Award Fee Summary Sheet" has been added to the TEST RFP and is included in fixed price task order 1TABPRO.

Question 104:
Document Reference: J-2, DRD-TEST-BP-04
Observation: The embedded spreadsheet does not include an area to report fixed price on the summary sheet. The supplemental sheets are requiring detailed cost information for fixed price WBS areas. In accordance with the instructions, fixed price should be reported as 1/12 of the fixed price.
Question/Comment: Will the government modify the example 533 to clarify the reporting requirements for the fixed price TOs?
Answer 104:
Supplemental formats were modified in DRD-TEST-BP-04.

Question 105:
Document Reference: L.16
Observation: The proposal acceptance period is 350 days. 350 days is an unusually time period, the typical acceptance period is 180.
Question/Comment: Does the government anticipate a potential delay in award of the contract due to continuing resolution or other funding factors? Would the government consider modifying the acceptance period to 180 days?
Answer 105:
The government does not anticipate changing this period. Due to the uncertainty within the Space community, the Government has determined that 350 days for proposal acceptance is necessary. In accordance with L.19.7 a i. "... in accordance with paragraph (d) of FAR provision 52.215-1, “Instructions to Offerors--Competitive Acquisitions,” a different validity period may be proposed by the Offeror."

Question 106:
Document Reference: L.19.2
Observation: The footnote states “Proposal Volume IV, Past Performance, and the Cognizant Audit Office Template (CAOT) are requested early, but not officially due until TBD.”
Question/Comment: Does the government mean Volume III, Past Performance or does the government mean Volume IV, Cost and Volume III, Past Performance?
Answer 106:
The footnote was changed to read "Proposal Volume III, Past Performance…"

Question 107:
Document Reference: I.1
Observation: 52.229-3 Federal, State, And Local Taxes are incorporated by reference. This contract is subject to New Mexico Gross Receipts Tax (NMGRT). The NMGRT rate has increased significantly during the past few years. The referenced FAR clause does not allow for equitable adjustment for changes in the state tax rate.
Question/Comment: Does the government intend for the Offeror to make a provision for escalation in the NMGRT rate during the term of the contract? Or would the government considered replacing the FAR clause with 52.229-4 Federal, State, and Local Taxes (State and Local Adjustments) to allow for equitable adjustment of the tax rate as it occurs?
Answer 107:
52.229-4 does not apply to this contract, 52.229-3 is the appropriate clause for TEST. It is up to the offeror to determine how they plan to approach the potential escalation of NMGRT.

Question 108:
Document Reference: L-4

Observation: The description of many of the positions states “typically a bachelor’s degree”.
Question/Comment: Will the government evaluate experience in lieu of a bachelor’s degree?

Answer 108:

The Government has provided guidelines for each Standard Labor Category in Attachment L-4. It is the offerors responsibility to acquire an understanding of the complexities of the work and to decide what qualifications the offeror deems necessary to successfully meet the requirements of the contract using the Standard Labor Categories as a guide.

Question 109:

Document Reference: L.19.5

Observation: OSHA Forms 300 and 300A’s are not referenced as attachments for the Past Performance Volume.

Question/Comment: Please verify whether or not these are considered attachments to Volume III. Since the format of the OSHA 300 and 300A forms are dictated by OSHA and OMB they cannot be reformatted to reduce page count. If OSHA logs are considered Volume III attachments, we suggest that they be removed from page count.

Answer 109:

Changed L 19.2 Table L-1, Volume III Past Performance to read "Past Performance Attachments Note: OSHA Forms 300 and 300A are not subject to page limitations"

Question 110:

Document Reference: L-19

Observation: A limit of 85 pages is placed on the Past Performance Volume, including all associated attachments.

Separate from the General Past Performance narrative contained in Volume III, the Offeror shall provide references from organizations and companies for whom work has been performed.

The Past Performance Questionnaire is 14 pages per copy.

Question/Comment: Are the Past Performance Questionnaires for each company’s contracts considered an official Volume III attachment, therefore considered part of the total allotted 85 page count? Or, since they are a standalone delivery, are they not part of the page count? If considered part of the allotted 85 pages, we would ask that they be removed from page count.

Answer 110:

The Past Performance Questionnaire is not part of Volume III past performance since that is provided directly to the Government as a standalone delivery from the Offerors reference.

Question 111:

Document Reference: J-4

Observation: Exhibit J-4.1, Installation Accountable Property List includes numerous computers and other IT equipment.

Question/Comment:

1. Does the list include all ADP/IT equipment at WSTF?
2. Is there a list with more detail? Make/model/age/etc.
3. Will ODIN/ACES supply users’ IT/ADP?
4. Is any IT/ADP supplied by the incumbent? Is there a list with values?

Answer 111:

1. No, only IT equipment that is identified on the Installation Accountable Property List. Computers that are supported by ODIN are excluded from the IAP listing
2. An updated list has been added to J-4, Exhibit 4.1 and has been posted to the TRL.
3. Only for ODIN supported seats.
4. No, unless the Contracting Officer deems it necessary for the contractor to supply IT/ADP equipment that is not supported by the ODIN Contract.

Question 112:
Document Reference: SOW 5.14.1
Observation: Procure, install, secure, administer, maintain and upgrade all approved IT hardware and software that is not provided by the NASA IT contractor. Maintain and update inventory and obsolescence schedules.
Question/Comment:
1. Please provide a list of the “approved IT hardware and software” that is not provided by the NASA IT contractor.
2. Shall the “approved IT hardware and software that is not provided by the NASA IT contractor” be procured by the contractor as GFE or Contractor-Furnished Equipment?
3. Are all of the listed IT applications considered “Specialized” and excluded from NASA IT managed services? Please provide the databases and software that are supporting each of the applications? Will those licenses transfer to the new contract?
Answer 112:
1. IT hardware and software that is not provided by the NASA IT contractor is included in the "WSTF IT Systems" document that has been added to the TRL.
2. IT Hardware and software that is procured by the TEST contractor is considered Installation Accountable Property.
3. All databases and applications listed within section 6.2.8.2 contain data and requirements that the TEST contractor is responsible for. The software that supports the databases includes Access/SQL and Oracle. Section 6.2.8.2 has been updated to clarify which databases and applications are developed by the NASA IT contractor.

Question 113:
Document Reference: SOW 6.2.8.2
Observation: SOW Area 6.2.8.2 provides a list of “IT systems and applications”
Question/Comment: Are all existing IT resources covered by current system security plans that are certified and accredited in accordance with NPR 2810.1, Security of Information Technology?
Answer 113:
All IT resources listed in 6.2.8.2 are covered by current security plans.

Question 114:
Document Reference: SOW 6.2.8.2
Observation: Operate and Maintain the IT systems and applications that are not maintained by the NASA IT Contractors…
Question/Comment: What type of applications and are their WLI for lines of code and change traffic for the applications, either application by application or for the entire package? In type of applications, we need to understand the language and/or platform for the apps (Oracle, PeopleSoft, Cold Fusion, SAP, etc.)
Answer 114:
The database applications that require development include Access/SQL and Oracle. COTS applications that are used, would require data content management, not database development

Question 115:
Document Reference: SOW 5.14
Observation: Regarding Section C, 5.14
Question/Comment:
1. What is the scope of the effort in terms of personnel supported? Where are they located geographically with regard to on site and off site?
2. What legacy systems, primarily those residing on old Operating Systems that need to be supported?

Can/will any be rehosted as part of this effort?
3. Is there a current content collaboration/management system [Sharepoint?] and existing content?

Answer 115:

1. Personnel who require the IT services listed in 5.14 are TEST contractors, conducting work as described in the SOW.
2. Legacy systems that require support are listed in the "WSTF IT Systems" in the TRL. Rehosting is not part of the contract transition effort.
3. Existing content is being transitioned to SharePoint on a gradual basis and will continue into the TEST contract.

Question 116:

Document Reference: SOW 5.14.7

Observation: SOW Area 5.14.7 states to “Complete IT service request forms”.

Question/Comment: Is there a system already in place to manage these requests, and will it transition to this contract? Also, will the desktop support contractors be certified technicians to perform any repair work?

Answer 116:

IT Service Request system is managed by the NASA IT Contractor and will be available for TEST Contractor use. The NASA IT Contractor that supports desktops will be certified to perform repair work. SOW 5.14.7 was updated to clarify TEST contractor's role in completion of IT service request forms.

Question 117:

Document Reference: E.

Observation: Section E-3 states that "The Contractor shall comply with the higher-level quality standards selected below"; the standards that follow are ISO 9001, ISO 14001, and AS9100. SOW Area 9.0, 2nd Section 2.3 reference in the table notes the Acceptable Quality Level for one of the Performance Standard as "Successful 3rd party ISO certification".

Question/Comment: Is the contractor expected to be certified to ISO 9001, ISO 14001 and AS9100 standards or merely be able to comply with these standards to support WSTF's certification?

Answer 117:

WSTF is registered as compliant with all three standards as a joint NASA/Contractor entity. By operating per the WSTF MSM, the new contractor will become part of the WSTF registration.

Question 118:

Document Reference: E.4

Observation: Reference the 2nd sentence at the top of the page on E-3 that states: "At NASA/WSTF S&MA discretion, functions may be delegated to S&MA Contractor representatives."

Question/Comment: What are the expectations about how proposals are to assess this possibility and cost this in the proposal? There is a lot of work content in these government functions that, if delegated, would need to plan for in advance to ensure successful completion of these tasks. Is this work to be performed as IDIQ tasks?

Answer 118:

The items listed in table E-4 are typically executed by "S&MA contractor representatives" with NASA oversight as required.

Question 119:

Document Reference: H.15; J-24

Observation: The list of contracts requiring ACAs are different between Section H, Paragraph H.15 pages H-16 through H-17 versus Attachment J-24, Section 1.1 pages J-24-2 through J-24-6.

Question/Comment: Should they be different, or are these sections both just examples/notional?

Answer 119:

The requirement is in H.15 and the fixed price task order 1 TAMGMT. Per the solicitation, paragraph H.15

specifies, “The success of the TEST Contract is dependent on the efforts of multiple Contractors, for a full list of other contractors operating at WSTF reference attachment L-10, WSTF Operations Information. " Additionally, per H.15"In accordance with paragraph (e) of task order 1TAMGMT, Contract Management, the Contractor shall develop ACAs with the following interfaces…"
The paragraph further goes on to state, "The Contractor shall, at a minimum develop ACAs with the interfaces listed above. The Contractor shall develop, maintain and adhere to the ACA’s with any other interfaces the Contractor deems necessary to avoid negatively impacting the WSTF Mission."

Question 120:
Document Reference: J-2, DRD-TEST-SQ-01; L.9
Observation: Section L.9 and DRD-TEST-SQ-01: Section L.9 references NPR 8715.3 but the corresponding DRD-TEST-SQ-01 does not list NPR 8715.3 among the references for the DRD.
Question/Comment: Should the DRD also reference the noted NPR?
Answer 120:
DRD-TEST-SQ-01 has been updated to include the reference.

Question 121:
Document Reference: SOW 5.14.1
Observation: Page C-39, last sentence, states “Develop, update and implement an IT Management Plan in accordance with DRD-TEST-IT-01 “IT Security Management Plan”.
Question/Comment: IT Security Management Plan is a component of the DRD Titled IT Management Plan and Reports (J-2) for clarity should the DRD IT Security title referenced be changed on Page C-39?
Answer 121:
Second paragraph under 5.14.1 was updated to reference the IT Management Plan.

Question 122:
Document Reference: J-2, DRD-TEST-IT-01
Observation: Page J-2-57, b) Data Type: Plan - 2, Reports - 1 (CPIC and IT Security Plans)
Question/Comment: Based on the listing provided on pages J-2-56 and J-2-57, the content of the DRD appears to contain Data Type: Plan – 4, Reports 1 (IT Management Plan, IT Security Planning, CPIC Planning, General Planning and Annual Training Program Report). Please clarify whether it is 2/1 or 4/1 data types?
Answer 122:
DRD-TEST-IT-01 has been updated to indicate that Plans and Reports are all type 2.

Question 123:
Document Reference: SOW 8.1 & 8.2
Observation: Inconsistency in stated timeframes for SSP T&R and end of Depot operations.
From Section 8.1.2 (SSP transition – facilities)
• … (transition) work also includes the disassembly and excess of flight hardware and flight-like test articles.
From Section 8.2 (SSP continued operations)
• SSP retirement will eliminate the requirement for WSSH and the Shuttle and ISS Hardware Depot in late FY11.
Question/Comment: Assuming the last SSP flight is in mid FY11 (as currently planned), what is the timeframe (and scope) of follow-on decon/disassembly/
disposition of remaining flight assets? Based on the large quantity of OMS/RCS hardware needing this processing, this would likely require sustaining depot facility
Answer 123:
In paragraph 8.2, the following sentence was added: "In the event that Shuttle transition and retirement is delayed, IDIQ task orders will be issued defining continued operations and support." The requirements for specific hardware, such as OMS/RCS would be detailed in those IDIQ task orders once the requirements

are received from the customer.

Question 124:
Document Reference: J-2, DRD-TEST-BP-04
Observation: Regarding DRD-TEST-BP-04, titled "NF533 Cost and Data Reporting"
Question/Comment: The 533M requirements reference NFS 1852.242-74, however the clause is not listed in Section G or H. Is Earned Value required for this contract, and if so, request NASA supply the EV DRD requirements?
Answer 124:
Earned Value is not a contract requirement for the 533. DRD-TEST-BP-04 has been updated to remove reference to NFS 1852.242-74. Offerors are to propose methods for performance measurement in DRD-TEST-PM-01.

Question 125:
Document Reference: SOW 2.12
Observation: Maintain secret security status for emergency services personnel, engineers, quality assurance personnel, and technicians to support Emergency Response requirements at WSC and ADF-SW, facility maintenance and repair at WSC, and possible classified testing and evaluation projects at WSTF.
Question/Comment: What is the estimated percentage of the workforce requiring a secret clearance?
Answer 125:
There is no prescribed percentage of the workforce. The requirement is to maintain the clearances of personnel in positions that require clearances.

Question 126:
Document Reference: M.5
Observation: Confidence levels are in part structured around "very minor"/"minor"/"reportable"/multiple "reportable." Size or quantity of problems encountered does not seem a relevant forecast of future performance; rather how they were managed by the contractor resulting in overall satisfactory/unsatisfactory performance is the key.
Question/Comment: Suggest these criteria be restated removing problem size/quantity and emphasizing how the Contractors actions in resolving such problems impacted contract performance. Specifically, handling large (or small) problems (regardless of number of problems) successfully without impacting contract performance seems a far better reflection of past performance to future performance than the size of the issue – and furthermore supports added confidence in doing so in the future.
Answer 126:
The Government has determined that the use of the confidence levels as stated provide a consistent set of evaluation criteria that balances both the causes of successful or unsuccessful past performance and the effect that the past performance had on the overall contract performance. Per Section L.19.5 - It is the offerors responsibility to in accordance with FAR 15.305(a)(2)(ii) provide information on problems encountered on the identified contracts and the Offeror's corrective actions.

Question 127:
Document Reference: L.19.2
Observation: "Pages shall be formatted in a standard page style, without the use of columns."
Question/Comment: Suggest this format criteria be reconsidered. A two-column format would be more space efficient offering more flexibility in page layout and making reading easier.
Answer 127:
The Government has determined that the use of a standard page style without the use of columns is the format that shall be used.

Question 128:

Document Reference: L-2 TO # 1TCEQUP
Observation: The task order and workload sizing data references the NASA Equipment Management System (NEMS).
Question/Comment: Should the reference be to the NASA Integrated Asset Management (IAM) System?
Answer 128:
The reference has been changed to state the NASA Integrated Asset Management IAM System (SAP) and the NASA Property System (Nprop).

Question 129:
Document Reference: J-4
Observation: Only a NASA Tag No., brief description, and value are listed.
Question/Comment: What is the age and current condition of the equipment? Is the value – book value or replacement value?
Answer 129:
All equipment that is currently in use and assigned to contractor custodians are in satisfactory condition. Equipment that is not working properly or in a non-working state shall be reported by the assigned custodian and either repaired, replaced, or excessed. The current values that are held in the property system are book values.

Question 130:
Document Reference: L-2 TO # 1TAMGMT
Observation: Fixed Price IDIQ Task Order 1TAMGMT, Description of Work, paragraph b. addresses “work authorization”.
Question/Comment: Will the Government please clarify Figure 3 Government provided Work Breakdown Structure that describes 2.4 Work Authorization as Cost Reimbursable IDIQ?
Answer 130:
The text related to "work authorization" was removed from 1TAMGMT to avoid confusion. Section 2.4, "Work Authorization" is intended to be Cost Reimbursable IDIQ.

Question 131:
Document Reference: Section J
Observation: There is no explicit export compliance plan requirement; e.g., a DRD for an Export Compliance or Information Protection Management Plan.
Question/Comment: An Export Compliance Plan would be a good thing to have.
Answer 131:
H.40 has been added to the RFP to address Export control requirements.

Question 132:
Document Reference: H.1; H.13
Observation: These are the only requirements that tie NASA export compliance requirements to TEST.
Question/Comment: Could H-13 (or a new Section) be used to specifically reference NPR PR 2190.1, Export Control Program? What about local directives?
Answer 132:
Clause H.40 – Additional Export Control Requirements has been added to the solicitation to cover export compliance requirements including NPR 2190.1 requirements.

Question 133:
Document Reference: L-13; L-2-12
Observation: Provides no requirement or guidance on assignment of Demilitarization (DEMIL) Codes, which are now demanded by GSA for personal property they accept for disposal.
Question/Comment: Cite DOD 4160.21-M Defense Materiel Disposition Manual (AUG 1997) and DoD 4160.21-M-1 Defense Demilitarization Manual (OCT 1991); and provide suitable language to direct their

use.

Answer 133:

To reduce Government workload, expedite reporting, and obtain the maximum cost-effective visibility of NASA idle or excess property, the TEST contractor will transmit data on available NASA idle, excess, or exchange/sale personal property to GSA via the NASA Disposal System (DAPL system) and GSA electronic interface. This includes both reportable and non-reportable property that would require any Federal Agency or eligible donation screening and/or GSA sales action. The NASA DSPL system and GSA interface provides the NASA property data to the appropriated GSA regional office and fulfills the requirement to formally report reportable property to GSA and provide listing of non-reportable property to GSA area utilization officers for utilization and donation screening (reference Federal Property Management regulations 41 CFR 101-43.305(a) and (b). Additionally, the NASA DSPL and GSA interface transmits data information on NASA idle personal property to permit the internal NASA Agency wide screening via the GSA's Federal Excess Disposal System immediately after initial input of the NASA idle personal property data to the DSPL system.

Question 134:

Document Reference: L-2-14

Observation: Responsibility for categorization (ITAR vs. EAR), who will make the mandatory AES entry, what documents must be kept and for how long, are missing.

Question/Comment: Add a paragraph or two to "Description of Work." The language is in NPR 2190.1, Export Control Program.

Answer 134:

Answer Pending

Question 135:

Document Reference: L-2-14

Observation: Requirement to obtain and retain state titles for all vehicles assigned to the TEST contractor is missing: these will be wanted when the vehicles are sold.

Question/Comment: These are much less trouble to get when the vehicles are new. Add language that requires the contractor get and keep all titles.

Answer 135:

All titles for Contractor or NASA acquired vehicles are maintained by the NASA Property Administrator. Title transfers and required documentation will be provided to the TEST contractor by the NASA Property Administrator when required. Contractors purchasing vehicles under the contract shall forward the Title and reference documentation to the NASA Property Administrator upon receipt. Titles for Government Owned vehicles are held by the NASA Property Administrator. The title transfer requirements will be supported by the NASA Property Administrator and provide the Test Contractor Property Office upon sale or transfer.

Question 136:

Document Reference: L-2-16

Observation: For imported personal property, does not firmly identify NASA as the Importer of Record (IOR), nor say who shall make formal entry into the Customs Territory of the U.S. Such items are imported for NASA under a Duty Free Certificate and a unique Harmonized Tariff System ("HTS") code. Customs now demands the actual HTS code be provided as well. There is no language here to tell the contractor to do these things.

Question/Comment: See language in Question above for basic corrective text.

Answer 136:

For all imports to NASA WSTF or WSTF contractors, the requesting organization shall contact the NASA Transportation Officer for coordination of imports. The Transportation Officer will provide information to the

importer and the requestor of the import a unique Harmonized Tariff System Code and a statement that should be identified on the shipping documentation and on the shipment. The following is the statement that is required to be communicated to the importer and on the shipping document: Please clear under Harmonized Tariff HTS Chapter 98, Sub Chapter 8, US Note 1. 9808.00.8000. All imports to WSTF shall be coordinated through the NASA Transportation Officer.

Question 137:
Document Reference: J-2, DRD-TEST-CM-03; L.19.4
Observation: Section L, Pre-Proposal Conference, and Attachment J-2 reveals a conflict regarding the submittal of DRD-TEST-CM-03, Contract Risk Management Plan.
Question/Comment: Section L.19.4 and Pre-Proposal Conference charts 22 and 25 state that the Contract Risk Management Plan is due with proposal submission; however, DRD-TEST-CM-03 states that initial submission of the plan is "Contract start + 15 days". Please clarify.
Answer 137:
DRD-TEST-CM-03 has been updated to indicate that plan is due with the proposal.

Question 138:
The IDIQ cost reimbursable sample task order IGEs are rolled up. The technical resources template for these TOs provide for a column for the resources basis, the proposed FTEs and a column for difference between the two. Will NASA be providing a breakdown of the IGE into the SLCs?
Answer 138:
The IGE provided in Table 2 is provided at the level of detail deemed appropriate by the Government. It is not broken out as to standard labor category since that information is be proposed by the Offeror per the instructions in Section L.

Question 139:
L.13(c) requires the Offeror to identify any property it intends to use in performance of this contract from the provided list. As stated in L.13(b) this Govt. Furnished Equipment is "as is" how is a non incumbent going to be able to discern which pieces of equipment are functionally in use today?
Answer 139:
All Installation Accountable Property that is offered to the contractor is in functioning condition. Any property on the list that is not functional at the start of the contract shall be identified to the NASA Property Administrator and dispositioned for excess. As part of the phase-in plan, the TEST contractor is required to perform a joint inventory with the outgoing contractor to validate the inventories that will be assigned to the TEST contractor. At that time, assets should be assessed to determine its condition and acceptance for contract support. A total reconciliation of property shall be performed at this time to ensure that the property that the TEST contractor is accepting is accountable and in working condition.

Question 140:
Also as a non incumbent on an ID/IQ type contract we may not be able to identify all potentially necessary pieces of equipment other than to fulfill the fixed price and sample Tasks. Will the Government be providing any historical guidance? Also is there a list that identifies when each piece of equipment was last utilized and/or services?
Answer 140:
No further information will be provided on equipment utilization. Fixed price task orders and equipment lists contain requirements for equipment. For the sample task orders, it is incumbent upon the offerors to understand the complexity of the work, and determine what equipment will be needed.

Question 141:
L.13(e) can you elaborate on what you are asking for here? Are you asking if the offeror purchases a piece of equipment for this effort and does not want to charge it directly to the contract how it will handle such

charges?

Answer 141:
The government is asking for insight into how commercially available equipment is charged within your company's accounting system.

Question 142:
L.13(h) please explain why the equitable adjustment provision in FAR 52.245-1 Govt. Property not applicable to this property?
Answer 142:
This has been added to Section I.1

Question 143:
L.8 (b) regarding 10pt and 12 pt font requirement; does it also apply to the spreadsheets in the cost volume?
Answer 143:
Yes, the 10 pt and 12 pt font requirements apply to the spreadsheets in the cost volume.

Question 144:
L.11(a) The Total Compensation Plan (TCP) requires that direct labor/salary information be provided. It is uncommon to provide such information in any volume other than the cost/price volume. Does the Government want Offerors to include direct labor information in the cost/price volume instead of the TCP?
Answer 144:
Refer to L.19.3 Volume I -Mission Suitability, Section MA4. Staffing Approach. A TCP is required in DRD-TEST-CM-08 along with TC Templates a-e.

Question 145:
L.11(d) What is the Governments interpretation of this section, "(d) The Offeror shall require all service subcontractors (1) with proposed cost reimbursement or non-competitive fixed-price type subcontracts having a total potential value in excess of $500,000 and (2) the cumulative value of all their service subcontracts under the proposed prime contract in excess of 10 percent of the prime contract's total potential value, provide as part of their proposals the information identified in (a) through (c) of this provision."
Answer 145:
The interpretation is for the offeror to require all service subcontractors with cost reimbursement or non-competitive fixed price type subcontracts having a total potential value in excess of $500,000 and the cumulative value of all their service subcontracts under the proposed prime contract which exceed 10% of the prime contract's total potential value to provide as part of the offerors proposal the information identified in (a) through (c) of NFS 1852.231-71.

Question 146:
Is the Government requiring that all proposed subcontractors provide a TPC if they are over 500k and it the Primes total proposed subcontract are more than 10% than a TCP will be required from all (as long as each are over 500k; major (over $1m annually) and non-major subs (over $500 and under $1m)?
Answer 146:
Through NFS 1852.231-71 the Government is requiring a total compensation plan for all subcontracts meeting the requirements of paragraph (c) of this clause.

Question 147:
H.27 CONTRACTOR PURCHASING: Any material or service procurements conducted in performance of this contract (including task/delivery orders) are not subject to any burdened costs and/or indirect rate costs including but not limited to: ODCs, Fee, G&A, material handling fees, SREs, or any other rates, costs, fees, or a combination thereof associated with the performance, management and oversight of procurement

functions. New Mexico Gross Receipts Tax (NMGRT) may be added, when not exempt under New Mexico State Type 9 and/or 15 Nontaxable Transaction Certificate, or any other exemption.

Is the Government directing Offerors to bid something other than their standard accounting practices/disclosure statements?

Answer 147:

The Government is entering into an agreement with the contractor that loaded rates are not added to procurements when these loaded rates are already paid for through the scope of the business functions fixed price task order. The purpose of this clause is to enter into an advanced agreement with the contract pursuant to the authority given in FAR 31.

Question 148:

L.18 Accounting for Lease Costs, is work to be performed at the Govt. site or contractor site?

If all work is to be performed at the Government site and the Offeror has an office in NM is the Government requesting a lease analysis even if it is in the indirects?

Answer 148:

The work is to be performed shall be at the Government site. Lease costs considered in indirect costs shall not be subject to lease analysis.

Question 149:

L.19.6 Volume IV – Cost Proposal – "Note: Refer to FAR Clause 52.222-43, Fair Labor Standards & Service Contract Act – Price adjustment, with respect to escalation for non-exempt personnel. If you are not proposing escalation for your fixed priced direct labor rates, explain how you plan to retain those skills."

Answer 149:

It is the intent of the Government in this note to instruct the Offeror that if they are not proposing any escalation in rates then the Offeror must explain in their proposal how they are planning on retaining those skills.

Question 150:

At present, there are no specifics of NASA's OCI concerns concerning this contract other than the prime not pursuing other contracts should the prime have any products from this contract performance. Is this the final form of this requirement and that there would not be any OCI restrictions on subs, other than obviously not testing their own products?

Answer 150:

It is the Offeror's responsibility to acquire an understanding of the complexities of the work required and to understand any potential OCI that exists and to effectively mitigate that OCI per the Offeror provided OCI plan (DRD-TEST-BP-01).

Question 151:

If a potential contractor is already technical or engineering service contractors to a Center for development of a given system planned for testing under this contract will OCI prevent that contractor from being on the TEST contractor team?

Answer 151:

It is the Offeror's responsibility to acquire an understanding of the complexities of the work required and to understand any potential OCI that exists and to effectively mitigate that OCI per the Offeror provided OCI plan (DRD-TEST-BP-01).

Question 152:

Many other flight systems under consideration or use by commercial companies utilize foreign components, such as the Xenit motor. What procedures are in place (that we can have copies of) describing receipt, in

bond storage, isolation, rights in technical data protection, return, etc., that allow us to insure those companies data is not taken by the Government?

Answer 152:

It is the government's intent to follow the data rights clauses and provisions contained within the facility reimbursable agreements, once such an agreement is developed and approved per DRD-TEST-CM-05.

Question 153:

Is there an existing NASA guidance or directive that would bar foreign components from the facility (a reverse ITAR situation)? How can we know whether or not an bilateral treaty, or DoD order, for example, prevents receipt, testing or handling of foreign components – will NASA take responsibility to ensure clearance/permission for potential Work for Others, (WFO) items/systems from the federal government?

Answer 153:

It is the government's intent to follow the date rights clauses and provisions contained within the facility reimbursable agreements, once such an agreement is developed and approved per DRD-TEST-CM-05.

Question 154:

If foreign components are utilized, they may require different propellant compositions that could not have prior NASA safety and use guidelines. Will NASA allow the existing foreign procedures, guidelines, specifications to be used, either granting a waiver for their use or quick acceptance?

Answer 154:

WSTF has implemented customer procedures and other documentation after completing the WSTF safety and readiness review processes. Future situations would be no different.

Question 155:

Are in-bond secure storage facilities available for receipt and storage of foreign components brought to WSTF for testing under WFO?

Answer 155:

Refer to Section C-7.6 Flight and Special Test Equipment Development and Processing the last two paragraphs. Maintaining and operating such facilities are part of this RFP, and are available to all WSTF customers.

Question 156:

What restrictions exist concerning foreign personnel coming to WSTF to witness or participate in tests of their systems? How can such access issues be resolved on an on-going basis with NASA/WSTF in order to support WFO?

Answer 156:

There are no exceptions for foreign nationals accessing government facilities. Refer to RFP Section G.13.

Question 157:

Will NASA support in-bond, duty free entry and exit from the US for any foreign components brought to WSTF under WFO?

Answer 157:

For all imports to NASA WSTF or WSTF contractors, the requesting organization shall contact the NASA Transportation Officer for coordination of imports. The Transportation Officer will provide information to the importer and the requestor of the import a unique Harmonized Tariff System Code and a statement that should be identified on the shipping documentation and on the shipment. The following is the statement that is required to be communicated to the importer and on the shipping document: Please clear under Harmonized Tariff HTS Chapter 98, Sub Chapter 8, US Note 1. 9808.00.8000. All imports to WSTF shall be coordinated through the NASA Transportation Officer.

Question 158:

Should any of these restrictions prevent WFO; will WSTF agree to not count such occurrences against

contractor WFO goals during award fee evaluations?

Answer 158:
It is the government's intent to follow the provisions contained within the facility reimbursable agreements, once such an agreement is developed and approved per DRD-TEST-CM-05.

Question 159:
Will work from other federal agencies such as DOE, count in the WFO since it would probably be affected via an existing memo of understanding between the agencies for payments transfers?

Answer 159:
It is the offeror's responsibility to propose an external customer plan. It is the government's intent to follow the provisions contained within the facility reimbursable agreements, once such an agreement is developed and approved per DRD-TEST-CM-05.

Question 160:
Will WSTF allow the contractor to offer WFO services using WSTF facilities that is in competition with the capabilities of other NASA or federal government installations, or would we be restricted to only offering those tests and services currently performed at WSTF?

Answer 160:
It is the offeror's responsibility to propose an external customer plan. It is the government's intent to follow the provisions contained within the facility reimbursable agreements, once such an agreement is developed and approved per DRD-TEST-CM-05.

Question 161:
Will WSTF exempt all commercial data arising from WFO from the Rights in Technical Data clause in the proposed contract?

Answer 161:
It is the government's intent to follow the date rights clauses and provisions contained within the facility reimbursable agreements, once such an agreement is developed and approved per DRD-TEST-CM-05.

Question 162:
What procedures exist or would be allowed to obtain waivers from various procedures such as deconstruction of systems and components or NASA safety regulations in order to perform commercial WFO?

Answer 162:
Requirements for post-test deconstruction to a "stand neutral" condition are generally firm but may be negotiable depending on succeeding work, i.e. a different customer has a similar test and may take over the facility "as is". Safety requirements are firm and non-negotiable.

Question 163:
Many commercial entities have expressed reservation about using or entrusting their commercial components to NASA without prior FOIA exemptions so that their intellectual property rights are protected. Can WSTF provide such exemptions and if so what are the procedures?

Answer 163:
Exemption 4 of the FOIA protects "trade secrets and commercial or financial information obtained from a person [that is] privileged or confidential." NASA would handle a FOIA request for a Government record that includes a company's trade secret or commercial or financial information the same way NASA handles all FOIA requests, including obtaining input from the submitter of the information. NASA cannot provide a prior determination that any particular data submitted by a party will qualify as exempt from reach under FOIA. However, NASA can assure these companies that we will comply with the FOIA, and with the NASA FOIA Regulations (http://www.hq.nasa.gov/pao/FOIA/fedregix.html).

Question 164:
Are there any WSTF or NASA restrictions about sharing NASA guidelines, procedures, or lessons learned with commercial entities under WFO activities? If licensing is required please provide the procedures that would be followed.
Answer 164:
ITAR and other restrictions apply to some documents; however, no licensing is required.

Question 165:
Document Reference: J-3
Please provide the Collective Bargaining Agreement for local 392.
Answer 165:
The Collective Bargaining Agreement for local 392 has been added to the TRL

Question 166:
Document Reference:
Please provide a comprehensive list of all of the current Maintenance Databases being used on the TEC contract and their status, (renewal requirements, expiration dates, etc.)
Answer 166:
Answer Pending

Question 167:
Document Reference: RFP Section H10 and L19.3.4
Please resolve the difference between H.10 and L.19.3.4 regarding the percentage goals for the Service Disabled, Veteran-Owned Small Business Concern. H.3 references a requirement of 3.0 percent of total contract value and L.19.3.4 references a requirement of .3 percent
Answer 167:
The Small Business Goals listed in L.19.3.4 for SDVOSB were updated to 3.0% (on page L-32).

Question 168:
Document Reference: Section C.2.2
Please provide a baseline number of sample task orders for workload data for 2.2 – Business Process.
Answer 168:
Answer Pending

Question 169:
Document Reference:
Please provide the Chemistry Laboratory Revitalization drawing package and specifications identified in Task Order Number 1TCCHLB as noted in the TO Scope of Work and TO Description of Work on page L-3-18. The work described appears to be a second phase for construction at the Chem Lab, first phase being the design in FY2010. If this is correct, the drawings and specifications are required for an appropriate response.
Answer 169:
Answer Pending

Question 170:
Document Reference: Section H.3
Within H.3 TASK/DELIVERY ORDERING PROCEDURES (NFS 1852.216-80) (OCT 1996) on page H-3 Paragraph (b)(3)(i) and (3)(iv) appear to be in conflict. Can we assume Paragraph (3)(iv) governs?
Answer 170:
There was an error in H.3 Paragraph (b) (3) (i) and it has been corrected to read: "…this shall NOT merely restate Government's requirements…"

Question 171: ***Section H.3***

Document Reference:
Within H.3 TASK/DELIVERY ORDERING PROCEDURES (NFS 1852.216-80) (OCT 1996) on page H-3 Paragraph (i) refers to SOW Paragraph 2.7.3 on page C-11. Can we assume that the second paragraph under Section 2.7.2 is actually Section 2.7.3?

Answer 171:
H.3 updated to reflect latest SOW reference, which is now 2.7.2. There is no SOW section 2.7.3.

Question 172:
Document Reference:
SOW, 3.1.6 Industrial Hygiene - "Disposal activities are generally limited to smaller scale quantities of asbestos waste. Large scale asbestos activities are typically completed by trained, certified asbestos subcontractors."

Current New Mexico asbestos regulations (Title 20, Chapter 9, Part 8) do not differentiate between “large Scale” and “Small Scale” quantities. Can the offeror explain what size (cubic feet, cubic inches, etc.) or weight of waste is expected from a “small scale” disposal activity? Will the offeror expect the TEST contractor to maintain a staff certified to the National Emission Standard for Hazardous Air Pollutants (NESHAP) 40 CFR, 63, Subpart M training requirements (40 hours - supervisor and 8 hours - worker)?

Answer 172:
Answer Pending

Question 173:
Document Reference:
There appears to be a series of jobs missing after page J-3.3-2 pertaining to WD 78-1124, CBA with IAM&AW, Local 2515 (FOSC contract). Please provide the missing information pertaining to the 78-1124, CBA with IAM&AW, Local 2515.

Answer 173:
Answer Pending

Note: Questions with an answer pending are still being researched. IT is anticipated that answers to those questions will be posted within the next couple of weeks.