

Technical Services for Aerospace Systems Modeling and Simulation II (SimLabs II)

NNA10345000R

Questions and Answers - Set 2

September 16, 2011

Q.1. Will the government consider requiring each potential prime bidder to submit, in advance, its OCI strategy for review and discussion prior to release of the final RFP to ensure that each prime bidder's OCI strategy is consistent with Government's expectation. Further, given the SOW requirements include the identification and acquisition of simulator software and hardware; we recommend the Government also include a potential OCI area for simulator hardware and software manufacturers.

*A.1. In order to maintain the integrity of the procurement, the Government will neither require nor allow the advance submission of a "bidder's OCI strategy", because the Government cannot, and will not, pre-evaluate pre-proposal submissions for any Offeror.*

*If this question stems from a concern that Contractor personnel participating in the development of a hardware or software specification for the SimLabs will later submit a proposal for the same requirement, the restrictions prescribed at Section H.10. (c)(2)(ii) already address this concern.*

*If this question stems from a concern that the Contractor will direct purchases of hardware or software to a particular vendor with which it may have a conflict, the requirements of FAR 52.244-5, Competition in Subcontracting, adequately address this concern.*

*If this question stems from a desire to add the design, development, and production of simulator hardware and software to the three year restriction prescribed at Section H.10.(c)(2)(i) (regarding the design, development, and production of aerospace vehicles), the Government currently does not consider such additional restriction necessary, but may reconsider this conclusion as the Final RFP is developed.*

*If none of these concerns is the reason for the question, please restate the question with greater clarity and specificity so that the Government may provide an answer with greater focus.*

Q.2. Attachment J.1(b) 1 and Excel Templates Exhibit 6 and Exhibit 9 discrepancy:

- a. Attachment J.1(b)1, Core section and Excel template Exhibit 6 Core section are not consistent. Please clarify.
- b. Excel template Exhibit 6, IDIQ section, show 18 labor categories, with total of 44.5WYE, while Attachment J.1(b)1 and Exhibit 9 shows 19 labor categories, with total of 46 WYE. Please clarify.

*A.2. Attachment J.1(b)1 Exhibit 6 and Exhibit 9 will reflect 18 labor categories with a total of 46 WYE, see Final RFP.*

Q.3. Cost Proposal - given that the threshold for "major subcontractor" is only \$200K per year, many of the small business proposed would qualify as "major subcontractors". These businesses should not be held to the same standard as the prime offeror for submitting sealed packages to the Government. We suggest that the Government require only subcontractors receiving more than 25% of the annual revenue on the contract to submit a sealed cost package.

*A.3. The Government has considered the request and has decided to keep the requirements of the Draft RFP.*

Q.4. On page 98, Section M.3(c), A driving goal of this contract is Outreach, which falls under Management. This is inconsistent with the Mission Suitability subfactor assigned scoring. Management Approach should be at least as important as Technical Approach in order to give this key aspect sufficient weighting.

Would the Government consider adjusting the scoring allocation?

*A.4. The Government considers the Mission Suitability, Management Approach Subfactor, assigned weight is indicative of the relative importance of this evaluation area.*

Q.5. Since some Offerors may have more than three major subcontractors on their team: Please verify:

- (1) the maximum limit of four (4) relevant contracts for past performance applies to the total number of contracts submitted from both the Prime and all of the Prime's major subcontractors, combined
- (2) the Government is not seeking an additional four relevant contracts from each individual major subcontractor or an additional four contracts from all of the major subcontractors combined.

*A.5. See Response to Q.6.*

Q.6. On page 73 of the DRFP, Section L.9(b)(1), where the Government states "the Offeror's capabilities," does "the Offeror" refer to the Prime plus its major subcontractors, rather than just the Prime? Please clarify whether the Government is looking for not more than four (4) relevant contracts from the Prime only OR not more than four (4) relevant contracts from a combination of both Prime and major subcontractors.

*A.6. The Government is looking for not more than four(4) relevant contracts from the Prime and major subcontractor(s) each. The Final RFP will be revised to reflect this clarification.*

- Q.7. On Page 73 of the DRFP, Section L.9(b)(1) it states “A list of not more than four (4) relevant contracts (government and/or industry contracts), each in excess of \$10,000,000 total contract value, received in the past three (3) years, or currently on-going, involving types of related effort.”

Does the term “receive” mean “awarded”?

*A.7. Yes, the term “received” means awarded.*

- Q.8. On page 67, of the DRFP Section L.9(a)B.1, bullet 4 it states: “The Offeror shall describe in detail innovative outreach strategies and their approach in working with SimLabs Government management in implementing these strategies with regard to scheduling, budgeting, and handling of deliverables associated with the outreach effort.”

No deliverables relative to the Outreach effort are defined in the Draft RFP. Please describe the expected deliverables for the Outreach effort and whether they are associated with the day-to-day Core Function of Outreach or specific to Task Orders resulting from the successful Outreach activities.

*A.8. Section L.9(a)B.1, bullet 4 has been changed, “strategies with regard to scheduling, budgeting, and handling of deliverables associated with the outreach effort.” has been deleted.*

*A requirement for an Outreach Report (Item 30) has been added to Attachment J.1(a) 3, Contract Data Requirements List, see Final RFP.*

- Q.9. On Page 61 of the DRFP, Section L.6, it states: “Subfactor B Management Approach – Oral Elements is limited to 30 slides.”

Would the Government consider excluding a cover slide and an agenda slide from the 30-slide limit for the management orals?

*A.9. The Government has reviewed this request and has decided that 30 slides is sufficient to address the oral elements under the Management Approach, including a cover slide and an agenda slide.*

- Q.10. The evaluation criteria in Section M for the Sample Work Assignments are seeking a “final technical solution,” “schedules,” and “estimated costs” while the instructions in Section L only ask for “unique and critical aspects” and “risk areas” for “technical, safety, cost and schedule.”

Have either of the Sample Task Assignments been worked in the past resulting in final technical solutions, schedules, and estimated costs providing the Government with a comparative baseline for evaluation purposes?

*A.10. The Government will ensure Sample Task Assignments in the Final RFP have been created exclusively for this RFP. The Sample Task Assignments are representative of the kind of work required by the SimLabs.*

Q.11. Is information describing past successful teaming experiences in the referenced contracts and information from the same past corporate working relationships in the management section only required from the Prime contractor on this proposal.

*A.11. As stated in Section L.9.(b) Past Performane (Vol. II) A.3. Corporate Management Responsiveness of the DRFP, "For all Offerors that intend to team, the Offeror shall submit information describing past successful teaming experiences in the referenced contracts."*

Q.12. Page 76 of the DRFP states: " For all relevant contracts identified in (b)(1) above, and for all NASA contracts completed within the last three years or active for at least one year..."

- a) Do we need to provide this information for only relevant NASA contracts that fit these parameters?
- b) Does "active for at least one year" mean one year during the last three years? It is unclear what the timeframe is for this one year of active status.
- c) Does "active" mean "current"?
- d) Do we need to provide information for the referenced contracts PLUS all NASA contracts completed within the last 3 years or active for more than 1 year?
- e) If for more than just the four referenced contracts, where do we provide this information in the proposal?

*A.12. Section L.9.(b) Past Performance Proposal (Volume II), A.4. Other Information will be deleted from page 76, see final RFP.*

Q.13. Regarding the 10-day requirement, this provides little time for Offerors' Government customers to receive, respond to, and submit the questionnaires.

Regarding the 20-day requirement, this DRFP has a significant amount of cross-linkages between past performance, key personnel, and technical solutions. Submitting a list this early in the proposal process may hamper Offerors' ability to ensure we and our major subcontractors select the most relevant contracts that also provide the best cross-linkages.

Please consider changing the requirements, such as having questionnaires due at the time of proposal submission, and providing more time to submit the list.

*A.13. The Government has reviewed your request and has determined the required Submission times are reasonable.*

- Q.14. On page 68 of the DRFP, Section L.9(a)B.3 bullet 9, Are Offerors to provide summaries of experience related to the Offeror, the entire team, or the key personnel?

*A.14. The Government has deleted Bullet 9 and revised language in Bullet 8, see Final RFP.*

- Q.15. On Page 68 of the DRFP, Section L.9(a), B.4, bullet 6, it states” If the Offeror currently employs and/or plans to employ non-US citizens who will be on-site personnel, explain how the foreign national access requirements of NASA Ames Research Center will impact the Phase-In activities as badging may take up to 180 days for clearance. Also demonstrate an understanding of what non-citizens will be tasked to do and what restrictions will be faced.”

If the Offeror does not employ or plan to employ non-US citizens who will be on-site personnel, does the Offeror need to address this item in the proposal/Orals presentation?

Does this apply to only the Prime or does it apply to the entire team?

*A.15. L.9.(a)B.4. states “The Offeror shall describe its phase-in plan, including approach and rationale for the following.” If the Offeror does not employ or plan to employ non-US citizens who will be on-site personnel, the Offeror needs to address this item in the proposal/Oral presentation.*

*Section L.9(a), B.4, bullet 6 has been deleted from mission suitability, see Final RFP.*

- Q.16. On Page 60 of the DRFP, Section L.9(a), B.5 it states: “The Key Personnel written proposal shall include the following:

- Key personnel commitment letters with percentage committed, commitment letter from company that intends to move existing staff to key position, and position descriptions and resumes for key personnel (see L.6(a) for page limitations). This commitment letter shall include the salary to be accepted if the individual is employed under this contract.”

This requirement states that Offeror’s must provide a commitment letter from the company that intends to move existing staff to a key position. However, this company commitment letter is not included in the page counts for Key Personnel. Can the offerer submit this letter outside of the page count limitation? Where should we put this letter in the proposal?

*A.16. Commitment letters are required for all Key Personnel. The requirement for “commitment letter from company that intends to move existing staff to key position” has been deleted, see Final RFP.*

- Q.17. Attachment J.1(b)1, Notes (1) and (2) are not identified on the table, will the government furnish these to the bidders?

*A.17. Attachment J.1(b) 1 will be revised, see final RFP.*

- Q.18. On page 69 of the DRFP, Section L.9(a)B.6, it states: "...Note, 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 NFS provision 1852.231-71."

Please define "service subcontractors" and "service subcontracts". Is this the same as "major subcontractors" discussed elsewhere in the DRFP?

*A.18. Service Contract refers to a type of contract. Per FAR Subpart 22.10 "Service Contract" means any Government contract, the principal purpose of which is to furnish services in the United States through the use service employees, ..."*

*Per FAR 19.7, "Subcontract" means any agreement (other than one involving an employer-employee relationship) entered into by a Government prime contractor or subcontractor calling for supplies and/or services required for performance of the contract, contract modification, or subcontract.*

- Q.19. On page 86 of the DRFP, Section M.2(b)(1) it states: "The compatibility between the proposed technical approach and proposed total compensation to accomplish the work will be an important consideration in the evaluation of this factor." And on Page 88, Section M.2(c) it states "The compatibility between the proposed technical and management approaches, and the overall resources proposed to accomplish the work will be an important consideration in the evaluation of this factor."

These evaluation criteria statements seem to be inconsistent regarding which compatible items are important. Please clarify this inconsistency.

*A.19. Section M.2(b)(1) and M.2(c) will be amended in the Final RFP to read as follows:*

*"The compatibility between the proposed technical and management approaches, and the overall total compensation proposed to accomplish the work will be an important consideration in the evaluation of this factor."*

- Q.20. A list of not more than four (4) relevant contracts (government and/or industry contracts), each in excess of \$10,000,000 total contract value, received in the past three (3) years, or currently on-going, involving types of related effort (-page 73).

Does this rule disqualify us if our past contracts have been for values of under a Million?

*A.20. As stated in the RFP, if the Offeror or major subcontractor does not have enough references to meet these requirements, references shall be provided to the maximum extent possible. If an Offeror does not have any relevant past performance history as determined herein, it will not be evaluated favorably or unfavorably and will be given a neutral level of assessment.*