

## Questions and Answers #2 OCEAN COLOR IV Draft RFP

1. RFP L.8(b)- OCI- Is it OK to assume that the OCI clause will only kick in against a company if it's personnel participate in the review of the ESTO ROSES' proposals after the award of the OC IV contract? This implies that any review of the ROSES proposals done before the OC IV award will not create an OCI condition. Also, review of ROSES proposals not related to the NASA GSFC OEB will not create an OCI condition.

**Answer: The actual conflict only occurs after award of the OCIV contract.**

2. RFP Section B, Table 2—what is the distribution of on-site and off-site personnel on the current Ocean III contract?

**Answer: There are currently 26 on-site personnel under NNG06HX09C. There are no off-site personnel under contract.**

3. DRFP, pg. 91 states "Offerors should address the availability of funding and other financial resources available for this effort." Could the government clarify what this means?

**Answer: This sentence has been removed for the final RFP.**

4. Section L.15, P. 84. Given the amount of information that offerors are required to address – a SOW with 15 major functional areas, 3 highly complex RTOs with numerous requirements (9 level 1 and 42 level 2 for RTO#1, 5 level1 for RTO#2, and 2 level1 and 13 level2 for RTO#3), and a Management Plan with at least 12 major requirements (at least 8 included in the page counted portion) – the 65-page restriction for the Mission Suitability Volume is not adequate to provide sufficient detail to show understanding and approach. We believe a minimum of 80 pages would be required in order to demonstrate the level of understanding and approach that GSFC will require to fully assess vendor responses.

**Answer: We will increase the page limits to 75. Please note, however, that the instructions to RTO1 and RTO3 require only a brief narrative to justify the staffing plan and travel. The detail was provided to ensure that the offeror can quantify the work (for staffing and costing), and to enhance understanding of the SOW requirements. No technical approach to RTO1 or RTO3 was requested, specifically to avoid redundancy with the SOW response.**

5. Section L.18.1, p. 97, defines a Significant Subcontracts as those "expected to exceed 10% of a Representative Task Order (RTO) estimate". Elsewhere in the DRFP, a significant subcontractor is defined as one expected to exceed 10% of the maximum IDIQ value of \$43M, resulting in an average threshold of \$860K/year. 3(a) Please clarify which definition must be used for the Cost Volume to determine if a subcontractor meets the significant subcontractor threshold.

**Answer:** There are two different definitions for a Significant Subcontractor. For Past Performance, the definition of a Significant Subcontractor differs from the definition of Significant Subcontractor under the Cost Volume.

See Section L.19, past performance: *“For purposes of establishing past performance, a proposed significant subcontractor is defined as any proposed subcontractor that is estimated to meet/exceed an average annual cost/fee of \$860K. **Note, the definition of significant subcontractor for the past performance evaluation may be different than for the cost evaluation**”*. The language in the final RFP will clarify both the cost volume definition and the past performance definition.

6. Section L.18.1, p. 97, defines a Significant Subcontracts as those “expected to exceed 10% of a Representative Task Order (RTO) estimate” Elsewhere in the DRFP, a significant subcontractor is defined as one expected to exceed 10% of the maximum IDIQ value of \$43M, resulting in an average threshold of \$860K/year. 3(b) If the definition is tied to the cost estimate for the RTOs, please clarify if a subcontractor must provide the requested cost exhibits ONLY for those RTOs where that subcontractor satisfies the significant subcontractor threshold. Specifically, if a subcontractor meets the threshold for one RTO but not for the others, must they provide cost exhibits only for the one RTO where they meet the criteria?

**Answer:** The language in section L.18 has been revised to point out that a significant subcontractor is defined as follows “For the purposes of the cost volume, a significant subcontractor is defined as a subcontractor expected to exceed 10% of the proposed cost for each Representative Task Order (RTO)”.

7. Section L. 18.2.3, p. 99. The RTOs suggest that estimates must start with the Government fiscal year with a start date of October 1, 2012. However the Phase-In requirements indicate a 45-day phase-in period starting on or about August 24, 2012 which would result in a contract start date of October 9, 2012. Please clarify what date must be used as the starting date in the cost exhibits.

**Answer:** Please use October 1, 2012 as the start date for the contract.

8. Section L.18.2.4. The description of information required for Exhibit 3 does not identify a requirement to indicate the number of positions to be staffed from incumbent personnel, whereas the Exhibit file itself includes a column for staffing from incumbent personnel. Please clarify what information is required in Exhibit 3.

**Answer:** Section L.18. 2.4 has been clarified in the final RFP to read as follows: “The Offeror shall show the total number of staff proposed for each position, how many are available from within the company, how many personnel will be obtained from the incumbent, and how many will be outside hired staff, for the first RTO year.

9. Section L.19(b), p. 106 includes a requirement to include a list of those to whom questionnaires were sent. Please clarify if that list is or is not included in the page counted portion of the Past Performance Volume.

**Answer: The Proposal and Page Limitations Table located at L.15 (b) 1. Will be revised to include the following under Past Performance Volume (c) that reads as follows “List of those that were sent questionnaires”. There will not be a page limit assigned to this section.**

10. Section L.20.3.c, p. 107. The second sentence reads “Driver must shallow....” We believe this to be a typographic error with the intended text likely to be “Driver must show...” Please clarify what the correct text should be.

**Answer: “Driver must shallow....” was a typo and has been corrected.**

11. Section L.20.3.f, p. 107 has a typo where “Drive will ...” should read “Driver will....” Please clarify what the correct text should be.

**Answer: “Drive will.....” was a typo and has been corrected.**

12. Section M.3 Subfactor B, p. 112. This Section includes 4 paragraphs. Each of the first 3 paragraphs refers specifically to one of the RTOs. The fourth paragraph however indicates that the Government will evaluate the assumptions made in preparing a response to the RTO. Please clarify if this paragraph refers ONLY to RTO#3 as suggested by the use of singular in the text “...response to the RTO” or if it is intended to be an overall description of the plan to evaluate assumptions for all RTOs.

**Answer: “response to the RTO” will be revised to read “response to the RTOs” as it does refer to all 3 RTOs.**

13. Section M.3 Subfactor C, p. 113. The paragraph describing evaluation of the Phase-In Plan includes an assessment of the “numbers of personnel growth over the phase-in period” and “weekly staffing projections” neither of which have corresponding requirements under Section L.17 Subfactor C, p. 92. Please clarify this apparent discrepancy between Sections L and M.

**Answer: Section L.17, Subfactor C has been revised to correct the discrepancy between L and M.**

14. Section M.3 Subfactor C, p. 113. The paragraph describing evaluation of the QAP contains an internal GSFC comment "(Bryan, can we delete any reference to customer surveys, here as well as in section L?)", that should have been deleted.

**Answer: Thank you. That has been deleted.**

15. Section M.3 Subfactor D(b)(2), p. 114, indicates that "...for small business offerors, NASA will evaluate this only if subcontracting opportunities exist.)" Please clarify how NASA will determine if subcontracting opportunities exist.

**Answer: The section that is referred to in the question is for small business offerors only. The small business offeror will tell us if subcontracting opportunities exist by proposing them.**

16. Section M.5, p. 117, includes a minimum value of \$2.15M for contracts that may be cited. Section L.19(a), p.103, in contrast defined the threshold as \$2M. Please clarify what threshold must be used in selecting cited contracts.

**Answer: The discrepancy has been noted and corrected. The correct amount in both locations is \$2.15 million.**

17. SOW. Functional Area 6, p. 4 indicates that it is possible that the OEB role on NPP VIIRS may expand to include operational processing and distribution within the OBPG. Please clarify if vendor responses must assume that such requirements are in fact incorporated into the SOW and to address how the offeror will satisfy those requirements.

**Answer: The offeror should address how they would approach an expanded role of operational processing and distribution, quality control, and user support for NPP VIIRS.**

18. SOW. Functional Area 9, p. 6, indicates this functional area "may include analysis of water samples ..." Please clarify if vendor responses must assume that such requirements are in fact incorporated into the SOW and to address how the offeror will satisfy those requirements.

**Answer: Yes. The requirements in SOW functional area 9 have been amended to read: "This shall include analysis of water samples collected by external investigators (e.g., to extract phytoplankton pigments concentrations using High Performance Liquid Chromatography), as directed by NASA. Furthermore, the Contractor shall ensure that all water samples are properly handled and stored prior to analysis. "**

19. SOW Functional Area 14, p.8, indicates that "Historically, roughly 50% of the ODPS processing servers and storage systems have been replaced or repurposed every 18 months..." Please clarify the role of the OCIV contractor with regard to these system upgrades. Namely, which of the following functions must be supported by the OCIV contractor: i) provide systems

engineering and market research to identify hardware and software to be acquired, ii) procure/lease new hardware and software, iii) install and configure new hardware and software, iv) repurpose existing hardware and software within the OEB, v) repurpose existing hardware and software outside of OEB, vi) other?

**Answer: The requirements of SOW functional area 14 (NOW functional area 13) have been clarified to read: The Contractor shall provide systems engineering and market research to identify hardware and software to be acquired, support the development of procurement specifications, install and configure new hardware and software, and repurpose existing hardware and software within the OEB.**

20. RTO#2, p. 11, Includes requirements for "Documentation and User Support" but based on the context it is not possible to determine if those requirements apply ONLY to Phase D or if they apply to all Phases (A thru D). Please clarify.

**Answer: The documentation and user support requirement applies to all phases. This section of RTO#2 has been amended to include the preceding phrase "In each phase of mission development, ...".**

21. RTO#2, Assumptions for Task 2, Item 7 (p. 12) Assume that the only travel for this task is an annual trip for one contractor to attend and present at the SPIE Optics and Photonics meeting in San Diego, California. Assume the meeting attendance is for five days, Monday through Friday. Please show your travel cost in year 3. On RTO # 2, offerors are instructed to include staffing and pricing for each of the five years. However, the instructions for pricing travel ask offerors to "Please show your travel cost in year 3". Does this mean that offerors are to show the cost of all 5 trips (i.e., one trip annually for 5 years) in the year 3 estimate or only the cost of the single trip occurring in Year 3?

**Answer: To eliminate confusion the final RFP RTO's now contain a "plugged" travel number in the assumptions area. The offeror will use this number for their travel and show the build up to their total travel cost in exhibit 6.**

22. M.3 Subfactor C – Management Approach, Mentor-Protégé (p 93) The Mentor-Protégé section is preceded by Position Description, Total Compensation Plan, Detailed Phase-In Plan, Contractor Quality Assurance Plan, and Safety and Health Plan. None of which count toward the page limitation. Would the government allow Section M.3 Subfactor C – Management Approach, Mentor-Protégé (p 93) to be excluded from Page Limitations as well in order to facilitate grouping and flow of Section that are included in the Page Limitations?

**Answer: A row has been added to the page limitation table to include Mentor-Protégé Participation Plan, which will be excluded from the page limitations.**

23. I.14 and L.17.2 Subfactor D.(a)(2) I.14 Discusses NASA's small business goals for Small Disadvantaged Businesses (SDB), Historically Black Colleges and Universities/Minority Institutions (HBCU/MI), and Woman Owned Small Businesses (WOSB) as being 8% of NASA's procurement dollars under prime contracts... In addition the table under, L.17.2 Subfactor D.(a)(2) states these goals as follows: SDB 10%, HBCU/MI .5% and WOSB as 5%. Please clarify which small business goals will apply to the awarded contract.

**Answer: The small business goals related to this procurement are stated at L.17.2(D)2. The goals stated at I.17 are the NASA overall goals.**