

CISTO-SCTS Question Set #11

Question/Comment	Response
<p>1. Please clarify whether the average annual cost/fee for proposed significant subcontractors is \$2M as stated in Section L.18.a or \$1M stated in Section M.5.</p>	<p>Refer to the response to question #2 of Question Set #7, published on May 09, 2012</p> <p>The definition of a proposed significant subcontractor for this procurement is correctly stated in Section L.18.</p> <p>An amendment will be made to the corresponding definition in Section M.5 to correct the definition of a proposed significant subcontractor for this procurement and will be stated as follows in M.5 PAST PERFORMANCE EVALUATION FACTOR (MAR 2012):</p> <p>A proposed significant subcontractor for this procurement is defined as any proposed subcontractor that is estimated to meet/exceed an average annual cost/fee of \$2M. Note, the definition of significant subcontractor for the past performance evaluation may be different than for the cost evaluation.</p>
<p>2. Please clarify direction under Section B1 pg. 5 & Section J.1 "List of Attachments", p. 87 for the IT Security Management Plan. Section B1 states that the IT Security Plan is due "within 30 days after contract award...". Section J states the IT Security Management Plan is "to be submitted within thirty (30) days of contract effective date". Is the contract award date the same as the contract effective date? Please clarify the timeline for when the IT Security Management Plan is due to the Government.</p>	<p>As stated in Clause I.7 1852.204-76, "Within 30 days after award, the contractor shall develop and deliver an IT Security Management Plan to the Contracting Officer"</p> <p>Section J.1 List of Attachments, Attachment J, Date, will be amended to state: "To be submitted within 30 days after contract award"</p>
<p>3. RFP Section (b) Proposal content and page limitations. RFP Page # 111 "Labor Categories"</p> <p>Subfactor B RFP Page 128, Question Set #4</p> <p>Offerors shall provide written position qualifications for the specific labor categories envisioned for this requirement for the entire SOW..... All position qualifications will be</p>	<p>The written positions qualifications are to be provided as part of Attachment B. Therefore, they are excluded from the 75 page limit.</p> <p>Section L.14 of the RFP will be amended to clarify that written position qualifications for the specific labor categories are excluded from the 75 page limit.</p>

CISTO-SCTS Question Set #11

<p>incorporated into the resultant contract as Attachment B.</p> <p>Recent Goddard IDIQ RFPs have excluded the labor categories and labor category descriptions from the page limit. Per (b) Proposal Content and Page Limitations, the Labor Categories are excluded from the Mission Suitability Volume 75 page limit. However, NASA’s response to Question No.6 4 suggests that the labor category position descriptions are included in the 75 page limit. Please confirm that these position descriptions are provided with the labor categories and are excluded from the 75 page limit.</p>	
<p>4. Section L.17.2(c), on page 135 of the RFP states: "In addition to the summary cost proposal exhibit for each RTO, Offerors shall provide detailed back-up cost spreadsheets that include the following elements by month ". Is it acceptable for excel Exhibits to be provided as an Attachment only in hard copy and/or electronic copy and to reference in the Cost Volume where the Exhibits are provided.</p> <p>Provide concurrence that all the Cost Exhibits may be included as an attachment or appendix to the Cost Volume rather than embedded in the body of the Cost Volume.</p>	<p>No. The Government does not want a separate volume of cost exhibits. Cost exhibits shall be included in the Cost Volume.</p> <p>Offerors shall provide the information requested in L.17 Cost Volume.</p>
<p>5. Section B pg 4 states that the PIV original list is due within 15 days of contract award, which the Government has stated will be in September. Contract phase-in is due to start in November which is when the offeror would make offers to incumbent resources. Request clarification on initial due date of PIV documentation for resources. When is the Government considering contract award, is it the phone call to the offeror or the notification in writing?</p>	<p>The term “contract award” in Section B.4 refers to the date the contract is executed.</p>
<p>6. In Section L.16.3, Subfactor A, RTO (1) – Major Procurement and Integration, the</p>	<p>As stated in L.17 (b) SUMMARY OF ESTIMATED COST AND FIXED FEE, Other</p>

CISTO-SCTS Question Set #11

<p>government states, “The budget for the procurement portion of this RTO is \$5M plus contractor fees associated with material and handling.” Is the government using the term “contractor fees” interchangeably with General and Administrative expense (G&A), Material Handling expense (MHX) or “other indirect costs”, or is the government defining contractor fees as “profit” or “fee”? Please define “contractor fees”.</p>	<p>Direct Costs (ODCs) for SOW Section 4.2 (d) only (i.e.), Hardware, software, maintenance, or supporting material are excluded from the application of Fixed Fee for delivery orders and task orders issued under this contract as specified in Attachment (B), Direct labor Rates, Indirect Rates and Fixed Fee Matrices. Therefore, “profit” or “fee” within this RTO is not allowed. “Contractor fees” for this RTO are any G&A or MHX required by the contractor for ODCs.</p>
<p>RFP Reference: SOW 11.d, pg 20 of 22</p> <p>Text from RFP: SOW paragraph 11.d states “Creation and insertion of data handling agents which would allow for the reduction or elimination of memory leakage, run-away files and halted processes in real-time and direct readout processing systems, where S/C data is being processed at the same time it is being received by the front-end acquisition sub system.”</p> <p>A: Is this due to a problem with Simulcast processing interfering with the data acquisition?</p> <p>B: Does this problem exist on both the new and old EOS-FES servers?</p> <p>C: If the problem is only on the old or the new server, could you identify which one is having the problem?</p>	<p>A. No. Problems have occurred during packet processing, the process logging system and/or real-time ingest processors interacting with operating system interrupts and I/O.</p> <p>B. No problems exist today, but could occur in the future.</p> <p>C. Neither, but could occur.</p>