

# Project and Engineering Support Services (PESS)

NNA12374362R

## Questions and Answers – SET 1

April 11, 2012

- Q.1. Evaluation Period to award is viewed by industry to favor the current workforce (we understand this is a new requirement) – however, please consider a more “competitive” friendly schedule
- A.1. The Government has considered this request and has decided to keep the current schedule posted. We think this is a realistic schedule and meets the FAR requirements.
- Q.2. Would the government consider a more “competitive Friendly submittal period. The current 45 days seems to favor the current contractor. We understand that this is a new requirement. Competitive friendly is 60 days.
- A.2. The Government has reviewed the request and decided to keep the current 45 days. For R&D solicitations, the requirement for submitting proposals is 45 days from the day the RFP is posted. We posted the Draft RFP on March 8, 2012 and plan to post the final RFP by the end of April 2012.
- Q.3. Many companies such as N.G. currently support Ames on their projects. Are these companies excluded from bidding PESS as a prime or sub?
- A.3. The PESS procurement has been set aside for a small business. The Prime must be a small business and can team up with other small or large businesses. The Prime must provide 51% of the requirement to bid as the Prime.
- Q.4. Please describe the “Hybrid Single Award...” contract vehicle approach mentioned in the presentation.
- A.4. We will only award one contract through the PESS solicitation. The contract will consist of a CORE and an Indefinite Delivery Indefinite Quantity (IDIQ) Contract Line item. Please see section B.1 Supplies/Services to be provided for specifics.
- Q.5. The DRFP states “The performance of the base period shall be for twelve (12) months from the effective date of the contract.” For proposal purposes, what contract start date should be used?
- A.5. We plan to issue the Final RFP towards the end of April 2012 with an estimated award date in Aug/Sept 2012. We will continue to update the APT as information changes.

Q.6. The table identifies Attachment 6 as the “Contractor’s IT Security Plan”, but there is no requirement listed in either the CDRL document or Section L to provide this Plan. I.10.(c).(4) states that an IT Security Plan is a FISMA requirement, and that “within 30 days after contract award, the Contractor shall develop and deliver and IT Security Management Plan”. Please clarify.

A.6. The “Contractor’s IT Security Plan” under J.1 (a), Attachment 5 will be added to the Contractor Data Requirements List (CDRL) in the Final RFP. However, the requirement for the Contractor’s IT Security Plan can be found in the Draft RFP.

Q.7. The DRFP states that diagrams, charts, tables, and photographs shall contain Arial font text in a size no smaller than 11 point. In order to develop illustrations that enhance proposal content, would NASA consider 9 point font for diagrams, photographs, charts and tables? Also, the file “Attachment J1b3 – Cost Template Workbook Exhibits 2-18 appear to have a font size of 10 point. Can the font size requirement be clarified or changed, or can the provided workbook be changed, such that offerors do not have to change the font size for those exhibits?

A.7. The Government has reviewed the request and decided to not change “Arial font text with a size not smaller than 12 point”.

Q.8. The draft RFP states: “Diagrams, charts, tables, and photographs shall contain Arial font text in a size no smaller than 11 point.” Arial 11 point is a very large font for even the simplest graphics such as an organization chart. This will make graphics difficult to prepare and their visual appeal compromised. We respectfully request that Arial Narrow 10 point font be the minimum font size for diagrams, charts, tables and photographs.

A.8. See response to Q.7.

Q.9. The second sentence of the first bullet requires the Offeror to include “the assignments and the skills required for other-than-key personnel” in the “Staffing, Recruitment, Retention, and Training” section of the Mission Suitability Volume. Section L.7.(c).3 identifies Exhibit 9 and states that “Offerors shall use the Standard Labor Categories and hours provided in the Exhibit. This will provide the Government with a standard cost model to be used to compare proposals. The cost model is for evaluation purposes and the actual number of individuals needed in the various labor categories will be determined upon negotiation of individual task orders.” To maintain consistency between the Mission Suitability Volume and the Cost Volume, should the Offeror utilize the corrected staffing profile that will be provided in Exhibit 9 as the basis for defining the assignments and skills required for other-than-key personnel required in the Mission Suitability Volume?

A.9. The Cost Template Workbook – Exhibits 2-18 have been updated and will be posted prior to release of Final RFP as [“J.1 \(b\) Cost Template Workbook – Exhibits 2-18”](#).

Q.10. It was acknowledged by the CO at the Pre-Proposal Conference that some exhibits in the Excel Costing Model (ECM) were inaccurate, and that they will be revised. Given the importance of the role of an accurate staffing profile in the contractor process of establishing teams for bidding, will consideration be given to releasing the revised exhibits as soon as possible, in advance of the final RFP?

A.10. [See response to Q.9.](#)

Q.11. Prior to release of the PESS Draft RFP, the Contracting Officer emphasized repeatedly that PESS was a new requirement and not a recompetition of existing efforts. In addition, the Past Performance Questionnaire, Attachment J.1(b)8, states: "This procurement is a new requirement for Engineering Services support at Ames." However, there are multiple references in the PESS Draft RFP to incumbent employees (e.g., Phase-in Plan, Staffing Plan and Cost Exhibits 6 and 16). Please confirm that PESS is a new requirement and remove all references to incumbency from the RFP. If PESS is a recompetition of existing contract(s), please identify the incumbent contract(s), end dates of incumbent contract(s), current task orders impacted by the PESS transition, salaries/wages for incumbent employees, length of service for each incumbent employee, and fringe benefits provided to incumbent employees.

A.11. [See response to Q. 9.](#)

Q.12. The PESS Draft RFP includes Attachment J.1(b)1, Cost Model Staffing List. However, there are no instructions or evaluation criteria stating how the labor categories and level of effort in Attachment J.1(b)1 are implemented in the proposal. In addition, the labor categories and level of effort in the cost templates (Exhibits 6 and 9) are different than those included in Attachment J.1(b)1. Please indicate if the labor categories and level of effort in Attachment J.1(b)1 are required to be used by all Offerors in the preparation of their proposals and resolve the inconsistency with cost Exhibits 6 and 9.

A.12. [See response to Q.9.](#)

Q.13. The last sentence in Section L.7(c)3 (Exhibit 4) states: "Costs are shown on a monthly basis in Exhibits 4-1 through 4-5 and summarized in Exhibit 4." The Excel Costing Model does not contain Exhibits 4-1 through 4-5. Please clarify, and provide confirmation that costs by month are not required.

A.13. [See response to Q. 9.](#)

- Q.14. Section L.7(c)3 (Exhibit 5) states, in part: “For purposes of proposal submissions, Offerors shall use the values in the following chart of Other Direct Costs (ODCs).”
- a. The amounts identified in this table do not correspond to the amounts entered in Exhibit 5 of the Excel Costing Model (ECM). Please clarify.
  - b. The ECM provides separate estimates for Travel, Materials, and Miscellaneous. Please clarify.

A. 14. [See response to Q. 9.](#)

- Q.15. Section L.7(c)3 (Exhibit 8) states, in part (*emphasis added*): “This schedule shows the direct labor cost for the core for each contract year, *by month*, with the labor rates from Exhibit 6 used to compute the cost.” Exhibit 8 of the Excel Costing Model does not identify costs by month. Please clarify, and provide confirmation that costs by month are not required.

A.15. [See response to Q. 9.](#)

- Q.16. The last paragraphs of Section L.7(c)3 (Exhibits 8 and 9) discusses nonproductive hours per person year. Exhibits 8 and 9 of the Excel Costing Model do not identify a place to provide this information. Please clarify.

A.16. [See response to Q. 9.](#)

- Q.17. Section L.7(c)3 (Exhibit 10) states, in part: “Other burden rates (e.g., material overhead, subcontracts admin.) must be shown separately.” Please confirm that, if necessary, Offerors should add columns to show the “other burden rates.”

A.17. [See response to Q. 9.](#)

- Q.18. Section L.7(c)3 (Exhibit 11) states, in part: “A separate template for each of the proposed burden pools is to be completed.” Please confirm that, if necessary, Offerors should add worksheets for the “other burden rates” that may be added to Exhibit 10.

A.18. [See response to Q. 9.](#)

- Q.19. Section L.7(c)3 (Exhibit 15) states, in part: “This template provides visibility, by employee category, into personnel policies and fringe benefits...” We respectfully request that the Government provide an example to demonstrate the level of detail required.

A.19. [See response to Q. 9.](#)

- Q.20. Section L.7(c)3 (Exhibit 16) states, in part: “The Offeror shall indicate in the space provided, the percentage of the incumbent workforce it expects to retain.” Please clarify exactly where on the exhibit the retention percentage is supposed to be entered.

A.20. [See response to Q. 9.](#)

Q.21. Section L.7(c)3 (Exhibit 17) states, in part: “The Phase-In Template is required of the prime only and is designed to show the total cost plus fixed fee (include all subcontractor Phase-In costs and fee).” The Note in Exhibit 17 of the Excel Costing Model states: “Phase-In shall be proposed on a cost only basis.” Further, there is no place to insert fee. Please clarify.

A.21. [See response to Q. 9.](#)

Q.22. Section L.7(c)3, Exhibit 1, states that Exhibit 1 must be used to satisfy the requirements of Items 1 through 15 of Table 15-2 as shown in FAR 15.408. There is no place on Exhibit 1 for Offerors to enter the information required in Items 7 (government property), 8 (CAS information), and 9 (the proposal statement) of Table 15-2. We respectfully request that Items 7, 8, and 9 be eliminated from the requirements stated in Section L.7(c)3 (Exhibit 1).

A.22. [See response to Q.9.](#)

Q.23. a. The labor categories identified in Exhibits 6 and 9 do not match the labor categories identified in the Costing Model Staffing List. Please clarify.  
b. The total IDIQ WYEs identified in Exhibit 6 do not match the number of people identified in the Costing Model Staffing List. Please clarify.  
c. The total IDIQ hours identified in Exhibit 9 do not match the number of hours identified in the Costing Model Staffing List. Please clarify.  
d. Section L.7(c)3 (Exhibit 9) states, in part: “Offerors shall use the Standard Labor Categories and hours provided in the Exhibit.” Please clarify.

A.23. [See Response to 9.](#)

Q.24. a. Row 15 of Exhibit 3 indicates that Fee pulls from Exhibit 4. However, Exhibit 4 contains Cost only (there is no Fee identified on Exhibit 4). Please clarify.  
b. Row 35 of Exhibit 3 indicates that Fee pulls from Exhibit 4. It seems that the reference should be to Exhibit 5 instead of Exhibit 4. However, both Exhibits 4 and 5 contain Cost only (Fee is not identified on either Exhibit 4 or Exhibit 5). Please clarify

A.24. [See Response to 9.](#)

Q.25. The asterisked note at the bottom of Exhibit 6 states “It is possible that these categories may be defined as either exempt or non-exempt labor categories.” To what is this asterisked note referring?

A.25. [See Response to 9.](#)

Q.26. In Exhibit 18 of the Excel Costing Model, please clarify what is meant by “Affiliation with Prime” in Cell A23.

A.26. [See Response to 9.](#)

Q.27. Draft RFP Attachment J.1 (b) 1, Costing Model Staffing List, includes a Core section and IDIQ section. The Core section includes labor categories (e.g., Site Manager, Sr. Buyer, and Administrative Assistant) that appear to be outside the scope of the Core SOW requirements which are focused on the Engineering Evaluation Laboratory (SOW 3.0 A). Please clarify this apparent ambiguity.

A.27. [See Response to 9.](#)

Q.28. Section 3. Cost Proposal Organization Exhibit 5 (page 76), the total ODC amounts on the table are different from the Excel template Exhibit 5. Please clarify.

A.28. [See Response to 9.](#)

Q.29. The DRFP states “The staffing data provided in J.1(b) Attachment 1 includes the government estimate of the annual staffing levels and descriptions.” It does not appear that descriptions are part of that attachment. Will the Government provide position descriptions?

A.29. [Descriptions will be provided and posted as J.1 \(b\) Cost Model Staffing List Descriptions, prior to the release of the final RFP.](#)

Q.30. Please provide job descriptions and qualifications (Education, Years of Experience, etc.) for the labor categories that are listed in RFP Att. J.1 (b) 1 (Cost Model Staffing List).”

A.30. [See Response to Q.29.](#)

Q.31. It appears that most, if not all, of the SOW 3.2 Project Support details are included in other PESS SOW elements. Would NASA consider removing the redundant information which is included in SOW 3.2?

A.31. [Task orders will define requirements based on various sections of the State of Work \(SOW\), as applicable.](#)

Q.32. P.71 and L.7(b)(3)(A)4, p.73. Section L.7(b)(1) states, “A list of not more than four (4) relevant contracts (government and/or industry contracts), each in excess of \$5,000,000 total contract value, received in the past five (5) years, or currently on-going, involving types of related effort.” while Section L.7(b)(3)(A)4 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, the Offeror and major subcontractors shall: ” Given that some Offerors have a very extensive list of NASA contracts within the last five years, will the Government consider limiting that list to those contracts that are relevant to PESS?

A.32. [L.7\(b\)\(3\)\(A\)4 p. 73 will be changed as follows: “Each Offeror and any proposed major subcontractor shall send a blank Past Performance Questionnaires to the cognizant Contracting Officer or the Contracting Officer’s Technical Representative of no more](#)

than four (4) relevant contracts (government and/or industry contracts), each in excess of \$5,000,000 total contract value for the prime and each in excess of \$1,000,000.00 total contract value for the major subcontractor, received in the past three (3) years, or currently on-going, involving types of related effort. All Past Performance Questionnaires shall be drawn from Section L.7, (b) Past Performance Factor (Volume II) (1) list above. See final RFP.

- Q.33. P.73. Section L.7(b)(3)(A)4 Other Information 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, the Offeror and major subcontractors shall: Describe any serious performance problems. . .” and “Provide examples of innovative methods. . .” Given that some Offerors have a number of NASA contracts either completed within the last three years or currently active, will the Government consider excluding the response to this section from the page limit of 25 pages allocated for Past Performance?

A.33. See response to Q. 32.

- Q.34. RFP page 71 states: “(1) **A list of not more than four (4) relevant contracts (government and/or industry contracts), each in excess of \$5,000,000 total contract value, received in the past five (5) years, or currently on-going, involving types of related effort.**” Please clarify if the list of not more than four (4) relevant contracts is the total for the prime and major subcontractors, or can the prime submit four (4) relevant contracts and each major subcontractor submit an additional four (4) relevant contracts.

A.34. See response to Q.32.

- Q.35. The draft RFP states: “The Offeror shall submit a detailed written safety and health plan. Safety items to be covered in the plan can be found in NPR 8715.3A and APR 1700.1, and shall include, at a minimum, those listed below.” The current version of NPR 8715.3 is revision C. Please confirm that the Safety and Health Plan should be prepared in accordance with the latest version of NPR 8715.3.

A.35. The Safety and Health Plan should be prepared in accordance with the latest version of NPR 8715.3. See final RFP.

- Q.36. In the section entitled “Critical Elements of Information,” it states, in part: “See procurement “Highlights of NASA Ames Research Center’s Request for Proposal (RFP) for “Project and Engineering Support Services (PESS)” document.” There is no such document. Please clarify.

A.36. There is no “Highlights for PESS” and will be deleted. This will be corrected in the Final RFP.

Q.37. We respectfully recommend that the title for Section H.10 be changed from “SUBONTRACTING AND DATE RIGHTS ...” to “SUBCONTRACTING AND DATA RIGHTS ...”

A.37. H.10 will be corrected to “SUBCONTRACTING AND DATA RIGHTS...” See Final RFP.

Q.38. Paragraph (c) states, “The following property and services are provided if checked:.” Nothing is checked. Please confirm that all property/services identified in paragraph (c) should be checked.

A.38. Property/Services identified in paragraph (c) on page 18 will be checked and corrected in the Final RFP.

Q.39. Please confirm that the first subparagraph on page 24 should be (c) instead of (e).

A.39. Clause H.2 (e), page 24 will be changed to (c) instead of (e). See Final RFP.

Q.40. Clauses H.11 and H.20 are duplicates. We respectfully recommend that one of the clauses be deleted.

A.40. H.20 INFORMATION INCIDENTAL TO CONTRACT ADMINISTRATION (ARC 52.227-98) will be deleted and marked “RESERVED”. See Final RFP.

Q.41. There is no such FAR clause 52.233-18. Please confirm that this should be 52.223-18 instead. If so, the clause should be updated to reflect the AUG 2011 revision, including the title change to “Encouraging Contractor Policies to Ban Text Messaging While Driving” (instead of “Contractor Policy to Ban Text Messaging While Driving”).

A.41. Section I, I.1, I. FEDERAL ACQUISITION REGAULATION (48 CFR CHAPTER 1) will be updated as follows. See Final RFP

FROM: 52.233-18 SEP 2010 CONTRACTOR POLICY TO BAN TEXT MESSAGING WHILE DRIVING

TO: 52.223-18 AUG 2011 ENCOURAGING CONTRACTOR POLICIES TO BAN TEXT MESSAGING WHILE DRIVING

Q.42. Please confirm that the number of pages for Attachment 3 (CDRL) is 9 instead of 10.

A.42. Section J, J.1 Attachment 3 is being updated. The page count will be corrected. See Final RFP.

Q.43. It does not appear as if any of the representations/certifications identified in paragraph (c) are checked. Please confirm.

A.43. Section K, K.1 ANNUAL REPRESENTATIONS AND CERTIFICATIONS (FAR 52.204-8) (MAY 2011), paragraph (c) will be updated. See Final RFP.

Q.44. FAR 52.215-16 (Facilities Capital Cost of Money) is listed twice in Section I (the first listing is misspelled). Please confirm that one of the two FAR clauses is a duplicate and will be deleted.

A.44. FAR Provision 52.215-16 is not in Section I. However, it is listed in Section L and will be corrected. See Final RFP

Q.45. The Cover Letter is not part of a Volume. Should the Cover Letter be submitted in its own 3-ring binder? Please clarify.

A.45. The Cover Letter can be included with Volume I or submitted in its own binder.

Q.46. We respectfully request that the due date for questionnaires returned from customers be extended to the proposal due date (instead of 10 days prior to the proposal due date). This will allow customers ample time to complete and return the questionnaires while allowing flexibility for travel/vacation time away from the office.

A.46. The Government has reviewed this request and has decided that 10 days prior to the proposal due date is sufficient.

Q.47. Please verify the e-mail address listed in paragraph 3 (i.e., should it be AnJennette.C.Rodriguez@nasa.gov instead of AnJennette [Contreras-Rodriguez@nasa.gov](mailto:Contreras-Rodriguez@nasa.gov)).

A.47. The e-mail listed in paragraph 3 should be [AnJennette.C.Rodriguez@nasa.gov](mailto:AnJennette.C.Rodriguez@nasa.gov). See Final RFP.

Q.48. The SOW makes several references to a Phase-Out plan in Sections 1.0 and 6.0. However, there are no references to or instructions for a Phase-Out anywhere else in the RFP. Please clarify.

A.48. The Offerors are not required to address Phase-out plan in its proposal.

Q.49. "Section G.5, List of Installation-Accountable Property and Services" is highlighted in yellow. Please confirm that this reference will be updated in the final RFP.

A.49. We have reviewed the Draft RFP and do not see any highlight in clause G.5 or G.7.

Q.50. We respectfully request that the Government provide additional information regarding the property identified on pages 1 through 4 of the Government Property List (e.g., manufacturer, make, model number, serial number, location).

A.50. A new updated list will be posted as "J.1 Government Property List 1" to be posted prior to the release of the Final RFP.

Q.58. The Contracting Officer confirmed at the pre-proposal conference that PESS is a new requirement and indicated that the cost exhibits would be modified to reflect a new requirement rather than an incumbent recompet. Please confirm that all other references to incumbency (shown below) will also be removed from the RFP.

**Section L – Phase-in Plan (page 69)**

- Estimate of, and supporting rationale for, the number of **incumbent** contractor employees expected to be hired.
- The impact of the Offeror’s policy for continuing and/or replacing the benefits of the **incumbent** contractor’s employees expected to be hired (e.g., seniority, accrued sick and annual leave, compensatory time, health plans, 401k plans, etc.).

**Section L – Staffing, Recruitment, Retention and Training (page 71)**

- Proposed approach to providing the staffing (skill mix) necessary to perform the requirements defined in the SOW. Include the assignments and the skills required for other-than-key personnel and the plan for **incumbent** skill retention.

**Section M – Phase-in Plan (page 88)**

- Estimate of, and supporting rationale for, the number of **incumbent** contractor employees expected to be hired.
- The impact of the Offeror’s policy for continuing and/or replacing the benefits of the **incumbent** contractor’s employees expected to be hired (e.g., seniority, accrued sick and annual leave, compensatory time, health plans, 401k plans, etc.).

**Section M – Staffing, Recruitment, Retention and Training (page 89)**

Approach to providing the staffing (skill mix) necessary to perform the requirements contemplated in the SOW. Include the assignments and the skills required for other-than-key personnel and the plan for **incumbent** skill retention.

A.58. All areas in the Draft RFP that reference incumbency (as shown above) will be deleted and corrected. See Final RFP.

Q.59. Section B.1(a) includes reference to paragraph F.2 (a) for item number 01B IDIQ requirement. Paragraph F.2(a) only references “Phase in and base requirement”. Shouldn’t the IDIQ requirement be included in paragraph F.2(a)?

A.59. The IDIQ requirement is included in the base period as indicated in B.1(a).

Q.60. SOW Section 6, Phase-in/Phase-out Plan-What existing NASA ARC contracts or tasks will be phased into PESS contract and what is the schedule? What contract number are these contracts? Can existing tasks be released for reference in order to properly plan a transition? Does the incumbent on these contracts/tasks have requirements to support Phase-out activities? What are the historical average number of personnel and costs of this work?

A.60. Depending upon the start date of the contract some tasks may be phased into the PESS contract. Requirements for Engineering, Design and Fabrication Services with ASRC Research and Technology Solutions (ARTS) contract NNA08AF30B & NNA12AA24C and Programs & Projects (P&P) with Lockheed contract NAS2-02090 may transition to this contract. However, there has been no final program/project decision made with or if any requirements with transition.

Q.61. SOW element 3.7, how is this different than the Core requirement? Both appear to support the M&O of the EEL facility.

A.61. Section 3.7 of the SOW addresses the project specific tasks that may be assigned to the EEL. The Core requirement in Section 3.0A addresses the routine maintenance work of the EEL and is not project specific. For example, the EEL must be cleaned; the equipment must be calibrated, on a regular basis (Section 3.0A). A project may require a vibration test for a piece of equipment (Section 3.7).

Q.62. Sample task order – what is the period of performance for this task? What are the deliverables for the task? Does the task end with the completion of the MCR?

A.62. Please see L.7 A 2. – Sample Task Order, which addresses the requirement of the Offeror’s task plan.

Q.63. The second sentence of the first bullet requires the Offeror to include “the assignments and the skills required for other-than-key personnel” in the “Staffing, Recruitment, Retention, and Training” section of the Mission Suitability Volume. Section L.7.(c).3 identifies Exhibit 9 and states that “Offerors shall use the Standard Labor Categories and hours provided in the Exhibit. This will provide the Government with a standard cost model to be used to compare proposals. The cost model is for evaluation purposes and the actual number of individuals needed in the various labor categories will be determined upon negotiation of individual task orders.” To maintain consistency between the Mission Suitability Volume and the Cost Volume, should the Offeror utilize the corrected staffing profile that will be provided in Exhibit 9 as the basis for defining the assignments and skills required for other-than-key personnel required in the Mission Suitability Volume?

A.63. The Costing Model Staffing Workbook has been updated and will be posted prior to the release of the Final RFP as [Cost Model Staffing List](#) .