

NNG14469449R
GEOPHYSICS, GEODYNAMICS AND SPACE GEODESY SUPPORT (GGSG)
QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

1. DRFP Paragraph M.3, GSFC 52.215-310 MISSION SUITABILITY FACTOR (MAY 2014), page 136. The last sentence in the second paragraph states “An offeror's proposed Mission Suitability approach shall be consistent with its proposed cost/price information.” DRFP Section L.14.2(c) Government Pricing Model Exhibit 1A specifies the hours by contract year and labor category. In another exhibit the DRFP provides the DL rates for most of the labor categories. The cost/price instructions and the use of a Government Pricing Model do not appear to be related to the Mission Suitability approach. Please clarify the aspects of the Mission Suitability approach that need to be consistent with the proposed cost/price information.

Response: The aspects of Mission Suitability that need to be consistent with the proposed cost/price information, include, for example, but are not limited to, management approach, subcontracting approach, source of personnel and any other area of mission suitability which impacts the Offeror's cost approach. As such, Offeror's proposed Mission Suitability approach shall be consistent with it's Government Pricing Model cost information.

2. DRFP Paragraph L.13 (3) Subfactor A—Scenarios, page 113. The RFP states “Each scenario response shall identify the technical approach, labor categories, labor hours, Government and external interfaces, the flow of activities from start to completion (including time line), and any other information required to determine the adequacy and reasonableness of the offeror's approach. The plan must be specific, detailed, and complete to demonstrate a clear and full understanding of the objectives; potential technical problems, risks, and critical issues; and possible problem mitigation/resolution. Any assumptions made in preparing a response to these representative tasks orders must be clearly stated.” Section M makes no corresponding references to representative tasks orders, plans, or labor hours for scenarios. The scenarios are not representative task orders and as such do not appear to have nearly enough specificity for the labor hours to be estimated. (1) Please consider modifying this instruction to delete the requirement to provide labor hours. (2) Please modify the references to the ‘representative tasks orders’ and ‘plan’ to be ‘scenario responses’.

Response: The statement referenced in the question above under L.13 (3) Subfactor A—Scenarios, page 113, will be revised as follows: “Each scenario response shall identify the technical approach, labor categories, Government and external interfaces, the flow of activities from start to completion (including time line), and any other information required to determine the adequacy and reasonableness of the offeror's approach. The scenario response must be specific, detailed, and complete to demonstrate a clear and full understanding of the objectives; potential technical problems, risks, and critical issues; and possible problem mitigation/resolution. Any assumptions made in preparing a response to these scenarios must be clearly stated.”

3. DRFP Paragraph L.13.3 Subfactor B—Management Approach, Page 116. The third complete paragraph on this page instructs that “Offerors shall provide written position qualifications for the specific labor categories envisioned for this requirement.”

NNG14469449R
GEOPHYSICS, GEODYNAMICS AND SPACE GEODESY SUPPORT (GGSG)
QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

Please consider excluding position qualifications from the Page Limit for the Mission Suitability Volume.

Response: For Draft RFP section L.13.3 Subfactor B, page 116, the language "Offerors shall provide written position qualifications for the specific labor categories envisioned for this requirement" will be revised to state, "Offerors shall provide written position qualifications in Attachment B for the specific labor categories envisioned for this requirement". The language "Offerors need to address the minimum requirements in the position qualifications, to include the necessary experience, summary of duties and responsibilities, specific requirements/licensing, minimum education and minimum experience required for the position. Offerors shall include the position title and to whom the position reports" will be deleted from Draft RFP section L.13.3 Subfactor B, page 116.

4. DRFP Paragraph L.13.3 Subfactor B—Management Approach, Page 116. The third complete paragraph on this page instructs that "Offerors shall provide written position qualifications for the specific labor categories envisioned for this requirement." The instructions for Volume III Cost Proposal (Page 124), also require that for Attachment B "In Section 6, provide Position Qualifications for all offeror proposed direct labor categories specified in Section 1 and all subcontractors' proposed direct labor categories specified in Section 5."

Does this identical information need to be published in both the Missions Suitability Volume as well as the Cost Volume?

Response: After Draft RFP section L.14.2(b), paragraph 2 (page 124), which states, "In Section 6, provide Position Qualifications for all offeror proposed direct labor categories specified in Section 1 and all subcontractors' proposed direct labor categories specified in Section 5", the following language will be added, "Offerors need to address the minimum requirements in the position qualifications, to include the necessary experience, summary of duties and responsibilities, specific requirements/licensing, minimum education and minimum experience required for the position. Offerors shall include the position title and to whom the position reports."

5. Attachment A Draft SOW Paragraph 1.1, GRAIL Mission Analysis, page 13. The SOW states "The contractor shall process data for the GRAIL mission to the Moon" and "The objective of this requirement is to aid in the development of high-degree solutions of the lunar gravity field to at least 420x420 in spherical harmonics using the primary mission data, and to higher degrees using data from the primary and the extended mission." This processing has already occurred, the objectives have already been accomplished, and the results have been published.

Would the Government please update the requirements and the objectives in this SOW area to reflect expectations for the next contract period?

NNG14469449R
GEOPHYSICS, GEODYNAMICS AND SPACE GEODESY SUPPORT (GGSG)
QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

Response: Under Attachment A, Draft Statement of Work, the requirement 1.1 GRAIL Mission Analysis, will be deleted from the SOW. As such, Attachment A, Draft SOW, 1.1 GRAIL Mission Analysis, will be replaced with "1.1 RESERVED". In addition, under Draft RFP, Section L.13.3, first paragraph, following the statement, "The following are the significant functional areas of the SOW that are to be evaluated for the purposes of this competition", 1.1 GRAIL Mission Analysis will be deleted from the list of significant functional areas.

6. Draft SOW section 1.9, page 15, Space Geodesy SLR Advanced Development, and section 1.19, page 18, Space Geodesy Advanced Development.

These two SOW areas are different generations of the same work. Section 1.9 is the newer version of the two. Is it acceptable to address just the newer version? If you require both to be addressed, is it acceptable to combine these two SOW areas into a single response?

Response: Draft SOW section 1.9 Space Geodesy SLR Advanced Development is identified in the list under Draft RFP, Section L.13.3, first paragraph, page 112, as one of the significant functional areas of the SOW which are to be evaluated for the purposes of this competition. The Draft RFP states under Section L.13.3, first paragraph, page 112, that "The technical approach shall address the following critical elements of the Statement of Work (SOW) in enough detail to clearly and fully demonstrate that the offeror understands the requirements and the inherent problems associated with the objectives of this procurement." Draft SOW section 1.19 Space Geodesy Advanced Development is not identified in the list under Draft RFP, Section L.13.3, first paragraph, page 112, as one of the significant functional areas of the SOW which are to be evaluated for the purposes of this competition.

Draft SOW sections 1.9 Space Geodesy SLR Advanced Development and 1.19 Space Geodesy Advanced Development will not be combined into a single Draft SOW functional area.

The Offeror's response to Draft SOW functional areas not listed in Draft RFP Section L.13.3, first paragraph, page 112 are at the Offeror's discretion; however, the Offeror should pay close attention to those areas identified for evaluation in Section M.

7. Draft SOW section 1.14, page 17, Earth Science Lidar Instrument Support, and section 3.2, page 23, Remote Sensing Instrument Development.

These two SOW areas are different generations of the same work. Section 1.14 is the newer version of the two. Is it acceptable to address just the newer version? If you require both to be addressed, is it acceptable to combine these two SOW areas into a single response?

Response: Draft SOW section 1.14 Earth Science Lidar Instrument Support is identified in the list under Draft RFP, Section L.13.3, first paragraph, page 112, as one of the significant functional areas of the SOW which are to be evaluated for the purposes of this

NNG14469449R
GEOPHYSICS, GEODYNAMICS AND SPACE GEODESY SUPPORT (GGSG)
QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

competition. The Draft RFP states under Section L.13.3, first paragraph, page 112, that “The technical approach shall address the following critical elements of the Statement of Work (SOW) in enough detail to clearly and fully demonstrate that the offeror understands the requirements and the inherent problems associated with the objectives of this procurement.” Draft SOW section 3.2 Remote Sensing Instrument Development is not identified in the list under Draft RFP, Section L.13.3, first paragraph, page 112, as one of the significant functional areas of the SOW which are to be evaluated for the purposes of this competition.

Draft SOW sections 1.14 Earth Science Lidar Instrument Support and 3.2 Remote Sensing Instrument Development will not be combined into a single Draft SOW functional area.

The Offeror’s response to Draft SOW functional areas not listed in Draft RFP Section L.13.3, first paragraph, page 112 are at the Offeror’s discretion; however, the Offeror should pay close attention to those areas identified for evaluation in Section M.

8. Draft SOW section 1.17, page 18, Hydrospheric and Biospheric Sciences Laboratory Technician, and Draft SOW section 3.3, page 24, Microwave Laboratory Support. These two SOW areas are different generations of the same work. Section 1.17 is the newer version of the two. Is it acceptable to address just the newer version? If you require both to be addressed, is it acceptable to combine these two SOW areas into a single response?

Response: Draft SOW sections 1.17 Hydrospheric and Biospheric Sciences Laboratory Technician and 3.3 Microwave Laboratory Support will not be combined into a single Draft SOW functional area.

The Offeror’s response to Draft SOW functional areas not listed in Draft RFP Section L.13.3, first paragraph, page 112 are at the Offeror’s discretion; however, the Offeror should pay close attention to those areas identified for evaluation in Section M.

9. DRFP Paragraph L.13.3, Subfactor A – Understanding Technical Approach (SOW) Elements and Scenarios, Page 113, Scenario 1. The last sentence reads: “Also, describe the level of hardware support and testing required for mission readiness.”

Does “hardware support” refer to the support for the systems under test during mission readiness activities or does “hardware support” refer to additional hardware that might be required to facilitate our participation in mission readiness testing (e.g., simulators)?

Response: “Hardware support” refers to the support for the systems under test during mission readiness activities.