

1. QUESTION:

The NASA ARC Announcement regarding NAMS: eligible proposing organizations limited to universities, nonprofits, or not profit/university consortiums.

When you can, will you please confirm this is so? We want to make certain we are operating under the right information as to NASA/ARC's procurement strategy.

ANSWER:

The RFP has been amended to clarify eligible Offerors. Please see amendment one dated 02 Feb 2015.

2. QUESTION:

Questions: Request a list of total contracts, amount, and scope for the last 5 years from the existing UARC.

ANSWER:

Requests regarding existing contracts should be directed to the NASA Ames Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) office. Information regarding process and Point of Contact (POC) can be located at the following site:

<http://www.nasa.gov/centers/ames/business/foia/#.VN0q0C6sGFh>

3. QUESTION:

Question: Please clarify the Phase-in period that should be considered in this effort.

ANSWER:

The anticipated phase in period is expected to be 60 days. CLIN 01 and paragraph F.2(a) has been revised via RFP amendment two dated 25 Feb 2015.

4. QUESTION:

Question: Request validation that Attachment 5 is indicative of the essential personnel (as related to clause H.2 "Key Personnel and Facilities (NFS 1852.235-71)), and request their resumes and relative seniority related to past performance for consideration.

ANSWER:

Clause H.2 "Key Personnel and Facilities (NFS 1852.235-71) (MAR 1989)" is a fill-in clause in which the Offeror identifies and submits the list of Key Personnel proposed for the NAMS effort.

The NAMS RFP attachment titled "Core Position Description" describes the skill sets necessary to fulfill the Core effort under NAMS. The Government does not identify key personnel.

5. QUESTION:

Question: Request list of existing open source (OS) software that may require enhancements that are anticipated to be part of this solicitation.

ANSWER:

Specific open source software will be identified at the Project/Task Order level.

6. QUESTION:

Question: Please clarify what "science" elements are considered part of the Core relative to the SOW.

ANSWER:

The SOW is revised via RFP amendment two dated 25 Feb 2015 to replace the noted language for Section 3.0 with the following:

“The Core elements will be in the body of the Aeronautics directorate work, in the areas of Air Traffic Management Automation and UAS, in the Science directorate, and in the Aeroflightdynamics directorate work, in the areas of Aeromechanics, Human Systems and Flight Control.”

7. QUESTION:

The RFP says phase-in is 30 days (no more than 30 days), page 12, F.2 Period of Performance. The SOW says a maximum of 60 days, page 25, 4.1 Phase-In.

Which is correct?

ANSWER:

The anticipated phase in period is expected to be 60 days. CLIN 01 and paragraph F.2(a) has been revised via RFP amendment two dated 25 Feb 2015.

8. QUESTION:

In paragraph 3.3.7.3 of the SOW it states that the Department of Defense imposes special requirements for software distribution to external user community via the Software Transfer Agreement (STA) program.

The question is: What are the specific DoD/Army policies/regulations that outline this STA requirement and can we get copies of them?

ANSWER:

The STA is an agreement document developed by the Army, NASA, and the contractor for the distribution, usage and support of specific U.S Army software tools. The STA will be developed after award with the contractor.

9. QUESTION:

In Section J.1 – List of attachments, table within (b):

Please confirm the correct number of pages in each attachment:

Attachment 1 – 3 pages are included

Attachment 4 – only 1 page is included (are we missing any?)

Attachment 5 – 10 pages are included

Attachment 6 – only 1 page is included (are we missing any?)

Attachment 7 – 2 pages are included

ANSWER:

The table for J.1 “List of Documents, Exhibits, and Attachments (ARC 52.211-90) (FEB 1997) paragraph (b) is updated via RFP amendment two as stated below:

(b) The following documents, exhibits, and attachments with exception of Attachment 3 are included only in the solicitation.

Attachment Number	Title	No. of Pages
1	Core Position Descriptions/Qualifications	3
2	Proposal Cover Sheet (JA Form 038) - Exhibit 1	1

3	Pricing Template Workbook - Exhibits 2 - 19	22
4	Contract Facilities Capital Cost of Money (DD Form 1861)	1
5	Cover Letter and Past Performance Questionnaire	10
6	Facility Capital Cost of Money Computation (Form CASB-CMF)	1
7	Quarterly Contractor Financial Management Report (NF 533Q)	2
8	Monthly Contractor Financial Management Report (NF 533M)	2
9	Questions and Answers	6

10. QUESTION:

RFP B.5—Limitations on Period of Performance – Page 7; SOW Section 3.2.1 – Page 12. The RFP’s two year base period plus one 2- year option, and one 1-year option is problematic from the point of view of the multi-year needs of faculty and graduate students. This structure, plus the general practice of funding specific tasks on a year-to-year basis creates an obstacle to academic research engagement. – How can academic engagement via IDIQ tasks effectively support the multi-year needs of graduate students and tenure-track faculty given SOW 3.2.1?

ANSWER:

There is no change to the period of performance structure stated in the RFP. Staffing and continuity of research are the responsibility of the contractor.

11. QUESTION:

SOW Sections 3.2.1 and 3.2.2 – Page 12. It is not clear how the requirements for academic collaboration and knowledge dissemination under “General Requirements” will be funded. -- Will these elements be funded within IDIQ tasks, or is the expectation that they will be funded by the bidder? If they are to be covered under IDIQ tasks, please consider specifying a min/max range of funding for academic collaboration.

ANSWER:

Academic collaboration and knowledge dissemination are general requirements applicable to all work performed under the contract. Specific requirements will be determined at a Task Order (IDIQ) level.

12. QUESTION:

SOW Section 3.2.1 and 3.2.2 – Page 12. It is not clear how the requirements for academic collaboration and knowledge dissemination under “General Requirements” will be funded with respect to management. -- Will these elements be covered under the management task (CLIN 2A) or is the expectation that they will be funded by the bidder?

ANSWER:

Academic collaboration and knowledge dissemination are general requirements applicable to all work performed under the contract. Specific requirements will be determined at a Task Order (IDIQ) level.

13. QUESTION:

RFP L.9.I.B.2.e) – Organizational Structure/Partnering Approach/Contract Management – Page 96. “Demonstrate effective understanding of the value of rapid, responsive management decisions and immediate engagement between management and technical personnel. Explain the Offeror’s plan for a physical management workspace, whether collocated or remote, and how this will support regular on-site interactions. Note: The Government currently has no plans to provide office space for contract management functions.” However, RFP M.2.A. I.B.2.d) – Page 125 states the following: “The Offeror’s approach to providing timely, responsive management decisions through active engagement of management personnel will be evaluated for credibility and likelihood of success. The plan for remote or on-site management workspace will be evaluated for feasibility and effectiveness.” -- The two references

above seem to be contradictory in that the Section L reference states that the Government has “no plans to provide office space for contract management functions” while the Section M reference states that the plan for remote OR on-site management workspace will be evaluated. Please clarify the government’s intent.

ANSWER:

There are no plans to provide government-furnished office space for contract management functions through the NAMS contract. Space may be available through the NASA Research Park under appropriate and authorized leasing arrangements if the Offeror chooses to have contract management on-site.

13. QUESTION:

RFP B.1 – CLIN 01 – Page 2 and RFP F.2.(a) – Page 12; SOW Section 4.1 – Page 25. The RFP specifies a 30 day Phase-In. The SOW states: “The Contractor shall accomplish the phase-in process as expeditiously as possible, with a maximum phase-in time of 60 days.”-- It is suggested that the referenced statements in the RFP be changed to reflect a 60-day phase-in as specified in the SOW to ensure adequate time to successfully migrate from the current UARC structure to the new NAMS structure.

ANSWER:

The anticipated phase in period is expected to be 60 days. CLIN 01 and paragraph F.2(a) has been revised via RFP amendment two dated 25 Feb 2015.

14. QUESTION:

RFP B.2 – Estimated Cost and Fixed Fee – Page 6. “The estimated cost of CLINs 02E, 03E and 04E and fixed fee will be negotiated for each task order. The rate of X% of total estimated costs will be used to calculate fee; however, the CO may determine that risk warrants fee to be negotiated at a different rate for a particular task order.” -- Please explain the criteria by which NASA will determine “risk” as the basis for negotiating fixed-fee on a task order by task order basis, and if it is possible that fee on ID/IQ task orders could be higher than the fee associated with the Core CLINs.

ANSWER:

Ames will utilize the criteria explained in the NASA FAR Supplement (NFS) 1815.404-471 “NASA structured approach for profit or fee objective” to assist with determining the appropriate fee for a given task order. Although it is expected that most IDIQ tasks will be similar in risk to the Core requirements, there may be instances where associated risks (and the corresponding fee) vary. The utilization of another fee rate for ID/IQ tasks other than the X% rate for the Core work would be considered an exception and not the norm.

15. QUESTION:

RFP G.1.II NASA FAR Supplement 1852.245-71 – Page 14. Entries for office space, office furniture, and other government property are checked, but with a proviso of “TBD at Task Order Level”. Since only the ID/IQ CLINs are defined as Task Orders, do the check marks apply to all Core activities, and the TBD is only for the ID/IQ Task Orders? Please clarify.

ANSWER:

The language “TBD at Task Order Level” will be revised to “TBD at Project/Task Order Level” on amendment two of the RFP dated 25 Feb 2015.

16. QUESTION:

RFP L.9.II.B.3 – Past Performance Questionnaires – Page 105. “No Later Than 20 Feb 2014” is stated as the deadline to “email a list of contracts from whom the Offeror’s team (Offeror and any proposed major

subcontractor/s) have requested past performance information to the NASA Ames Research Center Contracting Officer". It is assumed that the correct deadline is 20 Feb 2015. Please confirm.

ANSWER:

The correct date is 20 Feb 2015 and this is revised in the RFP amendment two dated 25 Feb 2015.

17. QUESTION:

RFP L.9.III.7 – Proposal Prime/Subcontractor Information Summary – Page 115. "All Offerors shall submit a completed TABLE 1 for prime, each team member. . . Subcontractors valued at \$1M or greater to submit a completed TABLE 5 below for all their subs . . ." The only table shown is TABLE 1. Is the request for TABLE 5 a typo?

ANSWER:

The referenced sentence in Section L is updated in RFP amendment two dated 25 Feb 2015 as follows:

"All Offerors shall submit a completed TABLE 1 for the prime, each team member and all subcontractors having a contract value of \$1 million or greater to provide information for use by NASA in the public contract award notification. Subcontractors valued at \$1 million or greater are to submit a completed TABLE 1 below for all of their subcontractors with a value of \$1 million or greater."

18. QUESTION:

RFP M.2.A.I.B.3 – Case Study: Sustainability (Oral) – Page 125. The following statement includes reference to TBL although the requirements in Section L.9, I.B.3. – Case Study 4: Sustainability (Oral, Written) – no longer include any specific reference to TBL. "With respect to the Oral presentation of this Case Study, the Government will review the Offeror's applicable institutional strategic approach to sustainability to evaluate the degree to which it demonstrates a clear understanding of, and ability to meet, Triple Bottom Line (TBL) objectives." Please clarify.

ANSWER:

The referenced sentence in Section M is updated in RFP amendment two dated 25 Feb 2015 as follows:

"With respect to the Oral presentation of this Case Study, the Government will review the Offeror's applicable institutional strategic approach to sustainability to evaluate the degree to which it demonstrates a clear understanding of economic, social, and environmental impacts on sustainability objectives."

19. QUESTION:

The reference to Core work in the statement of: "The Core elements will be in the body of the Aeronautics directorate work, in the areas of Air Traffic Management Automation and UAS, and in the Aeroflightdynamics directorate work, in the areas of Aeromechanics, Human Systems and Flight Control" does not include the Core work defined in CLIN 02D – Science Directorate per B.1.(a) in the RFP. Please clarify.

ANSWER:

The SOW is revised via RFP amendment two dated 25 Feb 2015 to replace the noted language for Section 3.0 with the following:

"The Core elements will be in the body of the Aeronautics directorate work, in the areas of Air Traffic Management Automation and UAS, in the Science directorate, and in the Aeroflightdynamics directorate work, in the areas of Aeromechanics, Human Systems and Flight Control."

20. QUESTION:

SOW 3.1.1.1 – Page 5. "Aero-Acoustics Engineering and Software" is described after the statement "The technical Core elements of this contract shall include the following Aeronautics requirements". However, this requirement is not designated as (Core) in its title, as is done for "Air Traffic Management" and "Unmanned Aircraft Systems in the NAS".

ANSWER:

Aero-Acoustics Engineering and Software is not Core work. A revision to the SOW via RFP amendment two dated 25 Feb 2015 clarifies this.

21. QUESTION:

Per the Addendum that just came out, do all team subcontractors also need to be degree granting institutions or non-profit organizations?

ANSWER:

The competition limitation for the NAMS RFP is specific to the prime contractor.