

Questions and Answers Submitted for DRFP NNG14499015
Systems Engineering Advanced Services
October 1, 2014

Question 1: Section L.14 first paragraph, Draft RFP calls for a Phase-In-Plan. Please provide the current contract's Phase-Out Plan

Government's Response: The Government does not currently have a phase-out plan and does not anticipate providing one as part of this solicitation. Once an award is made on the SEAS procurement, the Government may exercise its rights for a phase-out plan with the incumbent contract under FAR 52.237-3, Continuity of Services.

Question 2: Section L.14, 3rd paragraph, Draft RFP states: "*The offeror shall describe its strategy for using (or not using) significant subcontractors.*" The Draft RFP provides three different definitions of significant subcontractor (Att K, Past Performance, and Cost). We assume the Mission Suitability definition (10% of the GPM) is the definition to be used. Are we correct in our assumption?

Government's Response: In regards to L.14, para (3) significant subcontractors are defined as subcontractors expected to exceed 10% or more of the Government Pricing Model's (GPM) total estimated cost value. An example on calculation is provided in the DRFP.

Question 3: Section L.14, 2nd paragraph Draft RFP appears to call for position descriptions in the Mission Suitability Volume (Note typo, incomplete sentence: "*written position descriptions for the specific labor categories envisioned for this requirement.*") and in Attachment B, but the PDs are not part of the excluded page limitations in the Mission Suitability Volume. The Page Limitations Table in Section L excludes Position Descriptions in the Cost Volume. We recommend that the Position Descriptions be included in the Mission suitability Volume and not be part of the page count

Government's Response: In the final RFP Position Qualifications (position descriptions) are to be submitted in the Cost Volume **only** (per the table in Section L.12.b.1).

Question 4: Reference: Section L.12(a)4, Proposal Preparation- General Instructions (GSFC 52.215-201) (JUN 2014) (Page 93)

Background: After enumerating specific requirements for the CD-ROM label information, the final paragraph on this page instructs "The Offeror shall provide written documentation that describes the contents of each CD-ROM and each file."

Question: Where is this written documentation to be published in the proposal?

Government Response: This "written documentation" is a level of detail regarding the CD-ROM contents. It may be imprinted on the CD-ROM or included as a printed insert to the CD

Questions and Answers Submitted for DRFP NNG14499015
Systems Engineering Advanced Services
October 1, 2014

ROM case. It is not part of any specific proposal volume nor subject to any page limitation. It is essentially a table of contents for the CD-ROMs submitted with the offer.

Question 5: Section L13. (c)(6) and L.16 (a), we recommend having all cost information in the Cost Volume only. The Draft RFP is asking that we provide cost information in the Offer and Past Performance Volumes

Government's Response: Section L13.(c)(6) is a Subcontractor Listing, "The Offeror shall provide a summary listing (by name and address) of all subcontractors (regardless of dollar value) that have been identified throughout the Offeror's proposal and the subcontract value associated with each entity (GPM value). Section L.16 (a) is past performance and values deal with determination of past performance and is not a cost metric but a past performance metric. At this time the Government does not anticipate changing the final RFP for the sections noted above.

Question 6: Section L.12 (a)(5), Since Section L requires addressing the RTO requirements in the proposal, but not each SOW requirement, for consistency and clarity we recommend changing the sentence, "*The proposal shall include a matrix showing where in the proposal the technical requirements of the SOW and the evaluation criteria of this RFP are satisfied (i.e. SOW elements versus Offeror's proposal page numbers).*" The revised sentence should read, "*The proposal shall include a matrix showing where in the proposal the evaluation criteria of this RFP are satisfied.*"

Government's Response: The final RFP will indicate that "The proposal shall include a matrix showing where in the proposal the evaluation criteria of this RFP are satisfied."

Question 7: L.12 (a)(4) requests that electronic copies be provided in Microsoft Word and Excel for Windows XP. Windows XP is no longer supported by Microsoft Corporation, is insecure, and is not allowed in the GSFC environment. We suggest specifying the required version of MS Office (Word, Excel) files as 2003 or higher.

Government's Response: L.12 (a)(4) will be changed to read MS Office (Word, Excel) files as 2003 or higher.

Question 8: Section L.14, Subfactor B - RTO2, 2nd Paragraph, Correct reference to RTO 1 to indicate RTO 2.

Government's Response: Government will correct reference to RTO 1 to indicate RTO 2.

Question 9: Section L15 item 2(c) Draft RFP states: "*The Prime Offeror shall complete the OFFEROR MANAGEMENT and ADMINISTRATIVE HOURS/COSTS Section of Exhibit 1A.*" The Draft RFP further states: "*For evaluation purposes, all Management Costs shall be assumed Onsite and all Administrative Costs shall be assumed Offsite.*" Exhibit 1A is in conflict with the

Questions and Answers Submitted for DRFP NNG14499015
Systems Engineering Advanced Services
October 1, 2014

instructions as it contains only one spreadsheet for Management/Administrative costs, and it is labeled “*Offeror Management/Administrative OFFSITE Hours/Costs.*” Please resolve

Government’s Response: Exhibit 1A will be modified to be consistent with the final RFP’s language: “For evaluation purposes, all Management Costs shall be assumed Onsite and all Administrative Costs shall be assumed Offsite.”

Question 10: Section L15 item 2(e) Draft RFP states: “*For Exhibit 2B, Offerors will note that all Management labor categories shall be proposed using On-site rates and all Administrative labor categories shall be proposed using Offsite rates.*” Exhibit 2B is in conflict with the instructions, as Onsite is marked “NA” on form and allows only for Offsite rates for both Management and Administrative. Please resolve.

Government’s Response: Exhibit 2b will be modified to be consistent with the final RFP’s language. Management labor categories shall be proposed using On-site rates and all Administrative labor categories shall be proposed using Offsite rates.

Question 11: Section L15 item 2(i) Draft RFP states: “*Offerors shall propose the total firm-fixed price associated with the 45 day phase-in.....*” and “*Exhibits 8 and 8A shall be used to state the proposed price for the phase-in.....*” This is in conflict with Exhibit 8, which is titled “Phase-In Cost Plus Award Fee.” Also, there is no Exhibit labeled 8A. Please resolve

Government’s Response: The title on Exhibit 8 will be corrected in the final RFP to read, Phase-in Firm Fixed Price. Exhibit 8A is on the same tab as Exhibit 8 located further down the page.

Question 12: Section L.14 (3), page 104, first paragraph and L.15 (I), page 115 and Section M.4 COST EVALUATION FACTOR GSFC 52.215-323 (JAN 2014), page 130 – Phase-in Plan, Since the incumbent contractor or any Offeror with the incumbent will have a substantial cost competitive advantage in proposing the firm-fixed-price order, would the Government consider removing the Phase-In Plan price from the evaluated cost for the purpose of source selection to promote a more balanced competition?

Government’s Response: It is our standard practice to present the proposed phase in cost of each offeror to the SSA, as it represents part of the cost to the Government.

Question 13: Exhibit 1A GPM, The GPM contains two labor categories with labor hours that have no associated position descriptions, Flight Dynamics Engineer 3 and Thermal Engineer. Please provide position descriptions for those labor categories.

Government’s Response: Position qualifications for those labor categories will be provided in the final RFP.

Questions and Answers Submitted for DRFP NNG14499015
Systems Engineering Advanced Services
October 1, 2014

Question 14: Exhibit 1A GPM Is the GPM intended to be a representative sample of the total labor hours expected or is it intended to reflect the total contract labor hours expected? If a representative sample, what percentage of the expected total contract hours does it represent?

Government's Response: The GPM hours are for estimating purposes and may or may not reflect the total contract labor hours.

Question 15: Exhibit 1A GPM, the GPM classifies 25% of the labor force as off-site. Can you confirm that number?

Government's Response: Exhibit 1A GPM is confirmed to be correct in that 25% of the labor force for estimating purposes is off-site.

Question 16: Enclosure A, Position Descriptions – 6th entry in the table says “SEAS” when it probably should say “Flight Dynamics Engineer 3” based on the GPM.

Government's Response: Enclosure A, Position qualifications will be updated accordingly in the final RFP.

Question 17: There currently is no Task Order data in the eLibrary representative of the current contract. Does the Government plan to make that information available, and if so when?

Government's Response: The Government posted task order data in the e-library late last week.

Question 18: Given that there is an incumbent contractor, will the Government provide an estimated number of Secret, Top Secret and Top Secret/SCI cleared employees presently required or projected to be required to complete all classified work assignments?

Government's Response: Presently there is one secret position, RF Engineer. It is difficult to project what the requirements may be during the contract's period of performance.

Question 19: L.15 (2)(a). Reference to “incumbent labor rates provided in Enclosure A.” Enclosure A has the labor categories and position descriptions, but no labor rates. Cover page for Enclosure A indicates labor rates will be provided in RFP. Please provide incumbent labor rates as soon as possible prior to Final RFP, to ensure fairness in competition.

Government's Response: Available incumbent labor rates will be provided in Enclosure A at final RFP posting or before.

Question 20: L.16 – Past Performance. In cases where a bidder's (prime or subcontractor) past performance reference would normally be provided by another contractor that is also bidding on the SEAS contract, there is a concern that the contractor may have a conflict of interest when it comes to providing an objective and unbiased past performance reference and may choose to

Questions and Answers Submitted for DRFP NNG14499015
Systems Engineering Advanced Services
October 1, 2014

provide an N/R (Not Rated) response. When evaluating past performance, would the Government consider contacting civil servant references in addition to the references provided through customer questionnaires, if the civil servant reference is clearly aware of the quality of the work product provided by a subcontractor?

This solution was provided during the PAAC IV Questions & Answers (Q154) process.

Government's Response: The Government, as necessary, may use civil servant references provided for past performance evaluation.

Question 21: RTO 2: In our solution for RTO 2 are we limited to use only the position descriptions (PDs) provided in the Draft RFP? It appears that PDs are not provided for some of the skills required to accomplish the RTO.

Government Response: Offerors are not limited to using the PDs in the draft RFP; however, offerors must map its proposed positions to the position qualifications provided in the RFP. The Government believes the provided position qualifications incorporate all the positions needed for the RTO's and contract performance.

Question 22: RF Engineer 4

Description is for RF Engineer 3. Please modify the category column or description, including commensurate years of experience.

Government Response: The years of experience and description listed apply to RF Eng. 4; the category column will be changed from RF Engineer 3 to read RF Engineer 4; the PD will be updated accordingly.

Question 23: Thermal Engineer

Description is for Thermal Engineer 2. Please modify the category column or description, including commensurate years of experience.

Government Response: The years of experience in the PD applies to Thermal Engineer, the description portion of this PD is for a Thermal Engineer: The correct title and description will be changed in the final RFP to Thermal Engineer and corrected in the PD Exhibit B.

Question 24: Section L.13 (9)

DSS will not grant a Facility Security Clearance until after a contract has been awarded, therefore, being a new entity, a new joint venture offeror cannot obtain a facility clearance prior to contract award. To require a facility clearance prior to contract award would eliminate newly formed joint venture companies from submitting bids for this procurement, thereby restricting competition. Suggest rewording of requirement to state: "*....Offeror does not have to possess a Top Secret level facility security clearance at proposal submission or prior to award, but is only*

Questions and Answers Submitted for DRFP NNG14499015
Systems Engineering Advanced Services
October 1, 2014

required to describe in detail their approach for obtaining this clearance prior to the effective date of the contract (at the end of contract phase-in)."

Government Response: The Government is still assessing this feedback and will provide a complete response as soon as possible. We do not anticipate any changes to the actual Top Secret facility security clearance requirements.

Question 25: For RTO1: Is there an estimated date for the MCR? POP start January 1, 2016 with 36-months and a PDR at 34-months; should we just use the 7120.5E template? We have the same question for the MPDR and for SIR in RTO 2.

Government Response: Based on the information provided in RTO 1 and RTO 2, the government believes there is sufficient information for offeror to establish credible schedules for RTO 1 and RTO 2, including project review dates. Establishing a schedule is part of the RTO response and is required as a deliverable item in each of the RTOs. 7120.5E is a suitable guideline to use in establishing project milestones.

Question 26: For RTO 1 subtask 3: Does the "ground systems architecture and requirements" include both subcomponent and component assembly and test at GSFC, as well as at KSC during post shipment checkout and final launch processing?

Government Response: No, "ground systems architecture and requirements" does NOT include "both subcomponent and component assembly and test"; the draft ground systems requirements document due at MCR is at a high level and does not go down to the level of detail implied by the question.

Question 27: For RTO 2 subtask 3: Subtask indicates that building and certifying GSE for environmental testing is required, but GSE is not a deliverable, nor is a date given. It seems unlikely the Government would allow the contractor to use only internal certification processes, and to retain design/control of GSE. Should we assume a delivery process for GSE to NASA as part of this subtask?

Government Response: RTO 2, subtask 3, item 2 will be revised FROM: "Design, manufacture and certify" TO: "Define the requirements for"; there are no deliveries of hardware associated with this task.

Question 28: For RTO 2 subtask 3: "All work will be performed on site at GSFC, unless otherwise stated." Does this include fabrication of the environmental GSE, or can the contractor use qualified, off-site subcontractors to perform this task?

Government Response: RTO 2, subtask 3, item 2 will be revised FROM: "Design, manufacture and certify" TO: "Define the requirements for"; there are no deliveries of hardware associated with this task.

Questions and Answers Submitted for DRFP NNG14499015
Systems Engineering Advanced Services
October 1, 2014

Question 29: For RTO responses, the Government requests "the flow of activities from start to completion (including time line)". This suggests the request for a schedule for RTO responses. Given that schedules are generally developed electronically, can this portion of the RTO response be provided electronically, or can the schedules be provided outside of page count? This will allow offerors to provide a more comprehensive schedule that is likely easier to review, and reduce the chance of condensed format schedules within RTO responses.

Government Response: Submissions should follow the instructions outlined in the final RFP. Page count has been extended to 75 and the RTO's schedule/s will remain as a part of the page count.

Question 30: For RTO1: The Government states "NASA has agreements with several interested countries in these observation zones who want to participate in using the fire detection data of this mission.". Further, the RTO states that each member country will be provided with an ops center. Beyond the items provided in the MOA, does the Government expect routine collaboration or coordination with member countries?

Government Response: Yes the Government expects routine collaboration or coordination with member countries.

Question 31: RTO1 references an "ABC mission" of which the mandate is to "globally find and track forest and brush fires from the tropics to the temperate zone". RTO2 references "Project X" with what appears to be the same mandate. Are offerors to assume that RTO1 and RTO2 are completely separate projects, or that they refer to different elements of the same spacecraft? On the surface it would appear the intent is to be a single spacecraft, however specific elements, such as the intended launch system differ between the two RTOs. RTO1 lists the Delta II 7900-series which RTO2 lists the Taurus. Will the Government please clarify the relationship (or lack thereof) between the two RTOs.

Government Response: There is no relationship between the two RTOs and offerors should treat RTO 1 and RTO 2 as separate projects.

Question 32: Section E.2 Higher-Level Contract Quality Requirement (page 17): Will the Government provide a new link to the Quality Management System (QMS) requirements which are documented on-line in the GSFC QMS system? The link provided in the DRFP does not work.

Government Response: The link has been removed and the clause will be updated.

Question 33: Will the Government please verify its evaluation criteria for Past Performance submitted by a Joint Venture as the Prime Offeror? It is our understanding that Past Performance of the Joint Venture partners at the prime level will be evaluated the same regardless of whether

Questions and Answers Submitted for DRFP NNG14499015
Systems Engineering Advanced Services
October 1, 2014

the past performance citing is that of the Majority partner 8(a) company or the Minority partner company of the Joint Venture. Please verify that this is a correct interpretation.

Government Response: Your stated interpretation is correct. Past Performance of the Joint Venture partners at the prime level will be evaluated the same regardless of whether the past performance citing is that of the Majority partner 8(a) company or the Minority partner company of the Joint Venture.

Question 34: Reference: Section D.2, Identification and Marking of Government Equipment (1852.245-74)(JAN 2011) (Page 15)

Background: This section of the RFP provides details of requirements for marking Government Equipment, including use of Data Matrix Identification Symbols.

Question: (1) Will the provided GFP be marked in accordance with these requirements prior to receipt by the SEAS Contractor? (2) If not, will the SEAS Contractor be required to re-tag and mark all GFP in accordance with these requirements or will commonly-used NASA ECN, 1-dimensional barcode tags be acceptable for marking GFP?

Government Response: (1) NFS 1852.245-74 Identification and Marking of Government Equipment (JAN 2011) is a property specific requirement limited to equipment items to be delivered to the Government, on B.1 Deliverable List. NASA intends that this clause will assist the administration in the identification and control of equipment items that qualify for internal management recordkeeping and controls on delivery to the agency. (2) Any Government property furnished to the contractor will already be tagged with our ECN number and is not required to be retagged.

Question 35: Reference: Section J.1, Attachment B, Direct Labor Rates, Indirect Rates, and Fee Matrices

Background: This attachment requires Offeror data for Contract Years 1 through 6. However, the Pricing Exhibits provided with the DRFP are set up for Contract Years 1 through 5

Question: Will the Government resolve the apparent inconsistency between these requirements in Attachment B and the Pricing Exhibits?

Government Response: The Government will not be revising Attachment B and Pricing Exhibits to be consistent with one another. There is not a discrepancy between the docs. The GPM (cost exhibits) cover the 5 year performance period. We ask offerors to provide year 6 rates in the matrix in case we issue work within the 5 year effective ordering period that extends into year 6.

Question 36: Reference: Section L.12(a)5, Proposal Format and Organization (Page 94)

Questions and Answers Submitted for DRFP NNG14499015
Systems Engineering Advanced Services
October 1, 2014

Background: This Section L requirement states that “The proposal shall include a matrix showing where in the proposal the technical requirements of the SOW and the evaluation criteria of this RFP are satisfied (i.e. SOW element versus Offeror’s proposal page numbers).”

Question: (1) Is this SOW Compliance Matrix only required to be provided for the Mission Suitability Volume? (2) Since Offerors primarily are addressing Representative Task Orders, rather than the SOW per se, will the Government please clarify how the matrix will be used and evaluated?

Government Response: The final RFP when posted will indicate that “*The proposal shall include a matrix showing where in the proposal the evaluation criteria of this RFP are satisfied.*”

Question 37: Reference: Section L.14.3 Subfactor C – Management Approach (Page 103)

Background: The second paragraph on this page appears to be missing text at the start of the paragraph.

Question: Will the Government supply the beginning of the sentence for “written position descriptions for the specific labor categories envisioned for this requirement”?

Government Response: “Offerors shall provide” will be added to the beginning of the incomplete sentence at the start of the paragraph.

Question 38: Reference: Section L.14.3 Subfactor C – Management Approach (Page 103)

Background: The second complete paragraph on this page indicates that Offerors shall provide “written position qualifications for the specific labor categories envisioned for this requirement.” The instructions for Volume III Cost Proposal (Page 109), 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.” Additionally, the table in Section L.12(b)1 indicates that each Position Qualification is limited to one page per description. Plus, Section L contains a requirement for a “a matrix that cross-references the offeror-developed Position Descriptions with the Government-provided labor Position Descriptions.”

Question: (1) Since the Government has already identified 26 Position Categories in the Government Pricing Model, and at even two Position Categories per page this will consume 13 pages of the 50 page limit specified for the entire Mission Suitability Volume and the Government has an additional requirement for a matrix, can this information be excluded from the Page Limit for the Mission Suitability Volume? (2) Does this identical information need to be published in both the Mission Suitability Volume as well as the Cost Volume? (3) We suggest clarifying that the Mission Suitability Volume may include a reference to the Cost Volume for

Questions and Answers Submitted for DRFP NNG14499015
Systems Engineering Advanced Services
October 1, 2014

the details associated with the proposed Position Descriptions. This would be consistent with the revised final RFP instructions received under the GSFC/MIST procurement.

Government Response: Page limit has been increased to 75 pages in Mission Suitability. In the final RFP Position Qualifications (position descriptions) are to be submitted in the Cost Volume only (per the table in Section L.12.b.1).

Question 39: Reference: Section L.14.3 Subfactor C – Management Approach (Page 103); M.3.1 Subfactor C – Management Approach (Pages 126-127)

Background: The third complete paragraph on Page 103 begins with statements regarding Significant Subcontractors and goes on to list four numbered requirements.

Question: Do these four enumerated requirements apply only to Significant Subcontractors or do they apply to all proposed subcontractors whether or not they are significant?

Government Response: In Section L.14.3 Subfactor C – Management Approach (Page 103); M.3.1 Subfactor C – Management Approach (Pages 126-127) the four enumerated requirements apply only to Significant Subcontractors.

Question 40: Reference: Section L.14.3 Subfactor C – Management Approach (Page 103); M.3.1 Subfactor C – Management Approach (Pages 126-127)

Background: The third complete paragraph on Page 103 lists four numbered requirements. Item number 4 reads as follows: “methods of management and reporting to GSFC of subcontractors' financial and technical plans and performance.” In contrast, Section M's item number 4 reads as follows: “methods of managing subcontractor performance, including plans for addressing any problems that arise as a result of poor and/or non-performance of subcontracted portions of the contract for reasonableness, relevance and adequacy.” These requirements are not entirely parallel.

Question: Will the Government resolve the apparent inconsistency between these requirements in Sections L and M?

Government Response: Section M's item 4 will be changed to be parallel with Section L and the final RFP shall read: “and 4) methods of management and reporting to GSFC of subcontractors' financial and technical plans and performance, for reasonableness, relevance and adequacy”.

Question 41: Reference: Section L.14.3 Subfactor C – Management Approach (Page 103)

Background: The second to the last full paragraph on this page instructs the offeror to address periods of high work volume with respect to engineering services and manufacturing and testing.

Questions and Answers Submitted for DRFP NNG14499015
Systems Engineering Advanced Services
October 1, 2014

Question: Since it is our understanding that the SEAS contract would have very limited, if any, manufacturing expected during the execution of the Statement of Work, would the Government explain the extent and type of manufacturing that should be addressed in response to this instruction?

Government Response: Manufacturing will be removed and the paragraph will read: “The offeror shall describe what management approach their firm brings to understanding and managing multiple tasks for contracts of this magnitude. With respect to engineering services and testing, describe how the offeror will accommodate periods of high work volumes in order to maintain Project(s) schedules”.

Question 42: Reference: Section L.15.2(c), Government Pricing Model (Page 111)

Background: The instructions state “For evaluation purposes, all Management costs shall be assumed Onsite and all Administration costs shall be assumed offsite.”

Question: Will the Government provide further clarification on the expected delineation between “Management” (e.g., business manager, program manager, group managers) versus “Administration” (e.g., subcontract management, project control, clerical, financial)?

Government Response: The Government does not anticipate any further delineation between management and administrative costs. This could vary depending on the offerors approach.

Question 43: Reference: Section L.15.2(l), Phase-in Plan (Page 115); Cost Exhibits

Background: This section states that the Phase-in Period is 45 days and starts July 1, 2015.

Question: May we assume for the Cost Exhibits that CY1 starts August 15, 2015?

Government Response: GPM Cost Exhibit should be proposed with a start date of August 16, 2015 and ends on August 15, 2020. The GPM is based on contract year.

Question 44: Reference: Exhibit A, Representative Task Orders (RTOs)

Background: Typically RTOs provide the Project Review schedule. All deliverable due dates are related to Project review (i.e. 1 week prior to PDR).

Question: Would the government provide the dates for the major Project Reviews in the RTOs?

Government Response: The Government will not be providing dates: based on the information provided in RTO 1 and RTO 2, the government believes there is sufficient information for offeror to establish credible dates for the major Project Reviews for RTO 1 and RTO 2.

Question 45: Reference: Exhibit A, Representative Task Orders (RTOs), SEAS Representative Task Order 1 (RTO 1) (Page 2)

Questions and Answers Submitted for DRFP NNG14499015
Systems Engineering Advanced Services
October 1, 2014

Background: In the RTO task background description and science requirements table, the following goals and requirements were specified:

- Global coverage in temperate region 40 degrees N&S latitude
- Near-real time images
- Repeat imaging no more than 120 minutes

These goals appear to compete with each other with no overlap possible. Repeat imaging no more than 120 minutes implies near-continuous coverage over the area in question, requiring a GEO-type mission. Global coverage cannot be achieved with a GEO-type mission. You cannot obtain repeat imaging (more than 1 repeat image of the same general area) due to orbit dynamics.

Question: Do you really want repeating images less than 120 minutes apart or do you want at least 1 repeat image of the same area that is no more than 120 minutes apart? Please clarify this requirement.

Government Response: Near real time refers to the ability of the satellite and ground system to output results quickly as it takes images, not continuous near-real time coverage of the entire temperate zone. The goal is to be able to repeat an observation within 120 minutes if the first observation triggered an event, so the requirement is to have at least 1 repeat image of the same area that is no more than 120 minutes apart. This will be made clear in the updated RTO 1

Question 46: Reference: Exhibit A, Representative Task Orders (RTOs), SEAS Representative Task Order 1 (RTO 1) (Page 2)

Background: Table 1 – Science Requirements includes a requirement for Ground Resolution.

Question: Can the Government please clarify the ground resolution requirement in RTO 1 Table 1? We suggest revising the Table in RTO 1 to indicate that the ground resolution requirement applies when the instrument is in true nadir pointing configuration.

Government Response: RTO 1 will be updated to specify the ground resolution requirement applies when the instrument is in true nadir pointing configuration.

Question 47: Reference: Exhibit A, Representative Task Orders (RTOs), SEAS Representative Task Order 1 (RTO 1) (Page 3)

Background: The Statement of Work states “The spacecraft will be designed and built at GSFC and the payload (telescope and instrument) will be designed, built and verified by a contracting aerospace company.” In Subtask 2, the SEAS contractor is asked to provide the payload (telescope and instrument) preliminary design including providing the full PDR presentation package. This appears to be inconsistent since the outside contractor is usually responsible for the payload preliminary design if they are designing, building, and verifying the payload.

Question: In Subtask 2, what is the SEAS contractor role versus the payload contractor’s role?

Questions and Answers Submitted for DRFP NNG14499015
Systems Engineering Advanced Services
October 1, 2014

Government Response: The RTO 1 Subtask 2 will be changed to indicate the payload will be done in-house and subtask 2, items 1 and 2 will be clarified to read 1) Provide systems engineering for a telescope preliminary design; 2) Provide systems engineering for a Science Instrument (SI) preliminary design.

Question 48: Reference: Exhibit A, Representative Task Orders (RTOs), SEAS Representative Task Order 1 (RTO 1) (Page 4)

Background: In Subtask 1, Item 9 the DRFP specifies a requirement to provide a response to an upgrade in the Mission Requirements for housing an additional instrument that measures canopy and soil moisture.

Question: It would be fairly straightforward to delta/upgrade the Mission Requirements if we learn (close to) the very beginning of the Subtask that we would need to accommodate the additional instrument. The Subtask, including the scope, cost, need for design changes, schedule and cost, will grow in proportion to how long after Mission Award we are notified about the additional payload. Will the notification date be revealed in a revised RTO 1?

Government Response: RTO 1 will be updated to indicate that “One month after the start of phase B, NASA HQ will request that an optional capability be considered for this mission.”

Question 49: Reference: Exhibit A, Representative Task Orders (RTOs), SEAS Representative Task Order 1 (RTO 1) (Page 5)

Background: In Subtask 2, Item 9 the DRFP specifies the need to conduct the PDR dry run 3 weeks prior to PDR while the PDR presentation draft is due 6 weeks prior to PDR (Table 4 – Subtask 2 Deliverables). There is a 3 week span between the draft due date and the dry run.

Question: Should Table 4 be modified to change the PDR presentation draft due date to 3 weeks prior to PDR?

Government Response: RTO 1 will be revised to indicate the draft PDR presentation due date will be 4 weeks prior to PDR; this makes the draft PDR available one week before PDR dry run.

Question 50: Reference: Exhibit A, Representative Task Orders (RTOs), SEAS Representative Task Order 1 (RTO 1) (Page 5)

Background: In Subtask 3, Item 2 you specify a requirement to write and provide Interface Requirements Control Documents (IRCDs).

Question: Should the Interface Requirements Control Documents (IRCDs) be **Draft** IRCDs instead of Interface Requirements Control Documents (IRCDs)?

Government Response: Yes, RTO 1 should have specified Draft IRCDs; this will be corrected in the updated RTO 1

Questions and Answers Submitted for DRFP NNG14499015
Systems Engineering Advanced Services
October 1, 2014

Question 51: Reference: Exhibit A, Representative Task Orders (RTOs), SEAS Representative Task Order 2 (RTO 2) (Page 8)

Background: The RTO 2 statement of work states “The overall period of performance is twenty-four months. Work shall start just after completion of Mission Critical Design Review (CDR) and the Payload Pre-Ship Review (PSR) is scheduled for twenty-three months after task award.”

Question: Can the government clarify that what is meant by the Payload PSR is the Observatory PSR, not the Instrument PSR?

Government Response: “Payload PSR” should be “Observatory PSR”; this will be corrected in the updated RTO 2

Question 52 Reference: Exhibit A, Representative Task Orders (RTOs), SEAS Representative Task Order 2 (RTO 2) Subtasks 1 and 2 (Pages 8 and 9)

Background: The numbering of the Subtask elements is out of sequence or elements are missing. For example, Subtask 1 has elements numbered 11 through 20.

Question: Will the Government verify that in RTO 2’s Subtasks 1 and 2 there are no missing Subtask elements and correct the numbering (if necessary)?

Government Response: There are no missing subtask elements; Subtask 1 items should be numbered 1-10, Subtask 2 items should be numbered 1-7. This will be corrected in the updated RTO 2.

Question 53: Reference: Exhibit A, Representative Task Orders (RTOs), SEAS Representative Task Order 2 (RTO 2) Subtask 3 (Page 10)

Background: Table 3 – Subtask 2 Deliverables specifies the delivery of a Final Risk Assessment document 1 month prior to MCR. We assume ‘MCR’ is Mission Concept Review. However, this task supports spacecraft and satellite I&T support, which is well after MCR in the lifecycle. Other final documentation is due 1 month prior to PSR.

Question: Can the Government clarify the due date for the Final Risk Assessment?

Government Response: In Table 3 – Subtask 2 Deliverables, the final Risk Assessment should be due 1 month prior to PSR; this will be corrected in the updated RTO 2.

Question 54: Reference: Exhibit A, Representative Task Orders (RTOs), SEAS Representative Task Order 2 (RTO 2) Subtask 3 (Page 10)

Background: The instructions state, as part of Subtask 3, item 2, “Design, manufacture and certify mechanical and electrical GSE needed to perform environmental tests on the observatory.” This item as it is written is beyond the scope of systems engineering performed on SEAS.

Questions and Answers Submitted for DRFP NNG14499015
Systems Engineering Advanced Services
October 1, 2014

Question: Would the Government consider revising the requirement to read “Define the MGSE and EGSE required to perform environmental tests on the Observatory”?

Government Response: The RTO 2, Subtask 3, item 2 will be updated as suggested to “Define the requirements for...” instead of “Design, manufacture and certify...”

Question 55: Reference: Enclosure A, Position Descriptions

Background: There appear to be some typographical errors in the table of Government-provide Position Descriptions.

Question: (1) Can we assume the Position Description (PD) labeled as “SEAS” should actually be Flight Dynamics Engineer 3 since it appears to be in the Government Pricing Model immediately following the ‘Electrical Engineer 2’? (2) Is there a SEAS PD for Thermal Engineer (listed in Exhibit 1A, Government Pricing Model,)? (3) Is the ‘Multimedia Production Specialist’ in Exhibit 1A the same position as the “Multimedia Specialist” in the PDs? (4) Is the ‘Sr. Systems Engineer – Chief’ in Exhibit 1A the same position as the “Systems Engineer – Chief” in the PDs?

Government Response: There was a corruption of some sort when the Government posted the documents. In response: 1) Yes, the PD labeled “SEAS” should be labeled “Flight Dynamics Engineer 3”; 2) The SEAS PD for Thermal Engineer will be updated in the final RFP; 3) Yes, the PD “Multimedia Specialist” and the Exhibit 1A “Multimedia Production Specialist” are the same position; 4) Yes, the “Sr. Systems Engineer – Chief” and the “Systems Engineer – Chief” are the same positions. These items will be corrected when the PD and GPM documents are updated.

Question 56: Reference: Cost Exhibits 2 and 3

Background: The RFP refers to fixed fee and the Cost Exhibits show award fee.

Question: Will the Government resolve the apparent inconsistency between these requirements in Sections B and L with the Cost Exhibits?

Government Response: The Cost Exhibits will be changed to correctly state/show fixed fee. The anticipated contract is a Cost Plus Fixed Fee IDIQ. This is NOT an award fee contract.

Question 57: Question: Is there any update on the SEAS schedule?

Government Response: RFP is anticipated to post on or about October 20, 2014.

Question 58: Will the Key Positions be defined by the government in the final RFP?

Government Response: The Government is not defining key positions for this requirement.

Questions and Answers Submitted for DRFP NNG14499015
Systems Engineering Advanced Services
October 1, 2014

Question 59: There is no clear mention of the staff security clearance requirements. Will the final RFP specify, if any, of the labor categories require security clearance and the level of security clearance?

Government Response: On the current Contract METS II Bridge there is one secret position of a RF Engineer.

Question 60: RTO-1, Table 1: Are the units on Spectral Resolution nm?

Government Response: No; Spectral Resolution or resolving power is dimensionless and defined by $R = \lambda/\Delta\lambda$, where λ = wavelength; this will be made clear in the updated RTO 1

Question 61: RTO-2, Table 1: Is science data transmitted in the X-band Telemetry channel or is there a separate science data channel? If separate, what frequency band is used?

Government Response: Yes, science data is transmitted in the X-band telemetry channel. Table 1 will be updated to make this clear.