

Questions and Answers for Solicitation NNG15499015R

1. **Reference:** Cover Letter (Page 2); Section 12(b)1 (Page 93); L.12(b)3 (Page 94); L.15.2(g) (Page 112)

Background: The Cover Letter indicates that one of the changes made in the final RFP that may not have been addressed in the Draft RFP Questions and Answers is the deletion of the requirement to price RTO #1. Additionally, the final RFP reflects a modification to L.15.2 that removed the requirement for RTO #1 pricing and the associated requirement for a Basis of Estimate for RTO #1 (which also referred to compliance with the page limitations set forth in Section L.12(b)1). However, Sections L.12(b)1 and L.12(b)3 in the final RFP both continue to state requirements for the Basis of Estimates (BOE).

Question: Is the Page Limit of 35 pages specified in Sections L.12(b)1 and L.12(b)3 no longer applicable since the RTO #1 Basis of Estimate requirement has been deleted or is it to be applied to the only remaining requirement for a Basis of Estimate, which is the GPM Basis of Estimate requirement on Page 112?

Answer: The page limitation set forth in Sections L.12(b)(1) and L.12(b)(3) are still applicable to the Basis of Estimate for the Government Pricing Model.

2. **Reference:** Section J.1, Attachment B; Section L.12(b)1 (Page 93); Section L.13(a) (Page 95); Section L.14.3 Subfactor C (Page 101 - 102)

Background: Section L.13(a) instructs that for the Offer Volume “the indicated Offeror required fill-ins in Sections B-K must be completed.” At the end of the section, the RFP defines TBD and TBP, indicating that the Offeror fill-ins include those places where ‘TBP’ (representing To Be Proposed by the Contractor) appears in RFP Sections B-K. Section L.14.3 Subfactor C, indicates that “Position descriptions are to be submitted in the Cost Volume only (per the table in Section L.12.b.1).”

However, we see that a ‘TBP’ designation appears on Page 5 in Attachment B under the heading ‘6. POSITION DESCRIPTION (For All Prime and Subcontractor Direct Labor Categories)’, which is published in the RFP in Section J.1 as an attachment.

Following the instruction in Section L.13(a) suggests that we also publish Attachment B in the Offer Volume. However, this seems to be in conflict with the instruction in L.14.3 Subfactor C that clearly states that Position Descriptions are to be submitted in the Cost Volume only.

Question: Can the Government clarify if any of the Attachment B Matrices, 1 – 6, must be published in the Offer Volume in addition to the Cost Volume or shall all Attachment B matrices be included in the Cost Volume only?

Answer: All Attachment B matrices shall be included in the Cost Volume only.

3. **Reference:** Section L.12(a)4 (Page 92)

Background: The second paragraph provides an instruction regarding the electronic proposal files. It states that “The Offeror shall provide written documentation that describes the contents of each CD-ROM and of each file.”

Question: We assume that this documentation is not subject to any page limits and that we may provide the documentation at the same location in our proposal as the electronic files. Is this a correct assumption?

Answer: Yes, this information is not subject to the page limitation and should be included in the Offer Volume which does not have a page limitation.

4. **Reference:** Section L.12(a)5 (Page 92)

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

Question: Does this instruction only apply to the Mission Suitability Volume, and not to the Offer, Cost, and Past Performance Volumes?

Answer: Yes, this instruction only applies to the Mission Suitability Volume.

5. **Reference:** Section L.15.2(d) (Page 111)

Background: The RFP states “The Offerors’ and Subcontractors’ individual direct labor categories/rates and indirect rates used in Exhibit 2A to derive the loaded GPM-Specified Non-Management Direct Labor Category Rates (for Exhibit 1A) must match those proposed in Attachment B, DIRECT LABOR RATES, INDIRECT RATES, AND FEE MATRICES.” Does this mean that for any Exhibit 1A labor category which is based on two or more labor rates, that all source labor rates must be included in Attachment B.1 PRIME DIRECT LABOR RATE MATRIX? To further clarify our question, here is a hypothetical example:

We are proposing the COMP SYS ENG/SYS ADMIN labor rate as 50% from an internal rate of \$20.00 per hour and 50% from a salary survey at \$30.00. We enter both sources on Exhibit 2A and the proposed DL for our COMP SYS ENG/SYS ADMIN is \$25.00.

- For Attachment B.1 PRIME DIRECT LABOR RATE MATRIX, do we:
 - Approach 1: Enter COMP SYS ENG/SYS ADMIN with a CY1 rate of \$25.00, or
 - Approach 2: Enter COMP SYS ENG/SYS ADMIN – Internal with a CY1 rate of \$20.00 and COMP SYS ENG/SYS ADMIN – Survey with a CY 1 rate of \$30.00?

Approach 1 would have Attachment B.1 match exactly the blended DL rate in Exhibit 2A. Approach 2 would have Attachment B.1 match exactly the individual source DL rates in Exhibit 2A, but not show the proposed DL from Exhibit 2A.

Question: Which approach should offerors use to complete Attachment B.1 PRIME DIRECT LABOR RATE MATRIX?

Answer: The Government cannot comment on which approach the offeror should use; however there should only be one loaded hourly rate for each labor category.

6. **Reference:** Section L.15.2(e) (Page 112)

Background: The RFP States “For Exhibit 2B, Offerors will note that all Management labor categories shall be proposed using Onsite rates and all Administrative labor categories shall be proposed using Offsite rates.”

Question: Will the Government please clarify within Program Management, what is defined as Management, to be priced onsite versus what is defined as Administrative, to be priced offsite?

Answer: Program Management would be considered an employee who has direct supervision or management responsibilities over non-management employees performing the SEAS contract effort as defined by contract tasks, and is located on-site at Goddard Space Flight Center (GSFC) to accomplish such responsibilities. Administrative labor (offsite) would be considered an employee who provides administrative effort necessary to support the contract generally (e.g., reporting, human resources/payroll support, and contract compliance), but that does not involve the management or supervision of contract effort on specific tasks. For example, this could potentially be a contract administrator or human resource administrator.

7. Can the Government provide the SEAS Past Performance Questionnaire as an electronic MS Word file?

Answer: It is GSFC’s policy to provide these documents as pdf files; therefore the Government will not be providing an electronic MS Word file of the Past Performance Questionnaire.

8. RFP Section B.3(b) states “The Contractor’s proposed approach/pricing of the representative tasks set forth in its proposal for award of this contract shall be used as reference by the Contracting Officer in negotiating tasks with the Contractor which are issued under this contract, but only to the extent portions of a representative task are

relevant to portions of a task actually issued.” Since the representative tasks orders are no longer required to be priced, should the wording be changed to “The Contractor’s proposed approach ...” or should this paragraph be deleted?

Answer: Section B.3(b) is standard language for this clause; therefore this information will remain unchanged.

9. RFP Section L.12(a)(4) states that electronic files may be submitted in “Adobe Portable Document Format (PDF) (version X or greater).” Please specify “X.”

Answer: The “X” represents the Roman numeral 10, so version 10 or greater.

10. RFP Section L.14.3 Subfactor C, 9th paragraph provides instructions for addressing the staffing plan. Multiple topics are identified in the paragraph. RFP Section M.3.1 Subfactor C, 9th paragraph states only that “The offeror’s backup staffing plan will be evaluated ...” No reference to a backup staffing plan is contained in the instructions in Section L. Please clarify what aspects of the staffing plan are to be addressed and what aspects will be evaluated.

Answer: Under Section M.3.1 “Subfactor C Management Approach” the Government inadvertently stated “backup” staffing plan. This will be updated to state, “The offeror’s staffing plan will be evaluated for reasonableness and effectiveness”.

11. RFP Section L.14.3 Subfactor C, 10th paragraph states that the GPM-specified labor Position Descriptions are provided in “Enclosure B.” Should this reference be corrected to read “Exhibit B”?

Answer: Yes, that is correct this should reference “Exhibit B” not “Enclosure B”. This will be updated via an amendment.

12. RFP Section L.14.3 Subfactor C, 11th paragraph provides instructions for addressing significant subcontractors. Multiple topics are identified in the paragraph. RFP Section M.3.1 Subfactor C, 11th paragraph identifies items addressing significant subcontractors

that will be evaluated. While the paragraphs are mostly consistent, Section M makes no reference to the evaluation of “plans for addressing any problems that arise ...” Will this latter topic be evaluated?

Answer: Information will be added to Section M to discuss how the Government plans to evaluate this information via an amendment.

13. RFP Section L.14.3 Subfactor C, 11th paragraph provides instructions for addressing significant subcontractors. For this discussion, the definition of significant subcontractors is based on the definition in the cost volume instructions. The final RFP revised this definition from those expected to exceed 10% or more of the GPM to those expected to exceed 20% or more of the GPM. Many offerors likely built their teams based on a strategy that a 10% subcontractor would be considered significant and intended to discuss this strategy in this section of the proposal. The change of percentage for the purposes of this discussion forces offerors to discuss a revised rationale for a decision made under different assumptions. For the purposes of this discussion only, will the Government revise the first sentence of this paragraph to read “The offeror shall describe its strategy for using (or not using) significant subcontractors (those subcontractors expected to exceed 10% or more of the GPM).”

Answer: The Government does not plan to change its definition of significant subcontractor on the final RFP. It will remain at 20% or more of the Government Pricing Model (GPM).

14. RFP Section L.14.3 Subfactor C, 11th paragraph provides instructions for addressing significant subcontractors. The last sentence states “The offeror shall discuss its plans for addressing any problems that arise as a result of the proposed organization structure or poor and/or non-performance of subcontracted portions of the contract.” Does this sentence refer to all subcontracted effort or only work subcontracted to significant subcontractors?

Answer: The offeror shall address poor and/or non-performance of all subcontracted portions of the contract.

15. RFP Section L.15.2(a) Direct and Indirect Rate Substantiation. The first sentence stipulates that any offeror proposing to use the incumbent workforce must use the labor

rates provided in Enclosure A. Enclosure A is titled “Incumbent Weighted Average Rates.” We assume that the intent of Enclosure A is to provide incumbent Unburdened Direct Labor Rates which are to be used on Exhibit 2A for those labor categories for which the offeror is proposing to use incumbent staff. Please confirm that the rates reflected on Enclosure A are “Unburdened Direct Labor Rates” for the respective labor category.

Answer: Yes, the rates reflected in Enclosure A are “Unburdened Direct Labor Rates” for their respective labor category.

16. RFP Section L.15.2(c) refers to an Exhibit 1C, which was not included with the RFP Exhibit 1 GPM worksheet. Based on the description provided, it appears to be the Tab labeled Exhibit 1B in the RFP GPM worksheet. This section also describes an Exhibit 1B that references information, such as plug numbers for certain ODCs, which is not contained in the Exhibit 1B referenced above. Please clarify the references to Exhibits 1A, 1B, and 1C in this RFP section.

Answer: Yes, some of the descriptions are incorrect and will be changed with the amendment. Additionally, Exhibit C was not provided in the initial RFP and will be provided with the amendment.

17. RFP Section L.15.2(c), last paragraph refers to “... the Subtotal Offeror OFFSITE Management/Administrative Labor Categories ...” This statement would appear to be in conflict with the statement in the 8th bullet that Management and Administrative costs are both onsite and offsite. Please clarify what is to be included in the GPM summary.

Answer: As the RFP states, for evaluation purposes, all Management Costs shall be assumed Onsite and all Administration costs shall be assumed Offsite. The Government recognizes that in the last paragraph it states the Subtotal Offeror Offsite Management/Administrative Labor Categories. Although it is worded to include the Subtotal Offeror Offsite Management/Administrative there should not be any Management since management is assumed to be Onsite.

18. RFP Section L.15.2(d) provides an example which states that no “Offsite” hours are specified for the Configuration Management Specialist. However, Exhibit 1A does include Onsite and Offsite hours for this position. Please clarify.

Answer: All labor categories were listed for onsite and offsite; however rates should only be included for the labor categories which have hours listed. The example in the RFP is incorrect as the Configuration Management Specialist has both onsite and offsite hours. This example will be deleted and a new example will be provided via an amendment.

19. RFP Section L.15.2(f) refers to Exhibit 1C. The Exhibit 1 workbook does not contain a worksheet labeled Exhibit 1C. Please clarify.

Answer: The Government will be adding Exhibit 1C per the amendment.

20. RFP Section L.16(b), 2nd paragraph requires offerors to include “the written consent of their proposed significant subcontractors ...” Are these consent letters excluded from the page limitations of the Past Performance volume?

Answer: Yes, this is excluded from the page count and this will be added to the excluded list.

21. RFP Section M.3.1 Subfactor C, 13th paragraph refers to the evaluation of managing multiple tasks in the areas of “engineering, manufacturing and testing.” The corresponding Section L instructions were modified in the final RFP to delete the word “manufacturing.” Should “manufacturing” also be deleted from the Section M reference?

Answer: Yes; there are no hardware deliveries under the SEAS contract and therefore no “manufacturing”. This will be updated via an amendment to the RFP.

22. RFP Section M.4, first paragraph refers to “Representative Task Order proposed costs.” Based on the changes made elsewhere in the final RFP, should this reference be deleted here?

Answer: Yes, this reference should be deleted and will be done via an amendment.

23. RFP Enclosure A, Incumbent Composite Rates, contains a note under the table that refers to "Exhibit B." Should this reference be changed to read "Enclosure A"?

Answer: No, the reference to Exhibit B is correct.

24. RFP Enclosure C, Representative Task Orders. RTO 1, Table 3 – Subtask 1 Deliverables includes "Schedule to Preliminary Design Review (PDR)." Should wording of this item be changed from: "Preliminary Design Review (PDR)" to "Mission Preliminary Design Review (MPDR)"?

Answer: Yes, offerors should assume PDR means Mission PDR in this case and is updated in the Enclosure C included as part of Amendment 1.

25. RFP Enclosure C, Representative Task Orders. RTO 1, Subtask 3, task element 4 states "For Mission Concept Review, provide a schedule and manpower plan up to PDR." In Table 5 – Subtask 3 Deliverables, the second item refers to "Schedule & Manpower Plan to CDR" with a due date "1 week prior to MCR." Based on Element 4, should the second item in Table 5 be changed to read "Schedule & Manpower Plan to Mission PDR" with a due date "1 week prior to MCR"?

Answer: Yes, "CDR" is incorrect and should be "PDR". This has been updated in Enclosure C which is included as part of Amendment 1.

26. RFP Enclosure C, Representative Task Orders. RTO 1, Subtask 3 task elements 8 and 9 and the last deliverable in Table 5 refer to the "Preliminary Design Review." Is the PDR referenced intended to be the "Mission PDR" or the "Ground System PDR"?

Answer: Yes, Representative Task Order (RTO) 1, Subtask 3, Task Element 8 and 9 as well as the last deliverable in Table 5 should be "Mission PDR". This has been updated in Enclosure C which is included as part of Amendment 1.

27. For purposes of the cost volume, the definition of significant subcontractor was changed from 10% to 20%. Will the government also change Section L.9, item (d), from 10% to 20%?

Answer: No, this is standard language for this clause; therefore the percentage will remain unchanged.

28. In Sec L.13 c9; we recommend that the following phrase be dropped:

“For proposals submitted as joint ventures, the facility clearance must be granted in the name of the joint venture and the joint venture CAGE code shall be provided”.

And replace with the following:

Any JV member with an existing facility clearance can hire cleared personnel and maintain the clearance as needed.

Answer: The Government has concluded that the language will remain as is.

29. Will the Government consider increasing the MS Volume page count from 75 to 85 pages?

Answer: The Government believes 75 pages is sufficient to address the requirements in the Mission Suitability Volume and is not going to increase the page count.