

AMENDMENT OF SOLICITATION/MODIFICATION OF CONTRACT			1. CONTRACT ID CODE	PAGE OF PAGES 1 2	
2. AMENDMENT/MODIFICATION NO. 11		3. EFFECTIVE DATE August 14, 2014		4. REQUISITION/PURCHASE REQ. NO. N/A	
5. PROJECT NO. (If applicable)		6. ISSUED BY Office of Procurement George C. Marshall Space Flight Center National Aeronautics and Space Administration Marshall Space Flight Center, AL 35812		7. ADMINISTERED BY (If other than Item 6) Jeffrey S. Jackson (256) 544-8935 Jeffrey.S.Jackson@nasa.gov	
8. NAME AND ADDRESS OF CONTRACTOR (No., street, county, State, and Zip Code) N/A		9A. AMENDMENT OF SOLICITATION NO. NNM14494731R		9B. DATED (SEE ITEM 11) June 26, 2014	
9. CODE		10A. MODIFICATION OF CONTRACT/ORDER NO.		10B. DATED (SEE ITEM 13)	
11. THIS ITEM ONLY APPLIES TO AMENDMENTS OF SOLICITATIONS					

The above numbered solicitation is amended as set forth in Item 14. The hour and date specified for receipt of Offers [] is extended, [X] is not extended.

Offers must acknowledge receipt of this amendment prior to the hour and date specified in the solicitation or as amended, by one of the following methods:

(a) By completing Items 8 and 15 and returning 1 copies of the amendment; (b) By acknowledging receipt of this amendment on each copy of the offer submitted; or (c) By separate letter or telegram which includes a reference to the solicitation and amendment numbers. FAILURE OF YOUR ACKNOWLEDGMENT TO BE RECEIVED AT THE PLACE DESIGNATED FOR THE RECEIPT OF OFFERS PRIOR TO THE HOUR AND DATE SPECIFIED MAY RESULT IN REJECTION OF YOUR OFFER. If by virtue of this amendment you desire to change an offer already submitted, such change may be made by telegram or letter, provided each telegram or letter makes reference to the solicitation and this amendment, and is received prior to the opening hour and date specified.

12. ACCOUNTING AND APPROPRIATION DATA (If required)

N/A

13. THIS ITEM APPLIES ONLY TO MODIFICATIONS OF CONTRACTS/ORDERS, IT MODIFIES THE CONTRACT/ORDER NO. AS DESCRIBED IN ITEM 14.

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	A. THIS CHANGE ORDER IS ISSUED PURSUANT TO: (Specify authority) THE CHANGES SET FORTH IN ITEM 14 ARE MADE IN THE CONTRACT ORDER NO. IN ITEM 10A.
	B. THE ABOVE NUMBERED CONTRACT/ORDER IS MODIFIED TO REFLECT THE ADMINISTRATIVE CHANGES (such as changes in paying office, appropriation data, etc.) SET FORTH IN ITEM 14, PURSUANT TO THE AUTHORITY OF FAR 43.103(b).
	C. THIS SUPPLEMENTAL AGREEMENT IS ENTERED INTO PURSUANT TO AUTHORITY OF:
	D. OTHER (Specify type of modification and authority)

E. IMPORTANT: Contractor [] is not, [] is required to sign this document and return copies to the issuing office.

14. DESCRIPTION OF AMENDMENT/MODIFICATION (Organized by UCF section headings, including solicitation/contract subject matter where feasible.)

SEE PAGE 2 FOR DESCRIPTION OF AMENDMENT

Except as provided herein, all terms and conditions of the document referenced in Item 9A or 10A, as heretofore changed, remains unchanged and in full force and effect

15A. NAME AND TITLE OF SIGNER (Type or print)		16A. NAME AND TITLE OF CONTRACTING OFFICER (Type or print) Jeffrey S. Jackson, Contracting Officer	
15B. CONTRACTOR/OFFEROR	15C. DATE SIGNED	16B. UNITED STATES OF AMERICA	16C. DATE SIGNED
(Signature of person authorized to sign)		BY  (Signature of Contracting Officer)	August 14, 2014

AMENDMENT OF SOLICITATION
(Continued)

This is an amendment to Request for Proposal (RFP) NNM14494731R for NASA MSFC Information Technology Services (MITS) issued by the George C. Marshall Space Flight Center. The purpose of this amendment is to respond to questions and/or comments submitted by potential offerors to ensure consistency and clarity of understanding. Questions/comments and responses are provided in Attachment A to this amendment.

Based on the required proposal submission date of August 20, 2014, the Government does not anticipate the issuance of additional amendments.

Attachment A

Questions/Comments and Responses

Question 1

Reference Amendment 1, Question 72, and Amendment 3, Question 6.

We have reviewed requirements for submitting Attachment A in Amendment 1, Question #72, and Amendment 3, Question 6 and did not find instructions on how to submit Attachment A on CD. Since it is a sealed submission, we will not be able to include this information in our Mission Suitability Volume CD.

Also, we could not determine if we should send one envelope with all hard and electronic copies, or should we send separate sealed envelopes and place one in the original Mission Suitability volume, and place the 5 others in their respective copy of Mission Suitability?

We want to make our submission easy to navigate by keeping all JDQ information together if possible. May we put ALL JDQ forms at the end of the volume, after STC-4, and then our sealed package contents would immediately follow the JDQs?

Response:

It is understood that the Mission Suitability volume (hard and softcopies) will not reflect the Appendix A forms. Offerors must ensure that sufficient page count remains to insert these documents. Electronic copies of Appendix A shall be submitted with the sealed packages containing the hard copies. Appendix A forms (original and five copies) may be submitted either with the use of a single envelope or as separate envelopes for each Mission Suitability volume.

JDQ forms for the offeror and all proposed subcontractors shall be provided together as sequentially numbered pages under STC-2 (f) of the Mission Suitability volume rather than at the end of the volume. Proprietary salary and wage data may be provided on Appendix A.

Question 2

Reference – RFP Amendment 10

Amendment 10 was the Government's response to questions around the JDQ requirement, but has raised additional questions about the correct interpretation of the instructions. Please provide guidance as to which interpretation is correct, or if there are alternative instructions for fulfilling the requirement for submitting JDQs and Attachment As from each subcontractor.

Interpretation 1: The government requests a JDQ from the prime and each major and minor subcontractor for each vendor-LC combination. With this interpretation, if the prime and 2 subcontractors propose to fill the same labor category on different tasks (e.g., System Engineer I), 3 JDQs would be required within the page-limited Mission Suitability volume submitted by the Prime. Appendix A would also be required for the salary and Health and Welfare information for each labor category from each subcontractor and added to the page limit. This interpretation of the requirement would result in well over 80 JDQs, causing the prime to be out of compliance with the 40 page limit for JDQs.

Interpretation 2: We interpret the instructions such that we will submit a single JDQ for each labor category, whether it is filled by the offeror or a subcontractor. In the JDQ field for CONTRACTOR/SUBCONTRACTOR each prime will list the vendors that intend to staff these positions across all PWS tasks. Subcontractors listed on the JDQ form would not be required to submit additional JDQs. Subcontractor-specific salary and health and welfare information would be included in Attachment A. The subcontractor can submit this information with the Prime's proposal or within the sealed packages. The 40 pages of JDQ forms and the Appendices submitted by each subcontractor will be counted within the 260 page limit for Volume I. This understanding means that only 1 JDQ would be submitted for any labor category regardless of which team member would fill the position. Contractor labor category, salary, and health & welfare information will appear in the JDQ form (for the Prime) or on Appendix A (for each subcontractor).

Question 1: Is it the Government's intention to have only one JDQ for each proposed labor category from each offeror team (in the JDQ form field for CONTRACTOR/SUBCONTRACTOR each prime will list the vendors that intend to staff these positions across all PWS tasks)?

Question 2: If the Government requires a JDQ for LC-Vendor combination (which would exceed 80 JDQs), would the Government allow each major and minor subcontractor to submit their JDQ in their sealed bid and not be counted as part of the offerors' page count? Subcontractors would still submit Appendix A and remain part of offerors' Volume I page count.

Question 3: If not, would the Government consider allowing additional pages for JDQ forms for duplicative labor categories filled by our subcontractors?

Response:

A JDQ form is required for each labor category proposed by the offeror, and a JDQ form is required for each labor category proposed by a subcontractor. Depending on the offeror's approach, this may result in more than one JDQ form for a specific labor category. Offerors are reminded that (1) a maximum of two JDQs may be provided per page, (2) the number of JDQ forms utilized is relative to the offeror's staffing approach, (3) the JDQ forms count against the Mission Suitability page limitation, and (4) the 40 page guideline for JDQ forms is not a limitation and additional mission suitability pages may be allocated as needed within the total Mission Suitability page limitation.

Question 3

Reference – Attachment L-B, Cost Forms, Forms B2 Mission Enhancement Services

ONE

Should Attachment L-B Form B2 be priced using Overtime labor rates or should it be assumed any options exercised would result in additional WYE positions?

TWO

Attachment L-B Form B2, all CLINs Tabs require Fringe, Overhead, G&A, and Fee burdens to be added to the increased services for MITS mission enhancement services. According to Section B of the solicitation, the MITS mission enhancement services may be required and are not part of the total cost required on Attachment L-B Form B1, Tab A. Without knowing the amount of work that may ultimately be ordered for MITS mission enhancement services, we will not be able to accurately calculate the impact that the exercising of these options would have in our indirect rates. The potential exists for many different combinations of options to be exercised within a single year. Each different option would impact the indirect rates differently seeing as each option exercised would result in an increase in both cost and revenue depending on the option (or combination of options) exercised. Each option can be exercised along with one or more other options following the process described in the solicitation. For example:

Option A, Option B, and Option E could be exercised within a single year

Option A, Option E, and Option F may be exercised within a separate year

Option A, Option B, Option C, and Option E, Option F, Option G may be exercised

The number of options is extensive.

Additionally, the value of each option is also dependent upon when during the year it is ordered since the value of the option will be prorated. From F-4: "These values are contingent upon the time remaining in the applicable contract period (if the option is exercised during rather than prior to start of the period), and if the option is exercised during the period, the commensurate cost and fee for the option(s) exercised will be a prorated value of the cost and fee amounts for the period."

Each potential combination will have a different impact on the overall INDIRECT Rates for the program. Given that:

- 1) It is unknown which combinations of options may or may not be exercised;
- 2) It is not possible with the current CLIN structure to price out all possible combinations of options using the indirect rates that each combination would result in; and,
- 3) The timing of an option(s) being exercised is a vital factor relative to an offeror's fiscal year cycle and indirect rate development.

Therefore, should companies:

- 1) Simply use the indirect rates provided on Form B1 for Form B2 knowing that the rates are subject to change based on whatever particular combination of options and timing may ultimately be exercised?
- 2) If not, what assumptions should companies make regarding the exercising of options given that the exercising of any option will result in a different set of rates being applied to the program?

Without clarification, there is the potential of varying assumptions being made by the proposing offerors that could impact the indirect rates then used for Form B1.

Response:

For proposal purposes, offerors may assume that if any mission enhancement services CLINs are exercised, the requirement will remain constant for the remainder of the contract, subject to budgetary considerations. The use of overtime vs. full time staffing is relative to the offeror's approach for the provision of mission enhancement services. The use of Forms B1 indirect rates in Forms B2 for these services is an acceptable approach.

Question 4

Reference – Attachment L-B, Cost Forms

Per Section L, Volume II – Cost Factor Proposal Instructions (a)(11) on page L-36 states, “All dollar amounts provided shall be rounded to the nearest dollar and presented in real dollars.” Attachment L-B Forms B1 and B2 formulas provided in the cost template are formatted to show whole dollars; however, the formulas are not rounded to the nearest whole dollars nor presented in real dollars. Does the Government expect the offerors to update all Government-provided template formulas?

Response:

No. Offerors shall utilize the formulas provided in the cost forms.