

Questions and Answers SES II Draft RFP

Question 1: The Draft RFP states, “If proposing incumbent labor, the offeror shall use the position descriptions shown in Exhibit B for non-managerial labor categories.” Exhibit B was not included in the draft documents. Is the document available for posting to the procurement page?

Answer 1: Both Exhibit A and Exhibit B were inadvertently left out of the SES II Draft RFP upload. That has been corrected and both documents are now available on NAIS.

Question 2: The Draft RFP states, “For purposes of the Past Performance Volume, a proposed significant subcontractor is defined as any proposed subcontractor that is estimated to meet/exceed an average annual cost /fee of \$8M.” In other RFPs recently released from GSFC’ Code 500 (e.g., MIST, WESC), the prime threshold for contracts is typically the exact same dollar figure as the significant subcontractor estimated annual cost/fee. Will the government consider revising this statement to define a significant subcontractor (for purposes of Past Performance Volume) estimated to meet/exceed an average annual cost/fee of \$5.5M, in order to mirror the current threshold for prime contractors references, thus aligning it with other recent Code 500 procurements?

Answer 2: The definition of a significant subcontractor for the purposes of Past Performance will be changed to \$5M.

Question 3: In the Proposal Content and Page Limitations for the Mission Suitability Volume in the Table on Page 78, the content Excluded from Page Count does not show the Quality Assurance Plan. Will the Government consider excluding the Quality Assurance Plan from the Mission Suitability Volume’s page count?

Answer 3: The Quality Assurance Plan is now due 30 days after the effective date of the contract.

Question 4: In Section J.1, in reference to Attachment G-IT Security Plan, the table seems to imply that this plan will be part of the proposal submission. Typically, this type of plan is submitted 30-60 days after Contract Effective Date. Is the intent of the Government to have this plan submitted after contract effective date?

Answer 4: Yes, the IT Security Plan will be due 30 days after contract effective date. In the final RFP, Section J will be updated with the correct language.

Question 5

(a) PROPOSAL FORMAT AND ORGANIZATION;

(2) Offerors and proposed significant subcontractors for **cost proposal purposes [CORE REQUIREMENTS- defined as any subcontract that is likely to exceed 15% of the proposed Core contract value (Base plus Option periods) and Government Pricing Model (GPM) defined as any subcontract that is likely to exceed 20% of the proposed total GPM]** shall include one (1) additional separately packaged hardcopy of their Cost Proposal, marked “Enter correct RFP number/NASA Proposal Evaluation Material”, which the Government will forward to the cognizant Defense Contract Audit Agency (DCAA) office with their audit request.

Question 5a - In this section, a significant subcontractor is defined as one that is likely to exceed the stated percentage for the Core contract value **and** the GPM. Under the instructions for the Cost Volume, the wording seems to indicate that a subcontractor could be significant for the Core contract value, but not for the GPM, and vice versa. Does the requirement for providing a Cost Proposal hardcopy for DCAA audit apply only to subcontractors who will exceed both the CORE contract value and the GPM value percentage thresholds?

Answer 5a

No, if you have a subcontractor whose expected costs exceed 20% of the Core contract value, submit the additional separately packaged hardcopy of their cost proposal. If you have a subcontractor whose expected costs exceed 10% of the GPM value, submit the additional separately packaged hardcopy of their cost proposal. If the same subcontractor exceeds both thresholds, only one additional package is necessary covering their entire cost volume.

Question 5b - The significant contractor percentage thresholds in the requirement above (15% for Core contract and 20% for total GPM) are different than the significant contractor percentage thresholds stated in the cost volume instructions (20% for Core contract and 10% for total GPM). Should these two thresholds for defining a significant subcontractor be the same, since they both require the development of a subcontractor cost proposal?

Answer 5b

Yes, that was an error that will be corrected in the final RFP. Both sections should read that a Significant Sub, for Cost Volume, is defined as a subcontractor expected to exceed 20% of the Core requirements or 10% of the GPM (IDIQ) requirements. If the subcontractor is working requirements for both the Core and the GPM requirements and exceeds either thresholds, or both thresholds, they are deemed a significant sub and shall submit their cost proposal for DCAA audit.

Question 6

(b) PROPOSAL CONTENT AND PAGE LIMITATIONS - The offeror must provide a response to the very complex sample problem, a detailed approach to the Core SOW elements, and a management plan including a staffing plan and quality assurance plan within the 70 page limit for the Mission Suitability Volume. The 70 page limit will make providing a complete and meaningful response to these requirements very difficult. Would the Government consider raising the Mission Suitability Volume page limit to 90 pages?

Answer 6

The page limit has been increased to 85 pages. The Quality Plan is now due 30 days after contract effective date and the Staffing Plan has been removed from the page count for the final RFP.

Question 7

L.25 GSFC 52.215-224 COST VOLUME INSTRUCTIONS; 1. Instructions; Core Requirements - The offeror is asked to price the elements of the core requirements of the Statement of Work. However, although SOW describes the nature of each work element but there is nothing within the SOW nor elsewhere within the DRFP that describes the scope or scale of the work efforts or any indicators of the workload. Without such information, it is not possible for an offeror to determine the level of effort necessary to fulfill the requirements of the SOW or develop a BOE. Will the Government consider providing information specifying the scope, scale, and workload indicators for the Core Requirements? Or, as an alternative, will the Government consider

changing the instructions to direct the offerors to price the Sample Task rather than the SOW Core Requirements?

Answer 7

For SES II SOW section 2/Core, the work amounts to approximately 7% of the contract value of the current SES contract.

For SES II SOW section 3/Core, the work is not currently consolidated on a single task. However, it is estimated that approximately 6% of the contract value of the current SES contract is dedicated to the work defined in SOW section 3 of the current RFP.

Question 8

L.23 GSFC 52.215-203 OFFER VOLUME (JAN 2014)

(c) ADDITIONAL INFORMATION TO BE FURNISHED

(7) 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 and Sample Problem value).

This subsection requires a subcontract value by Sample Problem value. The instructions for the Cost Volume do not require the offeror to price the Sample Problem. Should this subsection read Core Contract value and GPM value?

Answer 8

The area in question has been changed to read (GPM value and Core Requirements Value)

Question 9

Sample Problem

3.1 Sample Problem 1A: GCC-F Systems Engineering Phase B/C

3. Select a Telemetry, Tracking, and Commanding (TT&C) system among government owned/developed and commercial options, taking into account the need to support many individual satellites.

Will the Government provide a listing and descriptions of the government owned/developed TT&C systems?

Answer 9

No, information about Government TT&C systems are publically available and can be found at <http://software.nasa.gov/category/Operations> The TT&C systems are located under Operations..

Question 10

SOW 2.1 Computer Security: What is the measurement of success in accomplishing "work in concert with the division level IT managers and system administrator teams"?

Answer 10

Computer Security personnel work with Division IT managers and system administrator teams to identify threats and work collaboratively to mitigate the identified threats. Success will be measured by the time of closure (from identification to patching) for each threat across AETD and feedback from Government AETD and Division level IT managers.

Question 11

SOW 2.1.1 AETD/Code 500 Information System Security Officers (ISSO), Ref Bullet 8 “provide vulnerability scanning reports for all AETD devices..” Does this consist of just distributing the code 700 scan reports or generating scans with AETD scan tools?

Answer 11

No, the scans are not limited to just Code 700 and AETD. The scans can also originate from the agency and other sources.

Question 12

SOW 2.1.1 AETD/Code 500 Information System Security Officer (ISSO) Ref Bullet 12 “...Develops scripts...” Are these operating scripts and if not, then in what language(s) are the scripts generated?

Answer 12

These are operating scripts developed within commercial tools such as KACE.

Question 13

SOW 2.1.1 SOW 2.1.1 AETD/Code 500 Information System Security Officer (ISSO) Ref para “The contractor team shall have working knowledge of system and security administration for ...Linux, and UNIX systems” What versions of Linux and UNIX will be supported in this requirement?

Answer 13

The majority of the LINUX systems used within AETD are the most current and one version back, however AETD maintains almost all versions of LINUX and UNIX versions in support of frozen on-orbit and operational systems. The ISSO should have strong LINUX knowledge across multiple versions and have the ability to suggest better versions to meet AETD requirements.

Question 14

SOW 2.1.1 SOW 2.1.1 AETD/Code 500 Information System Security Officer (ISSO) Ref sentence “...contractor be familiar with web technologies”. What particular web technologies should the contractor be prepared to support?

Answer 14

Knowledge of specific web technologies is not as important as overall knowledge of how web technologies work in the environment. The majority of the web technologies we use are open source technologies. The ISSO members are expected to be a subject matter expert in many areas of IT technologies, from Operating Systems, firewalls to web technologies.

Question 15

SOW 2.1.1 SOW 2.1.1 AETD/Code 500 Information System Security Officer (ISSO) Ref sentence “...the contractor team shall also have experience...maintaining firewalls.” Does this mean hardware firewalls? If so what firewall manufacturers and model numbers should a contractor be prepared to support? Also, are there software firewalls in use and if so please provide the specifics?

Answer 15

The ISSO members are expected to be a subject matter expert in many areas of IT technologies, from Operating Systems, firewalls to web technologies. The ISSO team will provide leadership to teams configuring and maintaining software and hardware firewalls.

Question 16

SOW 2.1.2 Division Lead System Administrator.... Is the Lead SA an existing formal position(s) within AETD?

Answer 16

Yes. Each Division has an established senior lead SA position leading the Division SA team.

Question 17

SOW 2.1.2 Division Lead System Administrator- Do you intend that the Lead SA position be a separate position in one of the Division SA Team(s)?

Answer 17

Yes. Each Division has an established senior lead SA position leading the Division SA team.

Question 18

SOW 2.1.2 Division Lead System Administrator- Ref sentence "...possess a working knowledge across all of the Windows/Linux/Mac/Unix based operation systems..." but then also states ".....shall be able to perform system and analysis and tuning..." It is unlikely that someone possessing just "working knowledge" of an OS would also be able to perform "system analysis tuning" on that OS. Will the government please clarify which level of experience is actually needed for the Lead SA?

Answer 18

The Division Lead SA position is a technical leadership position. The Lead SA should be a subject matter expert in many of the Division IT technologies.

Question 19

SOW 2.1.2 Division Lead System Administrator- Ref Bullet 6- "....scan all division computers..." Does this mean that the division lead System administrators perform security scans or do they coordinate scans with the ISSOs or Code 700?

Answer 19

The Lead SA should utilize as many tools and resources available to them to increase the security and risk awareness of the Division IT systems.

Question 20

SOW 2.2 Consolidated AETD System Administration, Ref statement "the contractor shall provide a consolidated portion of the IT technical support..." Within the current SES contract does this function exist as a separate organizational entity?

Answer 20

No, this function does not currently exist.

Question 21

SOW 2.2.1 Shared Server Support for AETD Divisions Ref statement "the contractor shall provide for maintenance of a configuration management plan..." Does this configuration management plan currently exist and is it up to date?

Answer 21

Configuration management plans currently exist within the organization where the service is currently maintained and are up to date.

Question 22

SOW 2.2.2 VMware/Server Support for the AETD Division Ref bullet 6 "Ensure completion of daily virtual machine backups.." What system is in place to perform this now?

Answer 22

VMs are currently backed up a variety of ways,(the majority are backed up to tape) depending on the Division supporting the service.

Question 23

SOW 2.2.2 VMware/Server Support for the AETD Division Ref bullet 6 “Ensure completion of daily virtual machine backups..” As a test or in reality, have backups of all VM systems been successfully recovered?

Answer 23

Yes, most have been successfully tested.

Question 24

SOW 2.2.3 SA Documentation Support for the AETD Divisions: Does the current AETD Users IT Policies and Procedures Document currently exist and if so, is it up to date?

Answer 24

The AETD Users IT Policies and Procedures is currently in draft form.

Question 25

SOW 2.2.3 SA Documentation Support for the AETD Divisions: Does the AETD System Administration Policies and Procedures Document currently exist and if so is it up to date?

Answer 25

The AETD System Administration Policies and Procedures Document is currently in draft form.

Question 26

SOW 2.2.4 Helpdesk Support for the AETD Divisions: Does the HEAT system currently provide for all the metrics required by this section or are some/all manually generated?

Answer 26

Yes, HEAT generates all the required metrics.

Question 27

SOW 2.2.5 AETD Engineering Software License Management: Ref bullet 4. “Develop and maintain a real-time web enabled Dashboard that provides...” Does that Dashboard system currently exist? IF so, is it COTS or GOTS? If GOTS, are there published requirements and in what web development system/language was it developed?

Answer 27

No, this dashboard does not currently exist.

Question 28

L.26(a) Past performance relevant contract size for Significant subcontractor: For the purposes of the Past Performance Volume, a proposed significant subcontractor is defined as any proposed subcontractor that is estimated to meet/exceed an average annual cost/fee of \$8M. Will the government consider lowering this average annual value threshold to \$4M to allow for a more open discussion of what a team is offering to the customer?

Answer 28

The Past Performance relevant contract size for Significant Subcontractors has been lowered to \$5M.

Question 29

L.26(a) Past performance relevant contract size for Prime The DRFP states: “Prime Offerors shall furnish the information requested below for all of your most recent contracts (completed and

ongoing) for similar efforts with a minimum average annual cost/fee incurred of \$5.5M that your company has had within the last 5 years of the RFP release date.”

Will the government consider reducing the average annual cost/fee incurred amount to allow the bidding 8(a) entity to discuss their relevant functional experience on a wider scope of contracts?

Answer 29

No. The Government feels that \$5.5M is a reasonable number considering the size and scope of the procurement.

Question 30

L.26 Consent Letter: The Government RFP States: Offerors shall include in their proposal the written consent of their proposed significant subcontractors to allow the Government to discuss the subcontractors' past performance evaluation with the Offeror. Would the government consider excluding the subcontractor's consent letters (authorizing the government to discuss teammates past performance the prime) from page count so as not to penalize companies that have opted to bid with teammates?

Answer 30

The Subcontractor consent letters will be removed from the Past Performance Volume page count for the final RFP.

Question 31

H.13, I.113 GSFC 52.227-99 Rights in Data: This clause references the GENERAL clause 52.227-14 but lists all Alternates (i.e., I, II, III, IV). This is in conflict with the title and text of clause I.113 which specifies only Alternates II and III. Which definition of 52.227-14 is correct?

Answer 31

Clause GSFC 52.227-99 has been updated for the final RFP. The updated clause reads as follows:

H.14 GSFC 52.227-99 RIGHTS IN DATA (JUN 2012)

The default Data Rights clause under this contract is FAR 52.227-14 RIGHTS IN DATA-GENERAL—Alternate II and Alternate III as modified by NASA FAR Supplement 1852.227-14 and GSFC 52.227-90. Any exceptions to this clause will be covered by FAR 52.227-17 RIGHTS IN DATA--SPECIAL WORKS as modified by NASA FAR Supplement 1852.227-17, if applicable, and GSFC 52.227-93.

Question 32

L.24, subfactor C, Management Plan, Task Orders: The DRFP states: “Task orders will be issued in accordance with the Task Ordering Procedure clause in Section H of this solicitation.”

Will the government confirm that this should state: Task orders will be issued in accordance with the Task Ordering Procedure clause in Section I of this solicitation. (ref: I.124 1852.216-80 TASK ORDERING PROCEDURE (OCT 1996))?

Answer 32

Yes, that was an error. The final RFP will state: . “Task orders will be issued in accordance with the Task Ordering Procedure clause in Section I of this solicitation.”

Question 33

B1. Item 15; J.1.A, Subfactor C, Management Plan: IT Security Management Plan: Section B.1 states that the IT Security Management Plan is TBP (to be proposed by the offeror), however, Section J.1.A, Attachment G states that the IT Security Management Plan is due 30 Days after Contact Effective Date and Annual Updates as Required. Will the government confirm that the delivery of the IT Security Management Plan is as stated in Section J that is due 30 Days after Contact Effective Date and Annual Updates as Required?

Answer 33

Yes, the Government confirms that the IT Security Management Plan is due 30 days after contract effective date. B.1, item 15 has been updated for the final RFP.

Question 34

L.22 (b) Proposal Content and Page Limitations: Does the government intend that the QAP deliverable (part of the Management Plan) be excluded from the page count of the Mission Suitability Volume?

Answer 34

The QAP is now due 30 days after the effective date of the contract.

Question 35

L.25 CORE REQUIREMENTS: Did the government intend to omit SOW section 2.1.1 from the list of WBS Level 4 sections?

Answer 35

No, that was an error. The final RFP has SOW section 2.1.1 included.

Question 36

L.25 1. Core Requirements: Exhibit 1 instructions say the Offeror shall populate both material and travel costs under the PWS sections as defined below across all five years and under whichever WBS sections the Offeror determines the costs are most likely to occur. Then the instructions say the Offeror shall distribute the cost evenly across the lower WBS levels established in Exhibit 2. Is the offeror to spread the costs evenly over the 2.1.1, 2.1.2, 2.2.1, 2.2.2, 2.2.3, 2.2.4, etc. evenly or should the costs be moved to whichever WBS sections the Offeror determines the costs are most likely to occur?

Would the government please provide historical data for the material and travel costs incurred in the current SES contract related to SES II SOW elements 2 and 3?

Answer 36

The language in L.25 1 has been changed to clarify that the costs, given by the Government, for both travel and ODC's should be spread evenly over the WBS Sections. By spreading the dollar values evenly across the WBS's, the Government feels that there is no need for historical data on SOW elements 2 and 3.

Question 37

L.25 1. Core Requirements: Core requirements define:

WBS Level 1: Is the total Core (SOW Sections 2.0 and 3.0)

WBS Level 2: Is SOW Section 2.0 and 3.0, separately

WBS Level 3: Is SOW section 2.1, 2.2, 3.1 and 3.2, separately

WBS Level 4: Is SOW section 2.1.1 2.1.2, 2.2.1, 2.2.2, 2.2.3, 2.2.4, and 2.2.5, separately

The instructions for Exhibit 2 state “the Prime Offeror’s proposed Core Requirements elements of cost and fixed fee by WBS, Starting at the lowest WBS Level (WBS Level 4) and then summarizing for each higher WBS Level up to WBS Level 1...”

Back in section L.24.2 the last paragraph states the cost volume must mirror the SOW sections 2 and 3 to WBS level 3.

Is a separate Exhibit 2 needed for each WBS level 4 or just at level 3 as indicated in L.24.2?

Answer 37

L.24.2 should have indicated WBS level 4, not level 3. That was an oversight. The final RFP will reflect the change to WBS level 4.

Question 38

L.25 1. For the bidding purposes, the Offer shall assume the following: The DRFP states, “For the bidding purposes, the Offer shall assume the following:

GFY 1 December 2016-November 2017

GFY 2 December 2017-November 2018

GFY 3 December 2018-November 2019

GFY 4 December 2019-November 2020

GFY 5 December 2020-November 2021”

Exhibits 1 and 2 have notations on the bottom of the spreadsheets that indicate a GFY of October 1 – September 30. Exhibit 13 also is reflective of the October 1-September 30 GFY.

Which GFY is correct?

Answer 38

The final RFP will be changed as follows:

Contract Year 1 December 1, 2015-November 30, 2016

Contract Year 2 December 1, 2016-November 30, 2017

Contract Year 3 December 1, 2017-November 30, 2018

Contract Year 4 December 1, 2018-November 30, 2019

Contract Year 5 December 1, 2019-November 30, 2020

Contract Year 6 December 1, 2020-November 30, 2021 for task orders whose Period of Performance goes one year beyond the end of the contract.

Notations at the bottom of the spreadsheets will be changed to Contract Year, as will the spreadsheets themselves.

Question 39

L.22 (b)(1) Proposal Content and Page Limitations: The Cost Volume has a BOE page limitation of 25 pages which is inclusive of both Prime and sub. There are three different BOEs required in the Cost Volume:

- L.25.1(9), requires a CORE BOE,
- L.25.4 (d) GPM requires GPM BOE, and
- L.25. (g) Exhibits that Pertain to the Entire Contract, requires a Sample Problem BOE

Given that, each of these BOEs must include information from significant subcontractors, will you confirm that the 25-page limit is for each BOE separately?

Given that, the sample problem is not priced, would it be preferable to include the sample problem BOE in the mission suitability volume with a separate 25-page limitation instead of the cost volume? In addition, can you confirm that the evaluation criteria is included M.3, Subfactor A?

Answer 39

The total page count for BOEs has been increased to 30 pages and that is for BOTH the Prime and Significant subcontractor, combined. The Sample Problem BOE has been removed from the cost volume and moved to the mission suitability volume and given a 15 page- page count. The Sample Problem BOES are evaluated as part of mission suitability volumes as stated in M3.

Question 40

Enclosure 3, SES Incumbent Rates: The majority of the labor categories currently in Enclosure 3 do not have incumbent rates specified. Additionally, many labor categories do not appear in Exhibit 6. Will the Government be updating Enclosure 3 to include additional incumbent rates with the release of the final RFP?

Why are there so many additional labor categories in Enclosure 3 that do not appear in Exhibit 6?

Answer 40

Enclosure 3, SES Incumbent Rates is complete. NASA Exhibit 6 had some errors that will be corrected with the release of the final draft. Enclosure 3 and Exhibit 6 will be more in-line at that time.

Question 41

B.5 (a) GSFC 52.216-90 MINIMUM/MAXIMUM AMOUNT OF SUPPLIES OR SERVICES (COST REIMBURSEMENT) (APR 2008) (Pertains to IDIQ Requirements): Does the contract max value of 246M include the Core value?

Answer 41

No it does not.

Question 42

L.22 (a) (2) and L.25. (1) Definition of Significant Subcontractors: The definition of significant subcontractors for CORE in L.22. (a)(2) is specified at 15% of the CORE value. This is different than the 20% specified in section L.25.1 for the CORE requirement? Please clarify which is correct.

Answer 42

That was an error. For the purposes of the cost volume a significant subcontractor is defined as 20% of the CORE requirements and/or 10% of the GPM. The correct numbers will be reflected in the final RFP.

Question 43

L.22 (a) (2) and L.25. (1) Definition of Significant Subcontractors: The definition of significant subcontractors for GPM in L.22.(a)(2) is specified at 20% of the proposed total GPM. This is different than the 10% specified in section L.25.1 for the GPM requirement?

Will the government clarify which is correct?

Answer 43

That was an error. For the purposes of the cost volume, a significant subcontractor is defined as 20% of the CORE requirement and/or 10% of the GPM. The correct numbers will be reflected in the final RFP.

Question 44

L.25 (1) CORE Requirements: In the CORE Requirements paragraph, significant subcontractors must complete Exhibits 2A, 2B, 3A, and 4. Did you mean Exhibit 5 (ODCs) instead of Exhibit 4?

Answer 44

Exhibit 4 can be for significant subcontractors if they are planning to sub some of the work out however, Exhibit 5 should have been included on the list so the final RFP will include Exhibit 5.

Question 45

L.25 1- For bidding purposes, the Offeror shall assume the following: The GFY is defined as starting December 1 on Page 91 of the RFP and October 1 in the Cost Exhibits (1 and 2).

Q: Can the Government clarify which is the correct GFY to use for bidding purposes?

Answer 45

The final RFP will be changed as follows:

Contract Year 1 December 1, 2015-November 30, 2016

Contract Year 2 December 1, 2016-November 30, 2017

Contract Year 3 December 1, 2017-November 30, 2018

Contract Year 4 December 1, 2018-November 30, 2019

Contract Year 5 December 1, 2019-November 30 2020

Contract Year 6 December 1, 2020-November 30 2021 for task orders who's Period of Performance goes one year beyond the end of the contract.

Notations at the bottom of the spreadsheets will be changed to Contract Year, as will the spreadsheets themselves.

Question 46

L.25 1 (D) Prime Offeror Core Requirements Summary of Estimated Cost and Fixed Fee for Slip Months. Will Exhibit 3 be evaluated and included in the contract? If so, how will Exhibit 3 be evaluated?

Answer 46

Exhibit 3 and 3A will be evaluated in accordance with M.4 Cost Evaluation Factor. In the case of an actual slip we would have the information that we needed and would make a change to 1852.216-74 Estimated Cost and Fee – Core Requirements.

Question 47

L. 26(b) Past Performance Questionnaire: The DRFP states: The Offeror shall instruct each of its references to return the questionnaire directly to the Government in a sealed envelope.

Q: Will the government allow the questionnaires to be returned via email? If so, please provide the email address.

Answer 47

Yes, e-mailing Past Performance Questionnaires is a reasonable means of providing them. Should your customer prefer to e-mail them rather than mail them, please have them e-mail to Lisa.A.Mullen@nasa.gov. The RFP has been updated to include this information.

Question 48

L.22 (b) (2) Proposal content and Page Limitations: Because of the amount of information required to submit a complete understanding of the Technical Approach to the Sample Problem and the Core Requirements, will the government permit the text in Diagrams, schedules, charts, tables, artwork, and photographs to be no smaller than 8 point, which is still very easy to read?

Answer 48

The page count has been increased to 85 pages and the BOE for the sample problem has been removed from the Cost volume and added to the mission suitability volume with its own page count, therefore, text in Diagrams, schedules, charts, tables, artwork, and photographs to be no smaller than 12 point as stated.

Question 49

L.22 (a) (4) Proposal Format and Organization: The DRFP states: The Offeror shall provide written documentation that describes the contents of each CD-ROM and of each file. Will the government confirm that printing this information on the CD label will satisfy this requirement?

Answer 49

Printing the required information on the label of the CD is acceptable provided that all the information fits and is legible.

Question 50

L.24 3 Subfactor A-Technical Approach to Sample Problem: The DRFP states: "...the Sample Problem is comprised of five individual sample task orders (Section 3 of Enclosure 2) that are ultimately linked together to create an end result. The offeror shall provide written task plans addressing each of the five sample task orders. Each task plan shall identify technical approach, skill mix (labor categories and projected hours), Government interface, list of deliverables, the flow of activities from start to completion (including time line), as applicable, and any other information required to determine the adequacy and reasonableness of the offeror's plan. The plans must be specific, detailed, and complete to demonstrate a clear and full understanding of the objectives; trade studies to be performed; potential technical problems, risks, and critical issues; and possible problem mitigation/resolution. Also, the plan should demonstrate the techniques and procedures necessary to satisfy the requirements in a timely and cost effective manner."

Essentially, there are 8 task plans that need to be submitted. A task plan is typically 6-8 pages each. This would be a minimum of 48 pages to address the sample problem alone.

Our response to the CORE requirements must address 10 pages of the SOW (Sections 2 and 3). Offerors cannot just regurgitate the SOW requirements in order adequately respond to this requirement to include the skill mix and personnel categories. Typically 2-3 times the number of pages would be necessary to adequately respond to this requirement.

In addition, a management plan, consisting of numerous requirements, needs to be within the current 70 page limit.

Based on the response requirements, will the government increase the mission suitability volume page count to 120 pages?

Answer 50

The page count for the Mission Suitability Volume for the final RFP will be increased to 85 pages.

Question 51

L.26(b) Past Performance Questionnaire: If Company X is providing past performance references for a contract where they were a sub to Company Y, can Company X provide their Past Performance Questionnaire directly to their Government customer rather than to their Prime (Company Y)? The concern is that Company Y may unfairly evaluate Company X if Company Y is priming and Company X is on a competing team: but must use their contract with Company Y for past performance.

Note: This question was asked on the TIDES procurement and permission was given to submit the questionnaire directly to their government customer.

Answer 51

Yes, Company X can provide their past performance questionnaire directly to their Government customer.

Question 52

SOW Software Engineering Process Requirements: Paragraph 2 of Section 1.0 of the SOW states that any organization developing, maintaining or acquiring S/W for NASA must adhere to NPR 7150.A and the flow-down of those requirements to GPR 7150.1-3. Paragraph 3, however, specifies NPR 7150.2A and GPR 7150.1-4. Further, Section 4.5 uses NPR 7150.2(a) and GPR 7150.1-3.

Would the government make these consistent so that there is no ambiguity in the requirement?

Answer 53

Yes, NPR 7150.2A and GPR 7150.1-4 are governing documents for developing, maintaining and acquiring software across all Software Engineering Division activities. GPR 7150.1-3 was typo. The change has been made to the SOW.

Question 54

Exhibit 6: Given that flight software sustaining engineering is part of the Core, why are there hours specified in Exhibit 6 of the GPM for flight software sustaining engineers (principal, senior and mid-level)?

Answer 54

That labor category has been removed from Exhibit 6.

Question 55

L.22(a)(5) Proposal Format and Organization: Since Section L requires addressing the Sample Problem and CORE requirements in the proposal, but not all 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).”* To state: *“The proposal shall include a matrix showing where in the proposal the evaluation criteria of this RFP are satisfied.”*

Answer 55

The language in the final RFP will be changed to read “The proposal shall include a matrix showing where in the proposal the evaluation criteria of this RFP are satisfied.”

Question 56

L.23 (c)(7) Subcontract Listing: This section requires the Offeror to provide a summary of subcontract values associated with both the GPM and Sample Problem. Since the Sample Problem is not priced but CORE is, should the “Sample Problem value” be changed to “CORE value”?

Answer 56

Yes, the language will be changed in the final RFP to reflect “CORE requirements value” rather than “Sample Problem value”.

Question 57

L.24. 3 Subfactor C, Management Plan: The DRFP states “...The Offeror shall describe the relationship to any corporate process initiatives (e.g., Capability Maturity Model Integration (CMMI)) that are planned or underway.” Does the government want this addressed in the QAP or is it a separate requirement for the management plan?

Answer 57

Plans to acquire a CMMI certification should be cited in the Management Plan.

Question 58

L.22(b) Proposal Content and Page Limitations: Will the government confirm that the Acronym List and Evaluation Compliance Matrix are excluded from page count in all volumes?

Answer 58

The Acronym list and the Compliance Matrix are to be submitted as part of the mission suitability volume and these two items have been excluded from the page count of that volume.

Question 59

J.1 A Attachment F and L.24, Subfactor C, Management Plan: Quality Assurance Plan: The DRFP states: “The offeror shall submit a written Quality Assurance Plan (QAP)...”

Q: Will the government confirm that the QAP is excluded from the page count of the Mission Suitability volume?

Answer 59

The QAP is now due 30 days after the effective date of the contract.

Question 60

L.24.3 and M.3.1 Subfactor C, Management Plan, Significant Subcontractors: The DRFP states "...If significant subcontractors are proposed, identify their interfaces to your organizational structure and provide and lists 4 requirements."

Will the government confirm that all references to "subcontractors" thereafter in this paragraph actually apply only to "significant subcontractors"?

Answer 60

Yes, the Government has added the word "significant" before the word "subcontractor" in the remainder of the paragraph, for clarity.

Question 61

H.7 1852.216-72 Observance of Legal Holidays (Aug 1992): (d) whenever administrative leave is granted to Contractor personnel pursuant to paragraph (e) ...Paragraph e was not included, will the government complete the clause?

Answer 61

For the final draft, the paragraph now reads "granted to Contractor personnel pursuant to paragraph (c)"

Question 62

G.7 1852.216-75 Payment of Fixed Fee: ***The fixed fee shall be paid in monthly installments based upon the percentage of completion of work as determined by the Contracting Officer.***

How is the "percentage" calculated? Is it based on the total cost incurred during the month or is the fee based on hours?

Will the fee be based actual costs or planned?

Answer 62

The percentage of completion is calculated by taking the total estimated cost of the contract value(the sum of all awarded task orders) plus M&A costs and dividing it into cumulative to date actuals. This equation produces a percentage rate that tells percent of contract completion. That percentage is then multiplied by monthly actual costs plus M&A which produces an amount which is the fee that will be paid for that month.

Question 63

Exhibit 6 GPM: GPM Exhibit 6 has hours listed for labor category titled "Flight Software System Developer (Mid-Level)" however this labor category is not listed in Enclosure 3.

Q: Will the Government add this labor category and associated incumbent information to Enclosure 3?

Answer 63

There were errors in both the Exhibit 6 and Enclosure 3 which will be corrected for the release of the final RFP.

Question 64

Enclosure 2 Sample Problem 1.2 Instruments: The sample problem states that “each cubesat carries either one or two remote sensing instruments. They are referred to by their satellite ID (F1, F2, F3 . . .) and their instrument ID (A or B).” Instrument F3-A is listed twice as Soil temperature and Subsurface soil moisture. Q: Is this a typo or does Instrument F3-A perform both of these functions?

Answer 64

This is a typo and will be corrected for the final RFP.

Question 65

Exhibit B Enclosure 3 Labor Category: Exhibit B, SES Labor Category Position Descriptions includes the following labor categories which are not reflected in Enclosure 3, SES Incumbent Rates: Flight Software System Developer (Senior), Flight Software System Developer (Mid-Level), and Ground software System Developer (Principle).

Q: Will the Government add these labor categories and associated incumbent information to Enclosure 3?

Answer 65

There were errors in both the Exhibit 6 and Enclosure 3 which will be corrected for the release of the final RFP. The corrected versions will satisfy the question.

Question 66

Enclosure 3 Exhibit B SES Incumbent Rate: Enclosure 3, SES Incumbent Rates references Education & Public Outreach (Principle, Sr., Mid-level, and Associate) labor categories however there are no labor category descriptions for these labor categories in Exhibit B.

Q: Would the Government add these labor category descriptions to Exhibit B?

Answer 66

Education and Public Outreach labor categories are being removed. These labor categories are not part of this procurement. It was an error.

Question 67

Enclosure 2-SES II- Sample Problem: Regarding Sample Problem 1A “...key efforts of the GCC-F Phase B activities . . .” are enumerated as items 1 - 6. However, item 6 states "Prepare and present CDR material". CDR is a phase C activity. Should the initial sentence be revised to state “The contractor shall be responsible for leading the key efforts of the GCC-F Phase B/C activities under the direction of the NASA GCC-F Ground Systems Manager?”

Answer 67

Yes. The final RFP will reflect a change to the language of the sample problem

Question 68

Section L.22 (a) (2) and Section L. 25 (1) The Draft RFP states, "Offerors and proposed significant subcontractors for cost proposal purposes [**CORE REQUIREMENTS- defined as any subcontract**

that is likely to exceed 15% of the proposed Core contract value (Base plus Option periods) and Government Pricing Model (GPM) defined as any subcontract that is likely to exceed 20% of the proposed total GPM]." This statement is inconsistent with what is stated in Section L.25 (1) Instructions for Core Requirements and IDIQ portion (GPM). The Draft RFP states, "For the purposes of the Cost Volume section for the Core Requirements of this procurement, a significant subcontractor is defined as a subcontractor expected to exceed 20% of the proposed Core contract value (Base plus Option periods). For the purposes of the Cost Volume section for the GPM portion of this procurement, a significant subcontractor is defined as a subcontractor expected to exceed 10% of the proposed total GPM." Please provide clarification on the percentage threshold for Core Requirements and GPM.

Answer 68

L.22 and L.25 have both been updated to reflect the same information. For the purposes of the cost volume a significant subcontractor is defined as 20% of the CORE requirements and/or 10% of the GPM. The correct numbers will be reflected in the final RFP.

Question 69

Section: Core Requirements (5) and (6); Exhibit 3 and 3-A: The Draft RFP states, "in accordance with Exhibit 3, which summarizes the Prime Offeror's proposed elements of cost fixed fee for Slip Months 1 through 6, CY 2020 through CY 2021 at WBS Level 1 (total Core Requirement)." and "in accordance with Exhibit 3-A for Slip Months 1 through 6 CY 2020 through CY 2021 at WBS Level 1 (total Core Requirement)." The document Exhibit 3 and Exhibit 3-A reference December 2021. Should Exhibit 3 and 3-A reference December 2020?

Answer 69

The Exhibits have been changed to begin in December 2020.

Question 70

SOW 3.1 FSW Rqmt #3: "Develop and certify a FSW Mission Operations software tools set ..."
Does the Government mean, a tool set for performing sustaining engineering across many different missions? If not, would the Government please clarify the purpose of the tool set, and the domain of its functionality?

Answer 70

There are often mission-to-mission congruencies for tools (and other products and processes); for example, one mission's architecture might have similarities with another, such that we can modify mission A's tool(s) to use on mission B. With the multi-mission FSSE model, missions share personnel, products, and processes, etc.

Each mission tends to have its own mission-unique products and processes (including 580 FSSE tools set), even though they do often share a baseline or other starting point

Question 71

Enclosure 2 Sample Problem: Can you identify the seven Universities with antennas? And do the antennas already exist or are they new for this mission?

Answer 71

The sample problem is a fictitious problem. An assumption can be made that the Universities are well versed in antennas.

Question 72

Enclosure 2 Sample Problem: While only one Wallops antenna will be used for uplink, is it possible to get multiple antennas for S-band telemetry in parallel?

Answer 72

The sample problem is a fictitious problem, developed for offers to propose better technical options. Offerors should state all assumptions as specified in section L.24, Subfactor A.

Question 73

Enclosure 2 Sample Problem: The sample problem says "500 kbits/second file downlink rate". Is this the spacecraft symbol downlink rate, or the data rate after all encoding is removed (which would imply a higher downlink rate, something over 1Mbit/sec)?

Answer 73

In this fictitious problem, the stated data rate is the effective data transfer rate; the spacecraft symbol rate or other RF characteristics are not considered important to the sample task.

Question 74

Enclosure 2 -3.3 Sample Problem 2A: GCC-F Flight Software Systems Phases B/C/D ...

"The Contractor shall lead the GCC-F FSW verification and validation (V&V) in the following areas:

- S/C Acceptance Test Execution Runs
- S/C Comprehensive Performance Testing
- S/C Mission Simulation testing"

Does this just mean that the contractor will lead the FSW testing effort (which would not be so unusual - the PDL is historically a civil servant, but Test Team Leads have sometimes been contractors)?

Answer 74

In this fictitious problem, the government is asking proposers to lead the V&V effort.

Question 75

General Cover Letter: "The Core Requirement will have a potential 5-year period of performance comprised of a 22-month base period plus two option periods, the first being 24 months and the second being 14 months. The IDIQ Requirements period of performance shall be from contract effective date through five years."

Please confirm the SESII Contract will have two separate period of performance, one for the Core and the other for the IDIQ. Specifically, the Core Requirement will have a period of performance of one base and two options as indicated in the draft RFP. The IDIQ will have a 5-year base period of performance.

Answer 75

Yes, that is correct.

Question 76

General RFP: Would the Gov't consider providing redlined documents for any subsequent revisions or modifications to the draft and/or final RFP indicating the areas of change?

Answer 76

A listing of major changes will be provided at time of final RFP.

Question 77

General, Section J: Attachment E, Safety and Health Plan is due 30 days after award. It is our experience that the Safety and Health Plan for Goddard procurements is routinely provided with the proposal and is evaluated due to the importance Goddard places on safety and health. Will the government require a Safety and Health Plan and will it be excluded from the page limits?

Answer 77

The final RFP is being revised so that a Safety and Health Plan is required at time of proposal and will be excluded from the page count.

Question 78

General, Section J: Attachment G, IT Security Management Plan is due with the bidder's response to the RFP. However, section M does not show the plan will be used as part of the evaluation. Given the importance of IT security to the SESII contract, would the Government consider incorporating the IT Security Management Plan into the evaluation criteria for Subfactor C in Section M?

Answer 78

The IT Security Management Plan is due 30 days after contract effective date. It will not be evaluated for award.

Question 79

General, Section L.22(a)(4): How many CD-ROMs are required? It is unclear if the government requires 2 copies/disks with all volumes to include pricing on each disk (2 total disks) or if you require 2 copies of each volume on their own disks (8 total disks). Please clarify.

Answer 79

The Government requires 2 copies of each volume on their own disks (8 total disks).

Question 80

Offeror, L.23 (c)(7): "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 and Sample Problem value)." The instructions for the Cost Volume require that a Basis of Estimate be provided for the Sample Problem but do not seem to require Offerors to provide a total cost. Should the parenthetical in the Offer Volume requirement be changed to read "(GPM value)"?

Answer 80

Yes, the parenthetical will be revised to state "GPM Value and Core Requirements Value"

Question 81

MS, L.24.3 Subfactor C: "The QAP shall describe the offeror's method (i.e. 100% inspection, planned sampling, random sampling, customer complaints, or incidental inspections) to determine measurements of performance are subjective or objective and shall identify the quality, quantity, and timeliness of the services to be provided." It appears that some words are

missing between the words "...to determine ..." and "... measurements of performance ...". In related GSFC RFPs, this missing words appear to be as follows: "...to determine whether performance requirements in the SOW are met. The QAP shall describe whether measurements..." Should this sentence be corrected as indicated?

Answer 81

Words were missing. The final RFP will have the paragraph fully populated with the missing words.

Question 82

MS Section B.1 and Section J.1: Although item 15 in Table B.1 indicates the IT Security Management Plan is due 30 days after Contract Effective Date, Attachment G in Table J.1 indicates the IT Security Management Plan is due at proposal due date along with other proposal elements such as the Management Plan and QAP. Please confirm the IT Security Management Plan is due with the proposal submission and excluded from page count.

Answer 82

The IT Security Management Plan is due 30 days after Contract Effective date. The Quality Assurance Plan is now due 30 days after Contract Effective date. The final RFP will reflect the changes to Section J.1.

Question 83

MS, Section J.1 Attachment E and Section L.24.3 Subfactor C: Given the importance and commitment of safety and health to GSFC and NASA, and the associated safety and health training and reporting during the execution of the SESII Contract, would the Gov't consider including a requirement to include a Safety and Health Plan as part of the Mission Suitability volume in Section L and M, but to exclude the Safety and Health Plan from page count?

Answer 83

The Safety and Health Plan is now due at time of proposal. It will be evaluated as part of the Mission Suitability volume.

Question 84

MS Section L.22(b)(1), Table: Please confirm Cover Page, Executive Summary, Table of Contents, List of Tables, List of Figures, List of Appendices, and proposal compliance matrix are excluded from page count.

Answer 84

Cover Page, Indices, SOW Compliance Matrix, Total Compensation Plan, Phase-in Plan, Position Descriptions, Safety and Health and List of Acronyms are removed from the page count as listed in the table at L.22.

Question 85

MS, Section L.22 (b)(1): The current draft RFP instruction does not exclude the Quality Assurance Plan from page count. Consistent with other recent solicitations at GSFC, would the Gov't consider excluding the Quality Assurance Plan from page count?

Answer 85

The Quality Assurance Plan is now due 30 days after Contract Effective Date.

Question 86

MS Section L.23(c)(8): "In accordance with Attachment D, Contract Security Classification Specification (DD 254), Offerors shall possess a Top Secret level facility security clearance by the

contract effective date and this clearance shall be maintained throughout the life of the contract. Offerors shall provide their CAGE code for verification of current security clearance status. No Offeror will be considered for award who does not have a Top Secret level facility security clearance in place by the due date for receipt of proposals.” The two stated requirements appear to provide different guidance to Offerors. Please clarify if Offerors are to have a Top Secret facility security clearance in place by the contract effective date or by the due date for receipt of proposals.

Answer 86

The Offer must have a Top Secret Clearance by the Effective Date of the contract.

Question 87

MS Section L.23(c)(8): “In accordance with Attachment D, Contract Security Classification Specification (DD 254), Offerors “In accordance with Attachment D, Contract Security Classification Specification (DD 254), Offerors shall possess a Top Secret level facility security clearance by the contract effective date and this clearance shall be maintained throughout the life of the contract. Offerors shall provide their CAGE code for verification of current security clearance status. No Offeror will be considered for award who does not have a Top Secret level facility security clearance in place by the due date for receipt of proposals.” Given the competitive landscape for GSFC 8(a) procurements and the participation of SBA sanctioned Joint Ventures, the later guidance would essentially discourage an award to a newly formed 8(a) Joint Venture submitting a proposal in response to the SESII solicitation as the Joint Venture cannot control the timing of actions undertaken by the Defense Security Services in order to adjudicate a facility clearance. Would the Gov’t consider incorporating the following language, which comes from a recent NASA procurement pertaining to Joint Ventures and facility clearance requirements, “The prime contractor or subcontractor performing the classified work, at the Government designated facility, must have an approved DD254 and a FCL. It is the prime contractor’s responsibility for flowdown of the DD254, as appropriate. If the subcontractor has an approved FCL and they are performing the classified work, then it is not mandated that the prime contractor also have an FCL.”

Answer 87

No. The Prime Contractor or the 8 (a) Joint venture must hold the Top Secret Clearance.

Question 88

MS Section L.24.2: “For the CORE contract requirement of the offeror’s proposal, the Work Breakdown Structure (WBS) shall mirror the Statement of Work sections 2 and 3 to WBS level 3 and shall be used to structure the Mission Suitability Volume for the Core Requirements.” Given the required level of detail, WBS Level 3, for Core Requirement proposal response, would the Gov’t consider increasing the page count for the Mission Suitability volume to 125 pages?

Answer 88

The page count has been increased to 85 pages and some required documents have been removed from the page count.

Question 89

Reserved

Answer 89

Reserved

Question 90

MS Enclosure 2, Section 1.3: Two instruments are listed as “F3-A.” Is this a typo? Please clarify.

Answer 90

This is a typo. The language in the final RFP will reflect the correct information.

Question 91

MS Enclosure 2, Section 1.3: The “Operations Concept” paragraph 3 reads: “All satellites in GCC-F will share the same command frequency, with satellite ID in the uplink packets identifying which satellite is to process the command message. Each GCC-F satellite has its own telemetry frequency.” Will individual cubesat telemetry packets be identified by separate spacecraft IDs in addition to an independent telemetry frequency?

Answer 91

Yes

Question 92

Cost Section L.22 a(2): “Offerors and proposed significant subcontractors for cost proposal purposes [CORE REQUIREMENTS- defined as any subcontract that is likely to exceed 15% of the proposed Core contract value (Base plus Option periods) and Government Pricing Model (GPM) defined as any subcontract that is likely to exceed 20% of the proposed total GPM]” Does the significant subcontractor have to satisfy both 15% of core and 20% GPM or one of the two?

Answer 92

L.22 has been updated to reflect the same information. For the purposes of the cost volume a significant subcontractor is defined as 20% of the CORE requirements and/or 10% of the GPM. The correct numbers will be reflected in the final RFP.

Question 93

Cost Section L.22(a)(2)and Section L.25.1 :Section L.22(a)(2) defines significant subcontractors as “...cost proposal purposes [CORE REQUIREMENTS- defined as any subcontract that is likely to exceed 15% of the proposed Core contract value (Base plus Option periods) “ while Section L.25.1 defines significant subcontractors as “For the purposes of the Cost Volume section for the Core Requirements of this procurement, a significant subcontractor is defined as a subcontractor expected to exceed 20% of the proposed Core contract value (Base plus Option periods).” Please clarify the criteria for determining significant subcontractors for the Core Requirement of Volume III – Cost.

Answer 93

L.22 and L.25 have both been updated to reflect the same information. For the purposes of the cost volume a significant subcontractor is defined as 20% of the CORE requirements and/or 10% of the GPM. The correct numbers will be reflected in the final RFP.

Question 94

Cost Section L.22(a)(2),and Section L.25.1,Section L.: Section L.22(a)(2) defines significant subcontractors as “...cost proposal purposes...and Government Pricing Model (GPM) defined as any subcontract that is likely to exceed 20% of the proposed total GPM]” while Section L.25.1 significant subcontractors as “For the purposes of the Cost Volume section for the GPM portion of this procurement, a significant subcontractor is defined as a subcontractor expected to exceed 10% of the proposed total GPM.” Please clarify the criteria for determining significant subcontractors for the GPM of Volume III – Cost.

Answer 94

L.22 and L.25 have both been updated to reflect the same information. For the purposes of the cost volume a significant subcontractor is defined as 20% of the CORE requirements and/or 10% of the GPM. The correct numbers will be reflected in the final RFP.

Question 95

Cost Section L.25.1, p.92: "The Offeror shall populate both material and travel costs under the Work Breakdown Structure(WBS)...and under whichever WBS sections the Offeror determines the costs are most likely to occur...The Offeror shall distribute the costs evenly across the lower WBS levels established in Exhibit 2 so that the costs consistently roll up to Exhibit 1." Would the Gov't consider replacing the word "evenly" with "appropriate" to be consistent with the first instruction?

Answer 95

The language in L.25 will be changed to read as follows: "The Offeror shall populate both material and travel costs under the Work Breakdown Structure (WBS) sections as defined below, across all five years, spread out evenly. These costs shall add up to the established costs provided by the Government in Exhibit 1. The Offeror shall distribute the costs evenly across the lower WBS levels established in Exhibit 2 so that the costs consistently roll up to Exhibit 1. The purpose of doing this is so that the Government has insight into how the burdens for these costs are applied.

Question 96

Section L.23(c)(8) Contract Security Classification: How will the detailed plan to provide a Top Secret facility clearance prior to contract effective date (at the end of contract phase-in) be evaluated?

Answer 96

The requirement for a detailed plan on how the contractor will obtain a TS clearance by the effective date of the contract has been removed.

Question 97

eLibrary Contents :

- | |
|---|
| <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Do the task orders represent Core and IDIQ elements of the program?2. Can the government specify which are core and which are IDIQ?3. Do the set of Task Orders represent a representative year of work of the current contact?4. If not, can the government provide a complete one year set so the bidder can assess and understand the full scope of a representative year of work?5. Can the government provide the period of performance and task order value for each Task Order (as the government did on the ESES II acquisition) to allow bidders to better understand the scope of work authorized? |
|---|

Answer 97

1. The task orders in the e-Library represent a cross section of the typical work performed under the current SES contract. The task orders are from the current year. The current contract is not broken down between Core and IDIQ. It's all IDIQ.
2. Task order 2006 in the e-Library represents the Flight Software Sustaining engineering core, SES II SOW Section 2. SES II SOW Section 3 is a consolidation of pieces of several IT services on

SES and other contracts within AETD. SES II SOW Section 3 represents a consolidation of institutional (non-mission specific) IT services supporting AETD.

3. See answer 1 under this section.

4. The Government feels that the task orders provided give enough background information for Offerors to understand the scope of work of the SES II Procurement.

5. The period of performance is embedded within each task order.

Question 98

Will the government consider adding 48 CFR 1852.243-71 – Shared Savings to the RFP?

Answer 98

Yes, that clause was accidentally omitted from the DRFP and will be in the Final RFP.

Question 99

Section L.24 includes a requirement for a Quality Assurance Plan (QAP) at proposal submission. Usually the QAP is included in B.1 Supplies and/or Services to be Provided. If appropriate for the government, you may want to consider adding it to Section B.1.

Answer 99

The Quality Assurance Plan is now due 30 days after Contract Effective date and it will be added to B.1.

Question 100

Section L.24 Subfactor C requires a QAP. Section L.22 (b) does not show the QAP as excluded from the page count. Please confirm that the QAP is excluded from the 70-page limit.

Answer 100

The Quality Assurance Plan is now due 30 days after Contract Effective date.

Question 101

Section L.24 Subfactor C requires a plan to support an organization with a CMMI Level 2. Section E.2 does not specify CMMI Level 2. Does the government require the bidder to have or have a plan to achieve CMMI Level 2 maturity on the program?

Answer 101

Yes.

Question 102

Please clarify in Section J.1 that the IT Security Management Plan is due 30 days after contract award.

Answer 102

The IT Security management Plan is due 30 days after Contract Effective Date. J.1 now reflects that.

Question 103

Section L.22(a)(2) specifies a significant subcontractor for cost purposes as having 15% of the Core and 20% of the GPM. Section L.25 (page 88) specifies a significant subcontractor for cost purposes as 20% of the Core and 10% of the GPM. Please clarify.

Answer 103

L.22 and L.25 have both been updated to reflect the same information. For the purposes of the cost volume a significant subcontractor is defined as 20% of the CORE requirements and/or 10% of the GPM. The correct numbers will be reflected in the final RFP.

Question 104

Retracted

Question 105

Is the page count cited in Section L.22 for BOEs inclusive of both the Core BOEs and the Sample Problem BOEs?

Answer 105

The page count for the BOE's has been increased to 30 pages and the sample problem BOE has been given its own page count, under the mission suitability volume, of 15 pages.

Question 106

Section M.3 Subfactor C CMMI Plan evaluates the reasonableness, effectiveness, and efficiency of integration of the offeror's CMMI plan with the existing Division CMMI processes, yet no Division CMMI processes are provided as part of the DRFP. Please clarify how a non-incumbent bidder who does not have insight into the Division CMMI processes can adequately comply with this requirement.

Answer 106

Section L.24 and M.3 have been revised to address this concern.

Question 107

Reference Draft RFP Section L.23 (c) (8): In regard to the Top Secret facility clearance requirement, the Draft RFP states that "For proposals submitted as joint venture, the facility clearance must be granted in the name of the joint venture...". Can the Government elaborate on whether or not there is a requirement for all companies making up the joint venture to have a TS Facility Clearance, or does it just apply to the joint venture?

Answer 107

No, NASA does not have that information. Please contact your Defense Security Services Agency.

Question 108

How will state, local, commercial, and federal past performances be graded? Will there be any differences in how those different types of past performance are evaluated?

Answer 108

As long as the past performance submitted meets the requirements for relevancy then it will be evaluated in accordance with the evaluation criteria set forth in Section M.

Question 109

Page 82 (Subcontractor Listing) mentions "Sample Problem Value" as an item to be listed. However, there is only a BOE requirement for the sample problem (Page 99, (g) SAMPLE PROBLEM) not a price (i.e. no mention of cost exhibits combined with sample problem).

- a. Does the government want a sample problem value stated in Volume I Offer?
- b. If yes, does the government expect full pricing exhibits similar to Core or GPM?

Answer 109

No. The language in the RFP has been corrected to read as follows: "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 and Core Requirements value).

Question 110

Page 83 states that "The Mission Suitability Volume and the Cost Volume must mirror the Statement of Work, sections 2 and 3, to WBS level 3", but on Page 91 states "Exhibit 2 shows the Prime Offeror's proposed Core Requirements elements of cost and fixed fee by WBS, starting at the lowest WBS Level (WBS Level 4)..." and on Page 93 states "The Core BOEs are to be submitted for the entire potential five year period of performance (Base plus Option periods) at the lowest WBS Level only (WBS Level 4)".

It appears that the government is simply using two different definitions of WBS Level. So that on Page 83 WBS Level 3 means, for example SOW 2.1.1, while in the cost volume it defines it as WBS Level 4 since that section defines a WBS Level 1 as a wrap-up of SOW Sections 2 and 3. Is this interpretation accurate?

Would the government consider changing Page 83 "WBS Level" to "SOW Level"?

Answer 110

The RFP has been updated to reflect WBS level 4 where there were inconsistencies.

Question 111

On Page 91, WBS Level 4 appears to be missing 2.1.1. Should section 2.1.1 be included?

Answer 111

Yes. The RFP has been updated to include 2.1.1.

Question 112

Section L.22 (a) (5) states: "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)."

What specifically is meant by the "requirements of the SOW", and "SOW element"? Should the matrix include every SOW section? Every "shall" statement? Every statement?

Does this include SOW section 4? Or only 2 and 3?

Answer 112

The language in the RFP has been changed to the following: "The proposal shall include a matrix showing where the evaluation criteria of this RFP are satisfied".

Question 113

L.22(b)(2) (Page 79) provides page definition, which requires at least one inch margins on all sides, using not smaller than 12 point Times New Roman font. The Government provided cost exhibits do not comply with the formatting requirement defined within this provision. Please clarify if the cost exhibits to be provided as part of Volume III: Cost Volume are excluded from the formatting requirements specified within this RFP provision.

Answer 113

The Cost Exhibits provided by the Government are to be used for the SES II proposal as formatted.

Question 114

Section L.22 (b)(1) (Page 78) assigns a 25 page limitation to Volume III: Cost Volume, Section (c) Basis of Estimates. Section L.25.1 addresses three different BOE components - Core Requirements (Page 93), Government Pricing Model (Page 97), and Sample Problem (Page 100). Please clarify if the page limitation applies to just Core Requirements, or if offerors must address all three components within the 25 pages.

Answer 114

The page limit for the BOEs for the cost volume is now 30 pages, which shall cover both the Core BOEs and the Government Pricing Model BOEs. The BOE for the sample problem is now part of the mission suitability volume and has been given its own page count of 15 pages.

Question 115

Section L (5) 8(a) Joint Ventures states:

“If an 8(a) joint venture is proposed, the Offeror should submit a Small Business Administration (SBA) signed and approved joint venture agreement with submission of the proposal. If SBA has not approved the joint venture agreement at the time of proposal submission, the Offeror shall describe its status in achieving joint venture approval from the Small Business Administration, including:

- Identify the companies included in the joint venture.
 - Identify the district SBA office and SBA Point of Contact/Business Development Specialist (name, address, phone number, and email) that the application was submitted to for review and approval.
 - If not yet approved, identify the steps you have taken toward achieving approval by the anticipated contract award date (include applicable dates of each activity).
- Award of the contract will only be made to a SBA approved 8(a) company or 8(a) Joint Venture.”

This clause addresses this past summer's ruling by the GAO in the case of BGI-Fiore JV, LLC that found that all proposed JVs must be evaluated regardless of whether the SBA approved the JV prior to submission or not. The GAO found that the JV is only required to have their approval at the time of award. Consider the issue that an 8(a) JV submits a proposal and meets the size and SDB requirements at the time of submittal but by the time of award (may be a year later) the SBA cannot certify the JV because in the interim it graduated from the 8(a) program or other awards made it outgrow the size standard.

Given that JVs can take multiple forms (Mentor/Protégée, Populated JV and Unpopulated JV) and the JVs method of incorporation can vary, with each form and permutation having various and different legal and reporting requirements, that often have conflicting language (FAR - for procurement, SBA - for size determination and set aside standards, DCAA for accounting and reporting requirements) shouldn't this section be expanded such that the selection authority can evaluate exactly what is being offered - since every JV construct has different obligations such that the risk to the government can be determined.

New suggested language:

If an 8(a) joint venture is proposed, the Offeror should submit a Small Business Administration (SBA) signed and approved joint venture agreement with submission of the proposal. If SBA has not approved the joint venture agreement at the time of proposal submission, the Offeror shall describe its status in achieving joint venture approval from the Small Business Administration, including:

- Form of the JV (Mentor/Protégée, Populated JV and Unpopulated JV).
- Legal method utilized to establish the JV (C-corp, S-corp, LLC, etc.).
- Identify the companies included in the joint venture.
- Each companies size standard
- 8(a) status (date awarded by SBA)
- Identify the district SBA office and SBA Point of Contact/Business Development Specialist (name, address, phone number, and email) that the application was submitted to for review and approval.
- If not yet approved, identify the steps you have taken toward achieving approval by the anticipated contract award date (include applicable dates of each activity)."

Joint venture agreement must be received by SBA prior to proposal due date and approved before award of any resulting contract. If you are contemplating a joint venture on this project, you must advise your assigned SBA Business Opportunity Specialist (BOS) as soon as possible. It is also recommended that the agreement be submitted as soon as practicable to ensure compliance with established regulations. NO CORRECTIONS AND/OR CHANGES ARE ALLOWED AFTER TIME OF SUBMISSION OF PROPOSAL OR BIDS.

Answer 115

All facets of the JV arrangement are reviewed and approved by SBA. SBA must approve a joint venture agreement prior to the award of an 8(a) contract on behalf of the joint venture. As such the language as written is considered sufficient.

Question 116

The title of 3.3 Sample Problem 2A includes Phases B/C/D. The End Date for this problem is March 1, 2018 (Launch +45 day transition to sustaining effort.) Will the government clarify if the Offerors response to this Sample Problem needs to include the Phase E activities?

Answer 116

No, that was an oversight. The sample problem is referring to the FSSE group that is typically part of Phase E, however, the activity listed in Sample Problem 2A will occur prior to Phase E.

Question 117

L.24.3 Subfactor C, Management Plan-Quality Assurance Plan: The Draft RFP states: "The offeror shall discuss its plans for incorporating established processes supporting an organization with a CMMI-DEV level 2 maturity rating"

1. Will the Government clarify that the "organization" in the above sentence is referring to the government?
2. Will the government confirm that an offeror does not need to have a formal/external (i.e., from the CMMI Institute) CMMI-DEV level 2 certification?

Answer 117

1.Yes, the word “organization” does refer to the Government.

2.If the offeror is not currently certified, a plan to be rated CMMI-DEV at the maturity level 2 is required and shall be reflected in the Management Plan.

Question 118

M.3.1 Subfactor C, Management Plan-Quality Assurance evaluation criteria: The DRFP states: “The Government will evaluate the reasonableness of any corporate process initiatives (e.g., Capability Maturity Model Integration (CMMI) that are planned or currently underway. The Government will evaluate how the offeror intends to integrate existing Division CMMI evaluated process for reasonableness, effectiveness and efficiency.

For clarity, the offerors existing corporate process initiatives are being evaluated against GSFC’s (Division as above) current CMMI processes, is this correct?

Answer 118

Section M.3 of the RFP has been revised to address this question.

Question 119

SOW: It is our understanding that the current SES contract requires packaging and manufacturing of electronics and custom designed Ground Support Equipment (GSE). The SES II Draft RFP SOW does not describe this type of work. However, in SOW section 1.1, it states...”Other activities, i.e., Computing Environments and Collaborative Technologies, Research and Development for advanced data processing concepts. Required development, hardware and software development, etc. Are best suited to an IDIQ approach”. And SOW section 4.7.1 states...” The Contractor shall design and develop advanced concepts for all aspects of mission including hardware, complex electronics, reconfigurable computing, and software solutions to meet highly complex mission data processing objectives.”

Will the Government please clarify their requirements for this hardware development and associated required packaging and manufacturing?

Answer 119

This contract is for Software Engineering that may work with hardware. Hardware development and associated packaging and manufacturing is covered under other contracts.