Human Health and Performance Contract (HHPC) Questions and Answers (1)
10/29/2014

Question 1. Attachment J-2 and Slide # 27 of the Pre-Proposal Presentation indicate that Attachment J-20 External Customer Plan (DRD HHPC-MGMT-08) is due with the proposal; however, there are no Section L instructions regarding this External Customer Plan. If this Plan is indeed due with the proposal, where does the Government anticipate its inclusion?

Answer 1. DRD HHPC-MGMT-08 will be updated in the final RFP to specify the initial plan shall be submitted at Contract Start + 30 days with final due at Contract Start + 60 days. Attachment J-20 will also be renumbered to "Reserved" as Attachment J-20 is not required at contract start, or with the original proposal.

Question 2. Section L.22.6 Part III C. indicates that the DRD HHPC-BP-04 – Export Control Plan is to be submitted with the proposal; however, this Plan was not mentioned on the Pre-Proposal Conference slides (original or revised) and Attachment J-2, Block 5, indicates that the first submission of this DRD is due at Contract Start + 30 days. Will the Government please clarify if the Export Control Plan (DRD HHPC-BP-04) is due with the proposal?

Answer 2. Answer 2: The initial Export Control Plan is due with the proposal submission with the final version due at Contract Start + 60 days. Attachment J-2 will be updated in the final RFP to reflect the clarification.

Question 3. The text appears to have been cut off at Section 4.7 of DRD HHPC SMA-03. Please provide complete DRD HHPC SMA-03.

Answer 3. The text was cut off in Section 4.7 of the DRD HHPC SMA-03. The last two words "upon request" were truncated. DRD HHPC -SMA-03 will be modified in the final RFP to include the complete verbiage.

Question 4. Section L.22.4 Subsection (e) states that the Environmental and Safety data requested should be provided for all "contracts performed in the last five years" and "For all work performed during the past five years from the date of the HHPC solicitation, Offerors shall provide the following [list of Environmental and Safety data requirements]."

For some offerors this represents hundreds of contracts, and this request (especially three years of OSHA Forms for all contract locations) would result in extraordinarily large amounts of data and paper. Would the Government please consider limiting this request to only those contracts relevant to the HHPC effort (the relevant reference contracts as described in Subsections (a), (b), and (c) of this Section L.22.4)?

Answer 4. The Government only requires data on the relevant reference contracts as described in Subsections (a), (b), and (c) of this Section L.22.4. The guidance at L.22.4 plans to provide language similar to the following in the final RFP as follows to clarify the Government's intent:

"Offerors shall provide the following performance data with explanatory remarks on recent and relevant contracts (as defined in L.22.4 (a) & (b)). Offerors shall identify the applicable North American Industrial Classification System (NAICS) Code for each contract and shall include

points of contact for each contract. If a joint venture or prime-subcontractor relationship is proposed, the same information shall be provided for each major subcontractor proposed (as defined in L.22.4 (a)). Explanatory statements shall be included as appropriate. Offerors shall provide the following:"

Question 5. DRFP Section L.22.5 (b) 3 heading "Indirect Rate Historical Data and Analysis" states that the contractor shall provide 5 years of historical indirect rate performance; however, the Overhead Rate Template and G&A Template of the Draft RFP only have columns for the prior 3 years of indirect rates. Should the contractor provide 3 years or 5 years of historical indirect rates?

Answer 5. Section L.22.5 (b) 3 "Indirect Rate Historical Data and Analysis" cost narrative requires five years of history in narrative form while the Overhead Rate Template and the G&A Template require three years of data to substantiate the Offeror's proposal. Both of these requirements are correct.

Question 6. The DRFP requires Offerors to show a buildup of their G&A expense base including detailed information on Government and commercial contracts to include contract number, organization, and point of contact. Does this requirement apply to only elements of G&A buildup directly related to the entity proposed to perform the work or does it apply to the entire company? If the latter, this requirement is overly onerous as it could represent thousands of contract entries depending on the size of the Offeror.

Answer 6. The requirement, as indicated in the DRFP, is applicable to the entity proposed to perform the work. As such, the calculated G&A rate must support the detail that would be derived from the proposed entity's G&A buildup.

Question 7. The Statement of Work Task Description states that copies of schedules are maintained on SharePoint and provides links to sites that appear to be inside of the NDC firewall. Does the Government intend to post the referenced schedules in the Technical Library?

Answer 7. The Government will post the schedules referenced in Attachment L-3, TO-RFP-02, Page L-3-27 in the Technical Library under the Pricing Task Order section.

Question 8. Work Package number 206, Requirement number 13 references Drawing Number SEG46122196-303, Packet Assembly, Petri Dish. Does the government intend to post the referenced drawing in the Technical Library?

Answer 8. The Government does not intend to post Hardware drawings in the Technical Library. The reference to the Petri Dish Packet Assembly drawing in the final RFP will be deleted from TO-RFP-02. For specifics relating to the Petri Dish Packet Assembly, Offerors should refer to the Crew Health Care System (CHeCS) Medical HW Catalog Reference Section 3.2 Microbiology and Water Quality located in the Technical Library under the "Applicable Documents" Section.

Question 9. Work Package number 206, Requirement number 14 references Drawing Number SDM46109454-308, Packet Assembly, Surface Sampler. Does the government intend to post the referenced drawing in the Technical Library?

Answer 9. The Government does not intend to post Hardware drawings in the Technical Library. The reference to the Surface Sampler Packet Assembly drawing in the final RFP will be deleted from TO-RFP-02. For specifics relating to the Surface Sampler Packet Assembly, Offerors should refer to the Crew Health Care System (CHeCS) Medical HW Catalog reference Section 3.2 Microbiology and Water Quality located in the Technical Library under the "Applicable Documents" Section.

Question 10. Subtask 8.1, Flight Medicine Clinic Operations, paragraph 4 under the Health Information Services heading states, "The Contractor will plan, implement, and coordinate development of the EMR while discouraging dependence on paper medical records for patient care with the goal of eliminating archival paper records by January 2015." This requirement occurs prior to the planned contract award date, should the target date for elimination of archival paper records be January 2016?

Answer 10. TO-RFP-08, "JSC Clinical Operations," will be modified in the final RFP to reflect that this is an ongoing activity and the phrase "by January 2015" will be removed.

Question 11. Proposal Scenario 2 – ISS On-Orbit Medical Event states, "Explain the end-to-end processes and functional responsibilities across the HHP Directorate, Center, and Program organizations responsible for addressing and resolving the issue, and maintaining the health and safety of the crew during all real-time mission operations." Does the Government intend for the Offeror to address functional responsibilities of all parties (Government and Contractor) or only the responsibilities of the contractor under the HHPC Statement of Work?

Answer 11. The Offeror should address the functional responsibilities of the contractor personnel in its scenario response. In implementation of the scenario, the Offeror should describe its assumptions regarding what functions and/or responsibilities the Offeror assumes will be provided by the Government and how the contractor will interface with the Government.

Question 12. Work Package Number 206, Requirement Number 7 references PVC Pipe Glovebag Frame, P/N SEG46122064-301; Glovebag Clips, P/N SEG46122124-301, and Glovebag Filter, P/N SEG46122084-301. Does the Government intend to post the referenced drawings in the Technical Library?

Answer 12. The Government does not intend to post Hardware drawings in the Technical Library. The reference to the Glove Bag drawings will be deleted from TO-RFP-02 in the final RFP. Offerors should refer to the Wet Lab and Glove Bag Overview Material found in the Technical Library under the "Reference Material" section.

Question 13. Work Package Number 206, Requirement Number 8 references P/N SEG46122125-30X. Does the Government intend to post the referenced drawing in the Technical Library?

Answer 13. See answer to #12

Question 14. Work Package Number 206, Requirement Number 9 references P/N SEG46122063-30X. Does the Government intend to post the referenced drawing in the Technical Library?

Answer 14. See answer to #12

Human Health and Performance Contract (HHPC) Questions and Answers (1) 10/29/2014

Question 15. Work Package Number 206, Requirement Number 10 references P/N SEG46122087-301. Does the Government intend to post the referenced drawing in the Technical Library?

Answer 15. See answer to #12

Question 16. Work Package Number 224, Requirement Number 1 references p/n 60106MFA-2 and 60106MFA-3. Does the Government intend to post the referenced drawings in the Technical Library?

Answer 16. The Government does not intend to post Hardware drawings in the Technical Library. The reference to the Glenn Harness drawings will be deleted from TO-RFP-02 in the final RFP. For specifics relating to the Treadmill harness hardware, Offerors should refer to the Crew Health Care System (CHeCS) Medical HW Catalog reference Section 2.5 Treadmill with Vibration Isolation and Stabilization and Section 2.6 Treadmill2 in the CHeCS Catalog found in the Technical Library under the "Applicable Documents" Section.

Question 17. Section B.3 includes a line item for level-of-effort (LOE) task/delivery orders; however, Section B does not include terms to establish required LOE. Under an IDIQ contract, this may be defined as a percentage of cumulative direct labor hours ordered on issued task orders. Please clarify how the Government intends to establish the required LOE.

Answer 17. The Government will establish LOE/Term Form Task Orders on an "as-needed" basis. Each of these LOE/Term Form Task Orders will provide a specific level of effort within a definite time period as LOE tasks are defined and obligated on the contract during contract execution.

Question 18. Section B.6 allots $5M of funding to the contract, and provides that this allotment of funding covers an estimated period of performance through September 30, 2025. Please clarify if the estimated to date should read "TBD" pending award of HHPC.

Answer 18. Clause B.6 "Contract Funding" will be modified in the final RFP as follows:

(a) For purposes of payment of cost, exclusive of fee, in accordance with the Limitation of Funds clause, the total amount allotted by the Government to this contract is $5,000,000. This allotment is for Human Health and Performance Contract (HHPC) and covers the following estimated period of performance: October 1, 2015 through **TBD**. (APPLICABLE TO COST-REIMBURSEMENT)

Question 19. This section refers to "contract WBS sections 2.0, 3.0, and 4.0," which imposes a Government-specified WBS structure. Should this section refer to SOW Instead of WBS?

Answer 19. Section C.1.8 of the Final RFP will be modified to SOW Sections 2.0, 3.0 and 4.0 to reflect the correct reference.

Question 20. The following text is inserted after Clause 52.244-2, "Subcontracts over $10M including options, NASA directed subcontracts, and other than unlimited rights and data subcontracts." Please confirm that this text is added to 52.244-2, subparagraph (d).

Answer 20. Yes, the verbiage cited in Clause 52.244-2 is intended to be included in subparagraph (d).

The "included by reference" clause will be updated in the final RFP to include the following clarifying language:

(d) "If the Contractor has an approved purchasing system, the Contractor nevertheless shall obtain the Contracting Officer's written consent before placing the following subcontracts: Subcontracts over $10M including options, NASA directed subcontracts, and other than unlimited rights and data subcontracts."

Question 21. FAR Part 16.603-4 prescribes Clause 52.216-24 when a letter contract is anticipated. Please clarify if it is the Government's intent to issue a letter contract.

Answer 21. It is not the Government's intent to issue a letter contract. Clause 52.216-24, Limitation of Government Liability, will be removed from the Final RFP.

Question 22. Att. J-2, Table 1 – DRL Reference, lists the title for DRL HHPC-MGMT-13 as "Environmental Management Plan". However, the DRD titles this deliverable as "Environmental & Energy Consuming Product Compliance Reports". Please clarify correct DRD title and confirm DRD required content.

Answer 22. The correct title of this HHPC-MGMT-13 DRD is "Environmental and Energy Consuming Product Compliance Reports." The J-2 title of the DRD will be updated in the final RFP. Also, based on coordination with the JSC Environmental Office, the DRD will be replaced with an updated version that provides more clarification.

Question 23. The DRD and Attachment J-20 state that the External Customer Plan is due with the proposal. However, Section L does not identify where to include this plan in the proposal, nor does it indicate pages limits, if applicable. Please clarify.

Answer 23. Attachment J-20 "External Customer Plan" is not required at proposal submission. Rather, the initial plan shall be submitted at Contract Start + 30 days with final due at Contract Start + 60 days. Both DRD HHPC-MGMT-08 and Attachment J-2 will be updated in the final RFP to reflect the required submission dates.

Question 24. Att. J-2 provides the initial due date for DRL HHPC-IT-02: Information Technology (IT) Security Plan and Reports as contract start + 30 days. However, Section L.22.3.1 (page 438) instructs Offerors to submit DRL HHPC-IT-02 with their proposal. Please clarify.

Answer 24. DRD IT-02 "Information Technology (IT) Security Plan and Reports" is due with the proposal submission with the final version due at Contract Start + 60 days. Attachment J-2 will be updated in the final RFP to correct the discrepancy.

Question 25. The DRD states that the Export Control Plan is due at contract start + 30 days. Table L-2 and Section L.22.6 indicate that the plan is due with the proposal. Please clarify.

Answer 25. DRD BP-04 "Export Control Plan" is due with the proposal submission with the final version due at Contract Start + 60 days. Attachment J-2 will be updated in the final RFP to correct the discrepancy.

Question 26. For SOW Section 2.3.8, there are two buildings listed (266, 272) along with several rooms (103, 104, 105, 107, 108, 110, 115, 130, 131, 134). There is no way to determine which room is in which building. Please clarify.

Answer 26. For Section 2.3.8 of the SOW and J-28 of the facilities listing, Building 266 is the building that houses the Neuroscience Laboratory, and the applicable rooms are 103, 104, 107, 108, 110, 115, 130, 131 and 134. Room 105 will be removed from the SOW in the Final RFP. Building 272 houses offices and is not part of the laboratories. The Attachment J-28 will be updated appropriately in the final RFP.

Question 27. Section L.3 provides the contract type as IDIQ with CPAF and FFP task orders. The section states that, "the Government intends to issue both CR completion form and term task/delivery orders..." Attachment L-3: IDIQ Task/Delivery Orders does not provide the contract type, and whether the task orders are completion or term form. Please provide this information for the sample task orders.

Answer 27. The following language will be added to L.22.3.2 Technical Approach (TA) Mission Suitability Sub-factor 2, TA2. IDIQ Task/Delivery Orders in the final RFP to clarify the Government's intent:

"All sample Task/Delivery orders shall be considered to be Cost/Completion form."

Question 28. The Draft RFP Table L-2 specifies the page limitation for the Safety and Health Plan (DRD-SMA-03) as 40 pages. Given the importance of safety and ensuring a VPP compliant S&H program in a complex environment that includes remote locations; a large number of laboratories, buildings, and hazardous materials; and various activities such as hardware development, clinical operations, laboratory testing, and experiment development, we recommend the page count be increased to 50 pages.

Answer 28. RFP Section L.22.2 Table L-2 DRD-SMA-03 Volume 1, Part 1 page count will be increased from 40 to 50 pages in the final RFP.

Question 29. Section L.22.2, Table L-2 provides Volume I page limit as 340 pages, plus 40 pages for DRD-SMA-03, for a total of 380 pages; however, Section L.22.2(d) reads, in part, "if an Offeror submits Volume I with 405 pages, the final 5 pages will be returned", which indicates Volume I page limit as 400 pages. Please confirm correct Volume I page limit.

Answer 29. The 405 was a reference number and for example purposes only. To reduce potential confusion, Section L.22.2 (d) in the final RFP will utilize a base page number count congruent with the total page count found in L.22.2 Table L-2. Please note that DRD-SMA-03 is subject to its own page count as described in Table L-2.

Question 30. The font size specified for the proposal text and graphics is Times New Roman 12 point. To make graphics and tables more visually appealing, we recommend the addition of the following caveat to the RFP:

Tables, charts, graphs, figures, diagrams and schematics will contain font sizes no smaller than 8 point, be uncomplicated, legible, and appropriate for the subject matter. Foldout pages may only

be used for large tables, charts, graphs, plans, figures, diagrams and schematics, not for pages of text.

Answer 30. The final RFP Section L. Section L.22.2 (h) will be updated as follows: "Text in diagrams, charts, tables, artwork and photographs shall be no smaller than Times New Roman 8 point text size."

Question 31. This section specifies that Offerors shall provide the following environmental and safety data "[f]or all work performed during the past five years from the date of the HHPC solicitation." In the case of a large business, "all" results in hundreds if not thousands of contracts. We request that you modify this statement as follows:

"For all past performance references submitted with the proposal, Offerors shall provide the following:"

Answer 31. See answer to #4.

Question 32. Consent letters appear to be included in the page count for Volume II – Past Performance. So as not to unduly penalize companies for a greater number of major subcontractors on their team, we request that the consent letters be excluded from the page count.

Answer 32. Section L22.2 Table-2 will be updated in the final RFP to note that Past Performance Consent Letters are not included in the 85 page count.

Question 33. Please clarify if Attachment L-10, Past Performance Information Matrix, is included in the page count for Volume II – Past Performance.

Answer 33. The L-10 Past Performance Matrix is excluded from the 85 page count for Volume II – Past Performance. Table L-2: "Overview of Proposal Volumes and Page Limitations" will be modified in the final RFP to clarify the Government's requirement in regards to page count.

Question 34. Section L.22.5 (b) -2 and -3 requires direct labor escalation and indirect rate history for any rates not included in a FPRA. Please clarify if a Forward Pricing Rate Recommendation (FPRR) issued by the Offeror's corporate ACO is acceptable in lieu of a FPRA.

Answer 34. A FPRR is not acceptable in lieu of a FPRA (Forward Pricing Rate Agreement).

Question 35. The RFP provides the Government's estimate for a WYE as follows: Section L.22.5 (b).6 provides that a "WYE is generally considered to be 2,080 hours per 12 month period."· Att. L-4 provides total specified resources as 410 WYEs, without reference to annual hours. The ISCT-SR Template included within Att. L-7 specifies total annual hours as 762,600, which equates to 1,860 annual hours per WYE (762,600/410). Please clarify how many annual hours a WYE equates to per the Government's estimate.

Answer 35. The straight time hour used in calculating the hours in the ISCT-SR is 1860 per WYE (Work Year Equivalent).

Question 36. Please clarify if Offerors are allowed to propose different annual hours per WYE as indicated in Section L.22.5 (b).6 for pricing the RFP specified resources.

Answer 36. Offerors are not allowed to propose different annual hours per WYE in the RFP specified resources. All offerors shall apply their fully burdened labor rates against the specified resources as indicated in the ISCT – SR template.

Question 37. The FBR Template does not include any area for the addition of Fringe Benefits. May Offerors add/modify existing columns to ensure rate development is consistent with their respective accounting methods?

Answer 37. The Offeror is allowed to add additional columns in the FBR Template in order capture the Offeror's respective accounting methods.

Question 38. The FBR Template contains a column entitled "% Incumbents at Current DL Rates". Please clarify if "current DL Rates", as used in context of the FBR Template, is referring to the current average DL rates that the Government will make available within the technical library.

Answer 38. Yes. The "% Incumbents at Current DL rates" as referred to in context to the FBR Template is the current average DL rates that the government will make available within the technical library.

Question 39. Table 1.0 defines Contract Year 1 as a twelve month period from 10/1/2015 – 09/30/2016. The DRFP states "Full Contract Year 2 through Contract Year 10 requirements may not be indicative of Contract Year 1 estimates prorated to a twelve month time period [emphasis added]. Please clarify the proration statement given that Contract Year 1 is 12 months.

Answer 39. The final RFP will be modified to remove the verbiage "prorated to a twelve month time period." This language, which is also located in the ISCT – TO, will also be removed. In addition, a duplicate paragraph in the ISCT – SR in which this language appears will also be removed.

Question 40. Regarding Compensation Templates (a) and (b), the Government remarked during the HHPC Cost/Pricing overview presentation that all Offerors shall populate the Column entitled "Incumbent Actual Labor Rate" with the current average DL rates by standard labor category that the Government will provide in the technical library. However, Sections L.22.5 (d).3(c)-1 and -2, currently read "The "Incumbent Actual Labor Rate" column is only applicable to incumbent contractors or subcontractors". Please clarify if all Offerors are to complete this column, and must populate it with the average DL rates that the Government will provide in the technical library.

Answer 40. The Incumbent Actual Labor Rate column should be populated by all offerors to reflect the data available in the Technical Library. The final RFP will be modified to clarify the Government's intent.

Question 41. Attachment L-2 provides four scenarios. Do any of the scenarios B – D represent actual issues that have been encountered on the ISS?? If these scenarios represent actual events encountered on the ISS, please provide the relevant associated documentation and corrective actions taken in the technical library.

Answer 41. Scenarios B-D are hypothetical and represent unique events that could theoretically occur during the performance period. Section L.22.3.2 TA.1 will be modified in the final RFP to clarify this distinction.

Question 42. Proposal Scenario 1 – Consolidation and Relocation of Science and Research Laboratories does not specify if this entire move is on-site or if there is an off-site to on-site component. Please clarify.

Answer 42. Attachment L-2, Section A, Scenario 1 "Consolidation and Relocation of Science and Research Laboratories" on the final RFP will be updated with a qualifier that states "Offerors shall assume that all moves will remain onsite at the Johnson Space Center."

Question 43. ISS Lockers item b) requires that the contractor "[p]rovide quarterly status report for ISS Lockers and PMP/VPMP Adapter Plate inventory and limited life tracking", however under the Deliverables and Schedule column, it shows "0" inventory reports for b). Please clarify the delivery requirements.

Answer 43. The requirement is to provide quarterly status reports for ISS Locker and PMP/VPMP Adapter Plate inventory and limited life tracking. The delivery requirement will be modified in the final RFP from "0" to "4."

Question 44. The Deliverables and Schedule column identifies that 0 Test Preparation Sheets (TPSs) are required for functional checkouts. Please clarify if this is correct.

Answer 44. No, this is not correct. The delivery requirement will be modified from "0" to "1" in the final RFP to reflect the Government's requirement for TPSs.

Question 45. TPSs are shown under the Deliverables and Schedule column in other similar sections, even if "0" are required. Please clarify if TPSs should be shown here.

Answer 45. Yes, TPSs for functional checkouts should be included in the Requirements Description column. The TPS requirement will be added and the Deliverables and Schedule columns will be modified from "0" to "2" in the final RFP to reflect the Government's requirement.

Question 46. The Offeror shall describe its approach to and rationale for meeting the contract requirements, as required on MAl, MA2, MA3, MA4, and MA5 sub-factors below.

Question: DRD HHPC-MGMT-08 External Customer Plan is not referenced in Section L.22.3.1 nor in Table L-2 Overview of Proposal Volumes and Page Limitations (pgs. L-13-14); however Attachment J-2 Data Requirements Documents Line Item HHPC-MGMT-08 shows the External Customer Plan as due with the proposal. Is DRD-MGMT-08 due with the proposal? If so, is it to be included as part of I. Mission Suitability Part 1 Management Approach and subject to the 340 page limit or as part of V Model Contract and Responsibility with unlimited pages count and not evaluated for selection purposes?

Answer 46. The External Customer Plan is not required at proposal submission. Rather, the initial plan shall be submitted at Contract Start + 30 days with final due at Contract Start + 60 days. DRD HHPC-MGMT-08 and Attachment J-2 will be updated in the final RFP to reflect the required submission dates.

Question 47. The offeror shall submit the following DRDs: 3) Information Technology (IT) Security Plan and Reports (DRD HHPC-IT-02). Question: Sub-section MA l includes DRD HHPC-IT -02 as does

Table L-2 on page L-13 under I Mission Suitability Part 1 Management approach (MAl-5); however, Attachment J-2 Data Requirements Documents Line Item HHPC-IT -02 shows this DRD as due at contract start plus 30 days. Is DRD HHPC - IT -02 due with the proposal as part of I. Mission Suitability Part 1 Management Approach and subject to the 340 page limit?

Answer 47. DRD IT-02 "Information Technology (IT) Security Plan and Reports" is due with the proposal submission with the final version due at Contract Start + 60 days. DRD HHPC- DRD IT-02 and Attachment J-2 will be updated in the final RFP to reflect the required submission dates. The initial submission is subject to the revised 375 page limit described in Table L-2: "Overview of Proposal Volumes and Page Limitations."

Question 48. Proposal Scenario 2- ISS On-Orbit Medical Event NASA Assumptions

• The affected crewmember's meals were from packaged food provided by the U.S.
• The remaining onboard USOS stored food of this variety is from the same lot.
• The suspect meals comprise a significant percentage of the onboard stowed meals.
• Assuming nominal food consumption, the remaining unaffected/suspect food will only support the USOS crew of three for three months.
• Next cargo resupply mission is scheduled to arrive in four months.

Question: Is the underlined wording above correct? Or should it say remaining unaffected/nonsuspect food?

Answer 48. The Draft RFP wording under the NASA assumption for Scenario 2 of "suspect" food is incorrect. RFP attachment L-2 section B proposal scenario 2 ISS On-Orbit Medical Event bullet four will be updated in the final RFP as follows" Assuming nominal food consumption, the remaining unaffected/non-suspect food will only support the USOS crew of three for three months."

Question 49. Med Level 1, 2, 3 example certifications don't match the degrees. (Examples: An LVN requires a only certification, but is included in Med Level 2 which requires a bachelor's degree, and RN requires an associate's degree certification, is included in a Med Level 3 which requires a master's degree. In contrast a Laboratory technologist which requires a Bachelor's degree, is included in Med Level I requiring only an associate's degree or equivalent).

Question: Should the certifications match degree requirements in the SLCs?

Answer 49. The SLC guidelines for Med Level I, II, III described in Attachment L-1, "Standard Labor Categories (SLC)" will be updated in the final RFP to provide clarification regarding the level of certification and degrees required for Med Level I, II, III.

Question 50. On page 1 of DRD SMA-03 Safety and Health Plan it states that the "initial submission with the proposal shall include" and then lists those sections it should include as follows:

Section 1: 1.1-1.7; 1.9-1.13
Section 2: 2.1-2.1.7.6; 2.7.2
Section 3: All
Section 4: All

However there is no section 2.1.7.6. We suspect this is a transposition and should have been 2.7.1.6.

Answer 50. The reference to Section 2.1.7.6 in DRD SMA-03 "Safety and Health Plan" is incorrect. The reference will be modified in the final RFP to 2.7.1.6 to correct the discrepancy.

Question 51. There are several sections where EA work instructions (e.g., EA-WI-023) are referenced instead of applicable SA work instructions (e.g., SA-WI-014). We recommend SA work instructions be used where applicable.

Answer 51. Section C of the SOW for HW and SW Development calls out SA-WI-014 in conjunction with NPR/JPR 7120 and EA-WI-023. For consistency, the Flight Product DRDs will be updated in the final RFP to include SA-WI-014.

Question 52. Question 55: Recommend deleting the reference to the crash cart task force. Crash carts were discontinued in June 2014 per NASA's direction.

Answer 52. While two crash carts remain active on-site at JSC, the crash cart task force has been determined to be no longer necessary and has been disbanded. References to the crash cart task force will be removed in the final RFP from all pricing Task Orders.

Question 53. The DRFP refers to Table 2.3 .19.4-2. We believe the intent is to refer to Table 7.4-2, Flight Projects Implementation Matrix.

Answer 53. WP 710, 713 and 714 requirements, located within TO-RFP-07 "ISS Medical Projects," erroneously reference Table 2.3.19.4-2. The correct reference should be Table 7.4-2 "Flight Projects Implementation Matrix." The final RFP will be modified to clarify the Government's intent.

Question 54. What labor agreement/diplomatic agreement exists for employees to work in Moscow/Star City, Russia and in Kazakhstan? Are host nation business licenses and/or taxes required of both the contractor and employees to the host nations? Are any host nation citizens employed at either the Moscow/Star City, Russia and in Kazakhstan training sites?

Answer 54. Host nation business licenses and/or taxes are not required. The contractor will be provided the authority to work abroad in Russia and Kazakhstan through the process and procedures established by the NASA ISS Program, such as letters of invitation and multi-entry service Visas. The decision to employ host nation citizens is a business decision that must be made by each potential Offeror.

Question 55. Compensation Template TC (e): Incumbency Assumptions: What elements of benefits, compensation, etc. currently have "Seniority Rights?"

Answer 55. The only area of benefits and compensation that is subject to "Seniority Rights" is vacation leave for non-exempt employees. Non-exempt employees have seniority rights with regard to vacation leave in accordance with the Service Contract Labor Standards Act. Reference the Wage Determination 2005-2511 paragraph on "Vacation" and 29 CFR 4.173. The board plans to place

a composite list of non-exempt employees and their years of service in the Technical Library as soon as this information is available, which should be shortly after RFP release.

For all other areas of benefits and compensation, offerors will propose benefits and compensation for exempt and non-exempt employees based on their unique management approach. Each Offeror's approach will be evaluated as part of their Total Compensation Plan.

Question 56. Compensation Template TC (e): Incumbency Assumptions: Can you provide the current Paid Time Off/Vacation schedule? Can you provide compensation step increases outlining any additional benefits granted based upon "Seniority Rights?"

Answer 56. There is no Paid Time Off/Vacation Schedule; however, Clause H.10, "Observance of Legal Holidays," provides a schedule of federal holidays. Compensation step increases are not subject to "Seniority Rights". Offerors will propose compensation step increases based on their unique management approach.

Question 57. Compensation Template TC (e): Incumbency Assumptions: In order to properly respond to your request to advise whether the Offeror will pay current incumbent labor rates, the Offeror would need to know the general composition of the current benefit package and the philosophy of the incumbent related to the total compensation package (e.g., higher, lower or median of market). The Offeror would request the types of employee benefit plans offered (i.e., medical, dental, disability, vacation/paid leave, vision, life insurance and retirement), along with the employee and employer cost share, and for retirement plans formula for contribution or benefit payment. In order to respond to whether the Offeror will maintain seniority rights, the Offeror requests information regarding the composition of the workforce, including ages and years of service of current employees. A table showing ages in 5-year increments along one axis and years of service along another axis with the number of employees in each age/service category would be beneficial.

Answer 57. Information regarding the current contractor's benefit package, compensation philosophy, and workforce composition represent proprietary information and will not be provided to Offerors.

The Government has provided a Government Resource Estimate in the RFP. The Government also plans to provide the average direct labor rate per Standard Labor Category in the Technical Library as soon as this information is available, which should be shortly after Final RFP release.

Question 58. The GRE indicates 760 FTEs, but Section L.22.3.2 (page L-22) indicates that only 700 seats are available at various JSC facilities. Will a separate contractor-owned/leased facility be required if total staff count is greater than 700?

Answer 58. Potential Offerors will be required to provide facilities for contract management personnel that operate the "Contractor-Provided, Offsite" facilities designated as SA in the "DLO" column of J-28 in addition to any other personnel not included in the on-site seat count. Further, while Section L.22.3.2 (page L-22) currently states that "Offerors shall assume that 700 office seats distributed among the JSC facilities are available for the HHPC contractor," the Final RFP will revise this number to 600 to more accurately reflect the amount of incumbent employees that are currently utilizing onsite JSC office facilities.

Question 59. Page L-23 states: 'The GRE is not to be considered a Government "plug number." The GRE Work Year Equivalent (WYE) estimates include all direct labor required to perform the entire SOW with the exception of traditional G&A type personnel such as: sales, human resources, finance, legal, procurement, or other corporate-level executives.' The bold/italicized excerpt seems to contradict Attachment L-3-1 TO-RFP-01 – Contract Management and Administration, which includes functions such as human resources, finance and procurement. Please clarify the discrepancy.

Answer 59. G&A expenses represent the cost of activities that are necessary to the overall operation of the business as a whole, but for which a direct relationship to any particular cost objective cannot be shown. G&A includes the top management functions for executive control and direction over all personnel, departments, facilities, and activities of the Offeror. Typically, it includes human resources, accounting, finance, public relations, contract administration, legal, and an expense allocation from the corporate home office. The exception provided in the RFP is for illustrative purposes. Each Offeror should propose their G&A expenses according to their own disclosure and accounting system.

Question 60. Model Contract and Responsibility, Part 1 Standard Form 33 and Completed Model Contract (pg. L-44 and Attachments in Section J): Should the Offeror include all DRDs listed in Section J-2 and all attachments in Section J in this volume, unless specified in another volume?

Answer 60. Per 22.6 "VOLUME IV – MODEL CONTRACT AND RESPONSIBILITY," "Offerors shall submit the required documents" for Section J as part of its Model Contract Submission.

Required documents include all DRD and Section J Attachments that are due with the Offeror's proposal. Additional guidance is provided in Attachment J-2 "Data Requirements List (DRL) and Data Requirements Descriptions (DRDs)" and "Table L-2: Overview of Proposal Volumes and Page Limitations."

Question 61. Is it the Government expectation that most or all of the personnel executing functions associated with TO-RFP-01 will do so from a contractor off-site facility and not as part of the 700 offices seats that will be made available to the HHPC contractor? If the TO 1 personnel are to be on site, will the successful Offeror need to locate the remaining staff to a contractor facility within a specified range from JSC? Can the government specify the range?

Answer 61. See Answer #58 for a response to Part I of Question #65. Regarding part two of Question 65, the HHPC RFP does not require a specific range in which the referenced facilities would need to be located from JSC. The location of offsite facilities is part of the Offeror's management and technical approach.

Question 62. The task order states "This TDO assumes work to support up to eleven flights..." however the flights listed in the sentence total to 15. Are Offerors to assume that the four ISS crew rotations are not part of the 11 flights referenced since they would be synonymous with the four Soyuz flights, or does the government intend for the Soyuz flights to be addressed separately from the four ISS crew rotations?

Answer 62. Attachment L-3-4 "TO-RFP-04" assumes work to support up to eleven flights total per year, which would encompass up to four crew rotations. TO-RFP-04 will be updated in the final RFP to clarify the Government's requirement.

Question 63. Requirement 201-5 on page L-3-29 references "export licensing assessment". Respectfully request clarification on the applicable NASA and/or federal standard for this assessment.

Answer 63. The applicable NASA and/or federal standard for the export licensing assessment are JWI-2190.1 "JSC Export Compliance" and SA-WI-025 "Human Health and Performance Directorate Export Control Processes." These documents are referenced in Attachment J-1 Applicable Documents List and can be found in the HHPC Technical Library located at http://procurement.jsc.nasa.gov/hhpc/.

Question 64. Several documents are referenced within the task orders as relevant procedures, instructions, or otherwise reference documentation products. Respectfully request copies of the following documents added to the bidder's technical library: EID 684-15453, LS-73006, ISSMP Master Schedules Book, JSC-26546, SSP 540XX_YY IDRD, NASA-STD-3001

Answer 64. NASA-STD-3001 can currently be found in the HHPC Technical Library under the Applicable Documents Section.

JSC 26546 will be added to the Applicable Documents section of the HHPC Technical Library.

LS-73006 and SSP 540XX_YY IDRD will be added to the HHPC Technical Library under the Reference Materials section.

Reference(s) to EID 684-15453 will be removed from the relevant Task Orders.

The ISSMP Master Schedules Book is developed yearly for the Projects and Experiments planned for that Fiscal Year. The FY16 Master Schedule is yet to be developed. The current ISS Master Schedule will be included in the technical library under the Pricing Task Order section for reference only.

Question 65. Requirement 230-14 on page L-3-65 references several ISSMP subtasks within the Task Delivery Order; however, the reference is unclear. To what do the numbers "2.1.18.21, 2.1.18.22, 2.1.18.23, and 2.1.18.24" refer?

Answer 65. TO RFP -02 Requirement 230-14, which can be found on page L-3-65, erroneously referenced paragraphs "2.1.18.21, 2.1.18.22, 2.1.18.23 and 2.1.18.24.' The correct references are "2.12, 2.13, 2.14 and 2.15." The Final RFP version of TO-RFP -02 will reflect this change.

Question 66. Requirement 232-9 on page L-3-69 references a requirement for the contractor to develop and implement a workaround for the failed PEPSE until it can be repaired or replaced. During the technical tours this workaround already appears to be at least partially in place, and the technical bidder's library appears devoid of reference to PEPSE. Respectfully request PEPSE reference documentation be added to the technical bidder's library.

Answer 66. It is anticipated that the PEPSE work-around will be complete in FY15. Therefore, Requirement 232-9, located on page L-3-69, will be removed from TO RFP 02 in the final RFP to address the anticipated completion date.

Question 67. Requirement 610-7 requires the contractor to provide liability coverage to the licensed contractor clinicians. Respectfully request clarification on the level of liability required to adequately address this requirement.

Answer 67. The level of liability insurance for licensed contractor clinicians is determined by the State of Texas Medical Board and is provided by the medical institution employing the physician.

Question 68. The SLC guidelines for Scientist IV and Scientist V require a Doctorate-level degree & 5 and 10 years experience respectively. Will the Government allow equivalent experience in place of the Doctorate-level degree? If not, is it the Government's expectation that contractor employees in scientist positions with Masters Degrees or lower be categorized as Scientist III regardless of years of relevant experience?

Answer 68. Yes, the Government will allow equivalent experience in place of the Doctorate-level degree. The SLC guidelines for Scientist I, II, III, IV and V, which can be found in Attachment L-1 "Standard Labor Categories (SLC)," have been revised in the final RFP to provide further guidance regarding the required level of degree certification .