

Questions & Answers
Part I
NPP Draft RFP NNH14496602R

- Q1) We do not understand NASA’s decision to prohibit a fee objective for this contract if the offeror is a non-profit. As you know, there will be unallowable expenses (such as interest payments on financing) associated with the conduct of the NPP for which non-profits would have no way of being reimbursed. This is a disparate treatment of non-profits versus for-profit entities that creates excessive financial risk for non-profits. We request that NASA allow all offerors to propose some nominal fee objective in order to prevent the perception of a biased competitive environment.
- A1) The statement on the draft RFP cover letter “If a non-profit organization is selected the contract type will be Cost-No-Fee” does not mean that profit/fee is prohibited. Non-profit organizations can receive profit/administrative type fees; however only if these funds will not be used to benefit any owners but for the self-preservation, business reserves, expansion or mission of the company.
- Q2) Will the Government make provisions for the contractor to draw down funding in advance in order to meet stipend payment requirements, or are we expected to draw from our own credit line (the interest on which is not an allowable cost) and then invoice the Government for the funding?
- A2) Typically a task order is incrementally funded with sufficient funds to cover a few months in advance allowing the contractor to bill for costs as they occur.
- Q3) Please clarify/confirm that the 1-page position qualifications required in Volume II do NOT count against the 30 page limitation. Reference table on p. 54 in Section L.
- A3) The 1-page limit per position qualification is excluded from the 30 page limitation of Volume II.
- Q4) If the Proposer includes a cover letter, an Executive Summary, a Table of Contents, a list of acronyms, etc. as ‘front matter’ in each volume of its submittal, will these pages count against the stated page counts in the table of p. 54 of Section L? Please clarify all exclusions across the four volumes.
- A4) The table on page 54 contains all exclusions and everything else submitted will be counted against the page limitations.
- Q5) Please confirm that a Health/Safety Plan is NOT required to be submitted with our proposal. Further, will a Safety & Health plan be required after contract award? We see no reference to a S&H Plan in any part of the solicitation, only incorporation of 1852.223-72 (Short Form) which simply says: “The Contractor shall take all reasonable safety and occupational health measures consistent with standard industry practice in performing this contract.”

- A5) A S&H plan is not required pre or post-award because the contractor will not be located onsite at NASA.
- Q6) Please provide more specificity behind Clause H.8 (page 26) which essentially says that any data requested by the Government under this contract will be considered a Special Work (and therefore owned by the Government). The very next clause (H.9) says that the default Data Rights Clause is 52.227-14 Rights in Data – General, so how will we know which data the Government is going to decide falls under Special Works and which is General?
- A6) As indicated, the default is the Rights in Data- General clause (52.227-14). If the Government wants the Rights in Data – Special Works clause (52.227-17) to apply to a given data set, the contractor will be informed prior to the creation of the data by the contractor, typically prior to a particular task order.
- Q7) Clause G.11, section (c), page 19: Why would item (8) “Medical treatment of a first-aid nature for Contractor personnel injuries or illnesses sustained during on-site duty” not be included? Similarly, will Contractor personnel (particularly PostDocs) have access to a Center’s medical facilities for required medical exams if working in lab areas and will this cost be reimbursable?
- A7) Medical treatment will be checked and is available for on-site Fellows. However, off-site contractor personnel will not have access to the Center’s medical facilities.
- Q8) Section L.7 item (c) requires the offeror to identify any Government property it intends to use from the list of property at 1852.245-81, but that clause is not a part of the RFP and no such list has been included anywhere. Similarly, Section G.11 item (c) (3) – Property Listed in Attachment, is not checked, so we would like clarification as to what GFP NASA contemplates an offeror needing to use or provide the list of possible GFP that will be available.
- A8) Provision will be removed.
- Q9) Clause B.4 (b) requires a minimum 115 days’ lead time on any proposal to increase the estimated costs. We all know things can happen suddenly and unexpectedly and it seems onerous to expect the contractor to have visibility that far in advance. In both FAR 52.232-20 (Limitation of Cost) and FAR 52.232-22 (Limitation of Funds), sixty (60) days is the norm for such notice.
- A9) The final RFP will be updated to read 60 days.
- Q10) We request that only monthly SF-533s be required rather than monthly AND quarterly – quarterly reports are retrospective and, in our experience, do not provide any additional insight into the coming months over and above what a monthly report provides.

- A10) According to the NASA Procedural Requirements (NPR) 9501.2E monthly and quarterly reports are required.
- Q11) Please clarify: Item 4 of the table in Clause B.1 is contradictory to the requirements of Attachment C. The Table implies that there is only a monthly SF-533 required by the 15th of the following month, while Item c. of Attachment C says the monthly SF-533s are due within 10 days and that a quarterly report is due within 15 days.
- A11) Item 4 of the table in Clause B.1, Monthly Financial Status Report refers to the report in Section D, paragraph 6 of the SOW, which is a different type of monthly financial report than the requirements of Attachment C.
- Q12) On p. 60 of Section L, under Mission Suitability Format, the Attachment A Statement of Work “shall be used to structure the Mission Suitability response to each of the Subfactors”. In addition, under Section 3 – Mission Suitability Instructions, for each Subfactor there is a lengthy list of specific items in each subfactor that are also to be responded to (“...the contractor shall...”), and many of these items are not called out in the SOW. Please clarify if each SOW item AND each item in the Mission Suitability instructions must all be responded to within the 30-page limit for Mission Suitability (with Phase-In Plan pages excluded from page count limit).
- A12) The 30 pages refers to Mission Suitability only. Pages 60 and 61 are instructions only for structuring the response. The offeror is not required to respond to the entire SOW. Offerors are required to respond to the Mission Suitability within the 30 pages.
- Q13) The draft RFP places significant emphasis on small business subcontracting, and the goals stated on p. 66 are fairly aggressive. Are these goals illustrative only or are they the government’s intended goals for this procurement? Given the nature of this contract, significant subcontracting of any type would likely add risk to its execution.
- A13) The percentages listed on page 66 are examples. The small business goals are set out in the table starting on page 64.
- Q14) Item (b) (1) on p. 83 points to interest on the government’s part for the subcontracting to be “high technology”. Given that NPP is primarily a management and administration program, we request clarification on the meaning of “high technology” and the extent to which subcontracting must be such.
- A14) There is not a requirement for vendors to propose subcontracting that is high technology. Where subcontracted work is proposed consistent with the RFP’s high technology definition as stated in Section L.11 on page 67, the Government will evaluate the extent to which work performed by small business subcontractor(s) is “high technology”.
- Q15) Please clarify: Attachment A Statement of Work, Section C.10 (pg 4) says Notify the

Centers, within two business days, of the results of the peer review including the ranking of the applicants for their consideration.” But the RTO Section 10 (pg 2) states: “Notify the Centers, within 15 calendar days of receipt of the of the reviews, of the results of the peer review, including the ranking of the applicants.” Which is correct?

A15) The RTO and the SOW will be revised for the contractor to notify the Center within five business days of the receipt of all of the reviews.

Q16) Attachment A Statement of Work section C.2 states there are 3 application deadlines, thus there are 3 application periods. The RTO assumptions on page 4 says “... 80 new Fellows will be awarded (20 each application period).” But 3 application periods times 20 applicants does not equal 80 new Fellows. Please clarify.

A16) The RTO will be revised to remove “(each application period).” Numbers of applications will vary depending upon the application cycle.

Q17) While New Technology Reporting and IP rights are clear with respect to the Contractor, since the PostDocs are neither subcontractors nor employees of the Contractor, please clarify the Government’s intent for IP ownership and rights as it relates specifically to the Post Docs.

A17) It is NASA policy that all intellectual property created by visiting temporary workers, such as postdoctoral researchers and interns, is owned by NASA. Usage rights, especially publication rights, covering their works are typically granted to the visiting temporary worker. Documents to memorialize and implement this policy will be provided to the contractor for signature by the visiting temporary worker.

Q18) SOW (page 2) states, “Annual stipends for Research Fellows currently range from \$53,500 to \$64,730 depending on location.”

1. Are location adjustments determined by the contractor?
2. Is the contractor able to escalate stipends based on year of PD?
3. Is the range set for the duration of the contract, or can it be adjusted annually based on annual review of post doc salaries?
4. Annual stipends for Senior Research Fellows are negotiable based upon the location of appointment, experience and career achievement: Is the stipend limited to the range above?
5. Are you able to provide a list of the current ranges in places at each host location?

A18) See individual answers below:

1. No, NASA makes that determination
2. No, NASA makes that determination
3. NASA makes the determination of when to adjust stipends.
4. No, senior stipends are at a higher rate using a formula which consists of the total of the base stipend, the number of years out from Ph.D. degree, and the average score obtained on the review of the application.

5. A spreadsheet which includes stipends and locality rates will be added to the eLibrary.

Q19) What role do NPP Center Reps play in the facilitation and coordination of the program?

A19) The NPP Center Reps manage the day to day activities of the NPP at their Center. They interact with senior Center management, Center scientists and engineers, the NPP fellows, and the Contractor.

Q20) G.5 page 14, this section states "Performance of this contract requires that Contractor personnel and any furnished and/or required Government property be located at both Government controlled and managed premises (on-site) and at Contractor controlled and managed premises (off-site)."

1. On the current contract, how many contractor personnel are located on-site and how many are located off-site?
2. What are the current Contractor's offsite locations, and how many Contractor personnel are at each location?
3. We assume that all Fellows are on-site at either a government facility or a university. Is this correct?

A20) See individual answers below:

1. Clause G.5 will be removed.
2. We cannot provide this information.
3. Correct.

Q21) Section H.10 ADVANCE AGREEMENT BETWEEN THE PARTIES: REQUIREMENT TO PROVIDE CONTRACT HISTORICAL DATA (GSFC 52.242-91) (AUG 2013)

Since this is a follow-on competition, will NASA provide historical labor category descriptions, full-time equivalents (FTEs), average direct labor rates, and other historical contract information in the RFP for use by all potential offerors to ensure a comprehensive and fair evaluation of competitive proposals and increase the probability that realistic pricing is provided?

A21) This clause was effective August 2013 and was not included in the current contract. Therefore, this information will not be available to provide to offerors.

Q22) The table showing the appropriate subcontracting goals for this acquisition shows the goal for Small Businesses (SB) as 0.3% with the individual sub-categories as TBP. We are assuming this is a typo and you mean 30% or .30 rather than .3%. Is this correct?

A22) No, this is not a typo 0.3% is correct as stated in the Draft RFP.

Q23) The SOW states that the contractor "shall develop...a website." Is it NASA's intent to replace the current NPP website? Please clarify/elaborate the meaning of "develop."

- a. What is the operating system that the NPP website runs under?
- b. In what language is the NPP website application code written?
- c. What kind of database does the NPP website use (e.g., vendor)? What version/release # of the database is currently in operation?
- d. What is the approximate size of the NPP website database?
- e. Where is the NPP website hosted? What hardware (server) is it hosted on? How many servers are employed?

A23) Yes, the Contractor would be required to develop and maintain a website. The current web site is not a Government-owned site and the requested information is not available. The contractor must determine what is needed to develop and/or maintain their website.

Q24) How frequently are the NPP website code and/or database updated with new features, enhancements, etc.?

A24) On an as needed basis TBP by the Contractor

Q25) Does the NPP website have uptime requirements?

A25) The website should be up continually with the exception of slight downtimes times for periodic routine maintenance lasting no longer than twenty-four hours at any time.

Q26) Are NASA civil servants allowed to serve on peer review panels for NPP?

A26) Although NASA civil servants are allowed to serve on panels, they should not be relied upon unless the specific expertise that was required could only be provided by a NASA civil servant.

Q27) The RTO period of performance is for 2 years, however, the RTO assumes the number of proposals received and number of Postdoc Fellows for a single year. Is the period of performance correct?

A27) The RTO period of performance is for two years. For proposal purposes, assume, for each year of the two years of performance, 240 fellows, of which 160 will have continuing tenure, 80 will be ending tenure (20 each quarter), and 60 new fellows will be awarded.

Q28) For the RTO, is it assumed that an NPP-dedicated website already exists?

A28) Yes, offerors do not have to include the cost of creating a website.

Q29) The period of performance starts February 1, 2016. According to SOW C-2, the first application deadline is March 1, 2016. Should the RTO response assume that one of the first steps in the schedule would be to receive the March applications, or should it show a complete cycle starting with announcing the solicitation for research (90 days prior to application due date)?

- A29) Yes, the response should assume that one of the first steps is to receive applications by the March 1 deadline.
- Q30) The RTO Assumptions state that reviewer identities are kept confidential from each other and from the proposers. SOW C-7 states that review panels will meet virtually and rank candidates. These two requirements appear to be in conflict. Can reviewer identities be known to each other in order to hold a relevant virtual panel?
- A30) Yes, reviewers may meet virtually. The RTO and SOW will be updated accordingly.
- Q31) The stated application deadline dates are March 1, July 1 and November 1. Is there any flexibility in these dates? We currently review every three months, with deadlines of February 1, May 1, August 1 and November 1 (in certain fields, November 1 was an important date for NASA applicants). We could certainly conform to the dates proposed by NASA, but integrating into the schedule that is followed by our other 20 federal lab sponsors would keep costs down. Over the past 6 years, following similar efficiencies, we have cut our administrative costs by 20-35% for these sponsors.
- A31) No. The NASA specified application deadline dates of March 1, July 1, and November 1 best suit the needs of the NPP and NASA. A fourth review date is not required.
- Q32) In the Draft Statement of Work, Part B (page 3), it states that, "The web site may be used for other purposes, such as electronic processing of applications, reporting, and other management and administrative functions, if beneficial to the Government". Could this requirement be expanded to describe more specific elements of web-based fellowship management systems that might be used to differentiate the qualification of offerors? For example – web-based rating systems, web-based portals for reference writers, credentialed sponsor modules for research opportunity management, applicant review and selection, etc.
- A32) It is up to the offeror to propose how they will utilize the website; however, in the event that the offeror chooses to use the website for multiple functions the offeror must be able ensure the security of their website in order to avoid any type of compromise to proprietary or personal data of Fellows.
- Q33) In Section L.11, point 2 (pages 60-61), the term Work Breakdown Structure (WBS) is introduced as the format for the Mission Suitability Volume, and is referenced as contained in Attachment A. For formatting purposes, can we assume that the WBS refers to the tasks ordered in Sections B-D of Attachment A?
- A33) The Final RFP will be revised to clarify the format for the Mission Suitability Volume.
- Q34) In Section L.11, point 3, Subfactor A, §1 (page 61), it states that ".....the task plan shall identify the technical approach, labor categories, projected labor hours.....". Normally we would show labor hours (and categories) in the Cost Volume. Will this breakdown be required in the Mission Suitability Volume as well?

- A34) Yes.
- Q35) Section L.11, point 3, Subfactor B, §3 (page 62) – Regarding the phase in plan – does the current contractor have a transition plan as part of the existing contract and will that be available as part of the RFP?
- A35) There is not a requirement for the current contractor to deliver a transition plan.
- Q36) Attachment G (this question also applies to parts of Section G11) – It is not clear if the language referring to “contractor’s employees” is intended to designate fellowship applicants/fellows. With respect to Attachment G in particular, contractor’s employees, who administer the program, would not be seeking clearance. Fellows, who work in NASA labs, on the other hand, will require a NACI, and possibly other clearances, but are not employees of the contractor.
- A36) In this instance, “contractor’s employees” does refer to the Fellows. NASA Security will manage the badging process for all Fellows.
- Q37) Representative Task Order, page 1, para. 3 and point 4 – Please clarify the initial screening of applications by the Centers versus referring the applications to Advisers for initial review. Presumably, applications to active Research Opportunities (RO) will match the Centers’ interests. The contractor should assure this by assuring eligibility of applicants within the RO matrix.
- A37) NPP applications must match the posted research opportunities, but may not be of sufficiently high quality or relevance for the Center Advisors to request they be peer reviewed. Therefore, the initial screening is performed by the Center Advisors.
- Q38) Representative Task Order, page 2, Key Deliverables – The task listing summarizes the major elements of recruitment and review, but does not mention fellowship award management – stipend, benefits, travel outcome reporting. Is the intent to manage the contract with multiple task orders?
- A38) No, it is not the intent to have multiple task orders. The recruitment, review and administration will all be performed under one task order. The RTO will be revised to include administration deliverables.
- Q39) Paragraph 4 of the cover letter states: “This competitive procurement will result in a Cost-Plus-Fixed-Fee (CPFF) Indefinite Delivery Indefinite Quantity (IDIQ) task order contract. However, if a non-profit organization is selected, the contract type will be Cost-No-Fee.” Please confirm that, in the event the successful offeror is a non-profit organization exempted under OMB Circular No. A-122 operating under Federal cost principles applicable to commercial concerns, the offeror will be awarded a Cost-Plus-Fixed Fee (CPFF) IDIQ contract.

A39) In the event the successful offeror is a non-profit organization and is exempt under OMB Circular No. A-122 operating under Federal cost principles applicable to commercial concerns, they will be awarded a Cost-Plus-Fixed Fee (CPFF) IDIQ contract.

Q40) If not exempted, NASA's own procurement regulations (ref. 1815.404-471-6) permit the collection of nominal fee based on specified formula for non-profit organizations that are not educational institutions. Would NASA consider using this regulation so that non-profit contractors may reinvest the nominal fee for this work back into the infrastructure and staff working on the contract to provide continuous improvement over time?

A40) See answer to question 1.

Q41) The RTO requires the contractor to "notify the Centers, within 15 calendar days of receipt of the reviews, of the results of the peer review." The SOW, however, requires the contractor to "notify the Centers, within 2 business days, of the results of the peer review including the ranking of applicants for their consideration." Please clarify how many days, once the peer review has concluded, the contractor has to provide results to the Centers.

A41) See answer to question 16.

Q42) The RTO identifies one of the key deliverables as the announcement of selections. Please define the scope of "announcement of selections." What is envisioned by the government?

The RTO does not indicate requirements for the following SOW elements:

- B
- C.11
- C.12
- C.13
- C.14 [NASA-only task]
- C.15

Please confirm that these SOW areas are not required as part of the RTO and, therefore, should not be described in the offeror's technical response or included in RTO pricing.

A42) Upon the acceptance of the NPP offer by the Fellow, the "announcement of selections" is the posting of the Fellow's name, NASA Center, Center Advisor, and the research proposal title to the NPP website within three (3) working days of the Fellow's acceptance.

Items B, C.11, C.13, C.14 and C.15 of the SOW in the Draft RFP are not required as part of the RTO. However, Item C.12 is contained in item 1 of the RTO and should be described in the offeror's technical proposal response and in the RTO pricing.

NOTE: Item C.14 is a NASA-only task to be performed by the Centers Security Office. The Contractor is not required to provide services for the badging of the Fellows.

Q43) Preparing selection letters/notifying applicants (RTO item 7) and providing an analysis of application and evaluation results (RTO 8) are required in the RTO but are not specifically defined elements of the SOW. Please confirm that these tasks are required and clarify where these RTO elements are to be included within the SOW.

A43) Item C.10 of the SOW in the Draft RFP will be revised to include the sentence, "The Contractor shall prepare selection and non-selection letters and shall notify NPP applicants in writing of the decision made on their applications."

RTO Item 8 will be revised for clarification; however, it is included in item D.8 of the SOW in the Draft RFP.

Q44) Does NASA have ownership of the current ORAU/NPP website and related databases (presumably 'Special Works' under the current contract) such that it can be transferred to and used by a new awardee, or should new offerors plan on having to build a new site?

A44) See answer to question 23.

Q45) In Section L pp.60-61 of the solicitation it says: "The WBS contained in Attachment A, SOW, of this solicitation shall be used." There is no specific reference to a WBS in the SOW. We assume this refers to the items under the letters A-D and the numbers under them. Please provide a specific WBS (preferably in tabular format) for clarification purposes.

A45) See answer to question 33.

Q46) In Section L pp. 60-61 of the solicitation it further says: "the Mission Suitability Volume and the Cost Volume must follow the provided WBS". However, if the WBS is indeed comprised of the items under letters A-D and the numbers under them, there are items that do not lend themselves to cost allocation and tracking (e.g., "make special efforts to recruit US citizens", "respond to program enquiries within 2 days"). Please clarify. Alternatively, may we propose our own WBS that will ultimately lend itself more easily to cost allocation and tracking by grouping together multiple of these items?

A46) See answer to question 33.

Q47) Despite the statement in Section L pp. 60-61 concerning the Cost Volume following the WBS, the Cost Volume only refers to costing the RTO at the WBS level 1, and no mention is even made of needing to provide costs at a lower level. Is it truly the intent for us to only provide one single overall number and not the lower level costs and BOEs? Also, the Cost Volume only appears to require the costs of the RTO and the Phase-in Plan, is there not a requirement to provide the full program annual cost estimates for items that are not captured in the RTO?

- A47) See answer to question 33.
- Q48) The solicitation requires a FFP proposal for the Phase-in Plan. Given the fact that our ability to execute the Phase-in Plan will depend on the timely cooperation of the incumbent and the Government (coupled with a lack of detailed knowledge about additional items that could be required) there will be significant risk and uncertainty in Phase-in Execution. Given the risk, we are concerned about proposing a FFP. Would the Government please consider allowing a cost-based proposal?
- A48) Not at this time.
- Q49) Respectfully request that proposals be due 45 day calendar days following release of final RFP.
- A49) The 30 day allotment for proposals will not be changed at this time.
- Q50) Will NASA issue a separate task for NPP management, in addition to the Fellow support tasks?
- A50) See answer to question 38.
- Q51) Does NASA approve the peer review panel members?
- A51) No, NASA does not approve the peer review panel members.
- Q52) Does NASA or the contractor approve NPP travel, especially foreign travel?
- A52) NPP travel is approved by NASA, with the recommendation of the Fellow's Center Advisor and NPP Center Representative. The Contractor does not approve NPP travel; however, they must adhere to the Federal Travel Regulations in processing all travel requests.
- Q53) To assist in accurate pricing, would NASA please provide a standard stipend rate table, organized by NASA Center and sponsoring Mission Directorate, that documents location specific adjustments for Fellows?
- A53) See answer to question 18 item #5.
- Q54) The last paragraph states "The ... WBS... shall be used to structure the Mission Suitability Volume for each of the subfactors" and L.8 (a)(5): "The format for each proposal volume shall parallel, to the greatest extent possible, the format of the evaluation ... subfactors contained in Section L..." Assuming the (missing) WBS mirrors the SOW, these two requirements seem contradictory. A Subfactor A response per L.11.2 would be structured per the WBS/SOW; a response per L.8 (a)(5) would be structured per the evaluation criteria for Subfactor A in which no mention is made of evaluating an

offer's response to the WBS/SOW, particularly where performance of an element of the WBS/SOW is not required (or required in full) to implement the approach we propose to perform the RTO. Please clarify.

- A54) See answer to question 33.
- Q55) For page count purposes, we assume that the Phase-In Plan includes all paragraphs under Phase-In Plan (p.62) and prior to Total Compensation Plan (p.63), including the approach to phase-in, the recruitment package options, and the staffing plan, including how we will fill requirements, and, therefore, are excluded from page limitations. Is this correct? If not, what is and is not excluded from page limitations in this section?
- A55) The Phase-In Plan on page 62 ends after paragraph c. The recruitment package options and staffing plan are not included in the Phase-In Plan.
- Q56) For page count purposes, we assume that the Total Compensation Plan includes all paragraphs under Total Compensation Plan (p.63) and prior to the Small Business Utilization (p.64), including the Fringe Benefits Chart, the supporting data, qualifications for specific labor categories, type of personnel, and resumes, and, therefore, are excluded from page limitations. Is this correct? If not, what is and is not excluded from page limitations in this section?
- A56) The four paragraphs below the Total Compensation Plan paragraph on page 63 are to be included. These paragraphs begin with "Classify all labor categories..., Identify the categories..., In accordance with..., and Provide supporting data..."
- Q57) SOW C.10 states that the Centers should be notified within two days of the results of the peer review, including the ranking of the applicants. RTO #6 states that the Centers should be notified within 15 calendar days of receipt of the reviews, including the ranking of the applicants. Please clarify the inconsistency.
- A57) See answer to question 15.
- Q58) The last paragraph states: "The Work Breakdown Structure (WBS) contained in Attachment A, Statement of Work...." We find no WBS in Attachment A or anywhere else in the DRFP. Please provide the WBS.
- A58) See answer to question 33.
- Q59) Regarding the page allocation for Position Qualifications (1 Page per Position), are these pages excluded from the 30-page allotment for the Mission Suitability Volume or part of the 30-page allotment?
- A59) See answer to question 3.
- Q60) The RFP states, "Applications are reviewed and ranked by a panel consisting of NASA

Headquarters Mission Directorate and Contractor personnel....” Can government officials be members of the Peer Review Panel?

A60) See answer to question 26.

Q61) Is there GFE on this contract? If so, will the Government provide a GFE list with the final RFP?

A61) No there is no GFE on this contract.

Q62) Section G5 includes requirements to manage property, however, sections L and M do not request the contractor to address property management nor evaluate it. Do you want offerors to address this requirement in the proposal? If so, will the government consider providing additional page count to address this requirement?

A62) See answer to question 20 item #1.

Q63) How many Task Orders are issued annually on this contract?

A63) Approximately ten task orders are issued annually; however, that number may vary based on budget and the number of qualified applicants.

Q64) Section I.9 includes requirements to manage task orders, however, sections L and M do not request the contractor to address task order management nor evaluate it. Do you want offerors to address this requirement? If so, will the government consider providing additional page count to address this requirement?

A64) No.

Q65) Would NASA consider changing the NAIS Code to 541990?

A65) No, 541612 is the appropriate NAIS Code for this requirement and is the same NAIS Code listed in the current contract.