

Questions & Answers  
Part 2  
NPP Draft RFP NNH14496602R

---

- Q66) Clause I.9 mentions that RFTPs and issued Tasks will include performance standards: Does NASA consider that the resulting award will in fact be a Performance Based Contract (PBC) as described in FAR Subpart 37.6? It is noted that the RTO does not address any performance or quality assurance standards. There are also no clauses in the draft RFP/contract that address the financial incentives (negative and positive) that one generally sees in a PBC.
- A66) Performance criteria will be provided in the SOW of individual task orders where appropriate.
- Q67) SOW Section D.3. (page 6) states, "Provide any necessary recruitment incentives, as accepted by NASA, to ensure a qualified candidate pool." What type of incentives are acceptable to NASA (sign-on bonus, health insurance, additional benefits or services, etc.).
- A67) The offerors shall propose the recruitment incentives based on their approach and knowledge of the field.
- Q68) What benefits are currently provided to Fellows?
- A68) Please refer to the Policies and the Procedures of the NASA Postdoctoral Program document that will be posted to the eLibrary.
- Q69) There is no requirement for providing health insurance in the Statement of Work. In previous iterations of NASA postdoctoral programs, a national health insurance program was provided. I note this is listed as a recruitment incentive elsewhere. Is provision of a basic health benefits program not a standard for all postdoctoral fellows?
- A69) Due to the fact, that Fellows are not an employee of the offeror or NASA, we cannot require the offeror to provide health insurance. However, the offeror may offer the Fellows health insurance as a part of their recruitment incentive package.
- Q70) Can some examples of "recruitment incentives" (Attach. A., D.3) be given?
- A70) Based on their knowledge of the field, offerors are expected to identify and propose any recruitment incentives necessary to obtain high quality Fellows as described in Section L.11.
- Q71) Does NASA anticipate that Fellows will be responsible for a portion of their own health insurance costs?
- A71) In accordance with Section L.11, as part of Subfactor B-Management Approach,

offerors shall propose the recruitment incentives they believe are necessary to obtain high quality candidates. This may include all or part of a Fellows health insurance costs.

- Q72) Paragraph D.1. of draft RFP NNH 14496602R (pp. 5-16) states that the “Fellows are not employees of the Contractor or the Government and they receive awards, not wages.” However, Paragraph D.2. (p. 6) states that the contractor shall “Provide worker’s compensation insurance for the fellows.” Because the fellows are not employees of the contractor, is the intent of Paragraph D.2. to require the contractor to provide coverage similar to workers’ compensation insurance (e.g., accident medical expense, accidental death, dismemberment and paralysis)? If the intent is that traditional worker’s compensation insurance be provided, are there defined minimum standards for the worker’s compensation insurance the contractor is required to maintain?
- A72) The Final RFP will be revised to remove that requirement from the SOW.
- Q73) A comment has to do with the requirement for workman’s compensation (Attachment A, Statement of Work, Section D.2). As described elsewhere in Attachment A, postdoctoral scientists “serve as guests at a NASA Center” and “Fellows are not employees of the Contractor or of the Government and they receive awards, nit wages.”
- A73) See answer to question 72.
- Q74) Does NASA anticipate that the proposed cost will include a portion of the NPP Fellow health insurance costs?
- A74) If the offeror proposes reimbursement, in part or in full, of health insurance costs as a recruitment incentive, it should propose those costs as described in Section L.11.
- Q75) If needed by the NPP fellow, who applies for export control licenses, the contractor or NASA?
- A75) The contractor is required to obtain export control licenses in accordance with NFS 1852.225-70.
- Q76) Also, for subcontracting, item (b) (4) on p. 83 describes the Government’s interest in the proposer participating in the NASA mentor-protégé program. Please clarify whether or not this is a firm requirement, and to what extent the proposer’s score may be reduced if such participation is not proposed.
- A76) Offerors are not required to participate in the Mentor-Protégé Program. However, if an offeror participates in the program and/or proposes to participate in the program and includes it in their proposal then an evaluation of their Mentor-Protégé Program will be performed.
- Q77) In Section L pp. 70 of the solicitation it states “... indirect rates... included in Attachment

B are 'not to exceed' bid rates." If the actual "pass through" volume is less than the \$17M per page 71, the actual indirect rates will by definition be higher than the rates provided in Attachment B. Please clarify if the "not to exceed" indirect rates proposed in Attachment B can be estimated using a "pass through" volume of less than \$17M.

A77) The pass through costs provided in the RFP are the Government's best estimate of the year to year activity; therefore, the offerors are not allowed to alter the pass through costs as stated in the RFP.

Q78) The section states "...a proposed significant subcontractor is defined as any proposed subcontractor that is estimated to meet/exceed an average annual cost/fee of \$1M. But in the costing for the RTO it states "Offerors and proposed significant subcontractors for cost proposal purposes defined as any subcontract that is likely to exceed \$125K of the Representative Task Order (RTO). If a subcontractor is significant for the RTO we request that there past performance be acceptable as well at the lower level.

A78) No, the past performance minimum average annual cost/fee incurred amount will not be lowered. The requirements of the Past Performance Volume and the requirements of the Cost Volume are two separate requirements. As stated in Section L.13 of the Draft RFP, for purposes of the Past Performance Volume, the past performance minimum average annual cost/fee incurred amount of \$1M for significant subcontractors based on the assumption that this IDIQ contract will meet its maximum ordering value of \$100M. The RTO in the Draft RFP is for proposal purposes only; which the value of the RTO is a minimal piece of the overall maximum ordering value of the IDIQ contract. Therefore, for the purposes of the Cost Volume only, a significant subcontractor is defined as a subcontractor that would exceed \$125K of the RTO.

Q79) Language in subparagraph (a) implies that you want the response to (a) to consist of only the Small Business Subcontracting Plan with content specifically and only as required by the FAR. Language in subparagraph (b) likewise implies that you want the response to (b) to be separate from the Small Business Subcontracting Plan in (a). Can the response to (b) be included in the Small Business Subcontracting Plan? Please clarify.

A79) The response to paragraph (b) shall not be combined with the response to paragraph (a).

Q80) In the Draft RFP for the NASA Post Doc Program, one of the listed types of small business is the HBCU. Does this mean Minority Serving Institutions (MI) are excluded (i.e Hispanic serving universities) from fulfilling this requirement? In many references we see HBCU/MI listed vs just HBCU. Could you clarify?

A80) The final RFP will be revised to state HBCU/MI.

**Additional questions resulting from the Q&A's Part 1 posted on 12/12/2014:**

Q81) Your answer to Q27 implies that the program will lose 20 Fellows each year during the RTO (ie 80 Fellows end tenure, but only 60 new Fellows awarded). Is this correct?

A81) The Final RFP will be revised as follows: 80 Fellows end tenure and 80 new Fellows awarded.

Q82) Will the final RFP have the same cost cap i.e. \$100M over 5 years?

A82) Yes.