

Note to potential bidder:

A total of twenty-five sample tasks, which were initiated across multiple years of the current contract, have been chosen from the seventy-eight tasks submitted to date. These sample tasks (contained in two reference documents) represent the key areas of contract work including proposal evaluations, assessments, and studies and represent the typical task content for these areas. This first document contains fourteen sample tasks for proposal evaluations, assessments, and studies. Six of the tasks included are SOMA proposal evaluation tasks and three are SOMA study tasks. The other five tasks are assessment tasks initiated from various users of the contract, including NASA HQ Science Mission Directorate, the ESSP Program Office, and LaRC. The second reference document contains a sampling of IPAO assessment tasks (eleven tasks) that shows the range of IPAO assessments performed under the contract.

1. **Task Order Title:** Programmatic Reviews of Hands-On Project Experience (HOPE) Projects (POP: 2/14/14 - 9/23/15, ORG: ESSPPO)

2. **Contractual References:**

2.1 **Statement of Work Reference:** This requirement is pursuant to contract NNL12AA00B, between NASA Langley Research Center and TBD. Refer to Paragraphs 4.0 Assessments.

2.2 **Limitation of Future Contracting Reference:** In support of this task order, the contractor:

- may have access to proprietary information and various other types of non-public data

As described in NASA Clause 1852.209-71 (Clause H.3, Limitation of Future Contracting, contained in contract NNL12AA00B), this work may give rise to a potential conflict of interest. Therefore, the contractor shall comply with Clause H.9, Access to Sensitive Information, and Exhibit D, Organizational Conflict of Interest Avoidance Plan, contained in contract NNL12AA00B.

3. **Purpose, Objective, and Background of Work to be Performed:**

3.1 The purpose of this Task Order is to provide technical expertise to the Earth System Science Pathfinder Program Office (ESSPPO) at NASA/LaRC to assist in implementing programmatic reviews of the selected Hands-On Project Experience (HOPE) Teams. TBD's technical support will include participation by TBD staff and expert consultants.

4. **Description of the Work to be Performed:**

4.1 Programmatic Reviews and Oversight for HOPE 4. To include the following:

- a. Evaluate project progress using the review success criteria as defined in the Addendums to the approved Terms of Reference for each project review to judge whether or not the review objectives have been satisfied.
- b. Assess the presented material identifying any findings, comments, and/or potential Request For Actions (RFA).
- c. Participate in appropriate post-review discussions. Provide expert opinions in area of expertise.
- d. Generate and submit any findings, comments, potential RFAs, and evaluation against the review success criteria.
- e. Raise concerns to the SRB Chairperson if a proposed action item closeout seems an inadequate response to an RFA.

4.1.1 TBD shall provide technical expertise as required to assist NASA in planning and conducting a Systems Requirements Review (SRR), a Preliminary Design Review (PDR), a Critical Design Peer Review (CDPR), a Final Engineering Review (FER), a Pre-Ship Review (PSR), and to assist in other programmatic oversight duties for the one HOPE 4 Team (RaD-X)

selected for implementation. TBD shall attend and participate in the scheduled reviews by providing subject matter expertise.

5. Government Furnished Items:

The Contractor will have access to technical documents with export control restrictions and to resource and strategic planning documents with Sensitive but Unclassified (SBU) distribution restrictions. All documents with restricted distributions shall be marked with the applicable control restrictions requirements. Additionally, all sensitive information shall be handled in accordance with the terms and conditions of Contract TBD and the OCI Avoidance Plan contained therein.

6. Period of Performance/Schedule/Deliverables:

Review start dates are estimates and can change based on the project’s selection date and subsequent progression of the project(s). All reviews will last no more than 1 day. Location for reviews will be LaRC, Hampton, VA for 6.1. Deliverables will be an individual report of each review.

6.1 RaD-X Implementation Schedule:

SOW Reference Paragraph	Milestones	Estimated Dates
4.1.1	SRR	February 2014
4.1.1	PDR	May 2014
4.1.1	CDPR	August 2014
4.1.1	FER	September 2014
4.1.1	PSR	January 2015

7. Other Information Needed for Task Performance

7.1. Performance Objectives:

7.1.1 Quality

This Task shall conform to the goals of the EASSS QA Program by:

- Delivering high-quality products and services that meet contractual requirements and satisfy the stakeholder’s technical, cost and schedule needs and expectations.
- Using continuous improvement to develop and deliver low-risk, innovative technical solutions.
- Evaluating performance using objective performance measures together with customer satisfaction, surveillance and performance evaluation inputs.

- Ensuring that the Task Order shall be staffed with only the highest quality non-conflicted subject matter experts, able to fully conform to necessary standards and procedures, and free of OCI and COI concerns.
- Ensuring prompt visibility and proactive resolution of emerging quality issues.
- Focusing on problem prevention by implementing and continually improving work processes designed to identify and resolve problems early in the development life cycle.
- Reporting comprehensive and accurate EASSS Program performance assessments.
- Undergoing a Quality Audit of our procedures (OCI/COI, training, and process procedures) every six months by our Quality Control Manager who reports findings directly to the TBD CEO.

7.1.2 Timeliness

The TBD Task Leader shall ensure:

- Technical experts are identified as far in advance as possible; that OCI/COI issues are identified and resolved as far in advance as possible; that required training is provided as far in advance as possible; and that required information/forms to bring consultants, temporary employees, and required subcontractors on board with TBD are completed in as far in advance as possible to ensure the experts will be available for the programmatic reviews.
- Timely and effective responses to problems or changes in requirements and budgets.
- All contract deliverables are accurate, developed in a quality fashion, and delivered early or on time.
- Risks are being managed in a timely and effective manner.
- Provide timely staff management for new requirements, vacancies, resignations and terminations (for employees, subcontractors, and consultants).
- Timely deliveries, reporting, and identification of issues or concerns.
- All potential problems are discovered and resolved as far in advance as possible and are worked proactively rather than reactively.

7.1.3 Cost

TBD shall utilize pre-negotiated TBD rates for estimating purposes. Subcontractors and/or consultants shall be selected based on best value and their ability to meet the schedule.

Hours (but no ODC charges) shall be assigned to this Task and actual costs incurred shall be reflected on the SF533 submitted as costs are incurred and invoiced per the EASSS contract.

Accrued Task costs shall be available to the NASA Review Manager within 10 days following each TBD pay period (twice monthly).

Task Estimate shall be within + or – 5% of the proposed amount, otherwise, fee shall be reduced commensurate with the overestimated cost.

7.1.4 Other

Subcontractor Consent. When consultants and/or subcontractors are identified, subcontract consent documentation shall be provided in accordance with Federal

Acquisition Regulation (FAR) Part 44. Adequate price competition shall be conducted unless adequately justified in accordance with FAR Parts 6 and 44.

7.2 Organizational Conflict of Interest

TBD OCI and Technical Approach plan dated 2/11/14F RevB is hereby referenced and incorporated in its entirety into this task order.

8. Period of Performance/Schedule

From the date of task issuance through see Optional Form 347, Block 15. Interim event dates may change based on direction of the TPOC. Changes to the completion date shall be approved by the Contracting Officer.

9. NASA Task Monitor

TBD
Earth System Science Pathfinder Program Office
MS TBD
Phone Number (757)-864-TBD
E-Mail Address: TBD@nasa.gov

TPOC Responsibilities:

- 9.1. The TPOC for the Task Order on the contract, as identified above. The TPOC's function is to serve as technical liaison between the Contractor and the Contracting Officer's Representative (COR). The TPOC is responsible for monitoring the overall task performance by the Contractor including delivery of the final product and/or services identified in the Task Order/Delivery Order Statement of Work. Specific duties and responsibilities are listed in Paragraph 2 below. Please pay particular attention to the limitations/cautions listed in Paragraph 3 below.
- 9.2. The following authority and responsibilities are hereby assigned to the TPOC:
 - a. Monitor contract technical performance. Ensure that the Contractor complies with the Statement of Work or specifications included in the contract. Notify CO of any problem areas or deficiencies in performance.
 - b. Communicate with Contractor personnel as necessary to ensure that Government requirements are understood. Technical information may be exchanged. This exchange should be without any implication of being a directive. Consult CO if the requirement exists to give technical direction. Only the CO can give technical direction.
 - c. Monitor Contractor's expenditure of man-hours and cost on the contract. Review periodic reports received from the Contractor on Contract Assignment/Work Order progress/cost. Report any discrepancies, concerns, questions to the CO.
 - d. Notify CO of any changes required to the contract. Only the CO can issue these changes.
 - e. Notify the CO of any violation of the terms and conditions of the contract or any other Contractor action considered detrimental to the Government.

- f. Send an information copy to the CO of any correspondence exchanged with the Contractor regarding the contract.
- g. Review the contract deliverables and advise CO on acceptability. Recommend to the CO closeout of the contract when all requirements have been completed.
- h. Other duties as follows:
 - (1) Review designated task deliverables then advise if acceptable (533s, OCI Plans, milestones)
 - (2) Recommend to the COR closeout of the Tasks when all requirements have been completed.
 - (3) Identify, evaluate, mitigate OCIs, notify CO immediately of OCI situations.
 - (4) All actions to be coordinated through the SOMA COR.
 - (5) See Task Order paragraph 2 – task monitor is advised of the contract clauses to be monitored during performance or the task.

9.3. The duties delegated in this letter cannot be re-delegated. The TPOC is cautioned that he or she may be personally liable for actions taken or direction given beyond the authorities delegated in this letter.

a. TPOC is not authorized to direct or supervise Contractor employees in the accomplishment of work assignments. Your primary interface shall be with the TBD Task Lead assigned to your task. Ensure TBD Task lead remains abreast of significant information communicated between TPOC (NASA) and other Contractor/Subcontractor/Consultant employees.

b. TPOCs are not authorized to approve or direct any changes in the Task Order/Delivery Order or to alter the contract in any way. However, changes to the task order milestone schedule are allowable via technical direction to accommodate necessary changes to the milestone schedule. The final completion date can only be changed through a contract modification signed by the Contracting Officer.

c. TPOCs are not authorized to approve or direct any expenditure of funds beyond the Task Order/Delivery Order specified amounts.

d. TPOCs are cautioned not to release to the Contractor any proprietary data. If the Contractor requires access to such data, consult the Contracting Officer/ Contract Specialist.

e. TPOCs are not authorized to request proposals of any nature associated with this contract/task orders.

This appointment is effective signature date of this task order and shall remain in effect until completion of the Task Order or until rescinded in writing by the CO or COR on this contract.

1. Task Order Title:

1.1 Planetary Data System Version 4 (PDS4) Operation Readiness Review (ORR) for LADEE and MAVEN Data Providers
(POP: 8/22/13 – 9/23/14, ORG: HQ SMD)

2. Contractual References:

2.1 Statement of Work Reference: This requirement is pursuant to contract TBD between National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA) Langley Research Center (LaRC) and TBD. Refer to Paragraphs 4.0 Assessments, and 5.0 Studies.

2.2 Limitation of Future Contracting Reference: In support of this task order, the contractor:

- will have access to non-public information as part of its performance of a government contract which may provide a competitive advantage in a later competition
- may have access to proprietary information and various other types of non-public data

2.3 Conflict of Interest: As described in NASA Clause 1852.209-71 (Clause H.3, Limitation of Future Contracting, contained in contract NNL12AA00B), this work may give rise to a potential conflict of interest. Therefore, the contractor shall comply with Clause H.9, Access to Sensitive Information, and Exhibit D., Organizational Conflict of Interest Avoidance Plan, contained in contract TBD.

3. Purpose, Objective, and Background of Work to be Performed:

3.1. The Planetary Data System (PDS) is undergoing a major revision of its online system. The current system is under development by the Engineering Node (EN) of the PDS at NASA's Jet Propulsion Laboratory (JPL). This initial release of Version 4 (PDS4) will be available to the LADEE and MAVEN planetary science missions for delivery of archival quality science data products to the PDS. The Science Discipline Nodes (DNs) of the PDS are intimately involved in the definition of requirements of PDS4.

3.2. The PDS4 Review Panel (RP) is tasked to perform an independent assessment of the PDS4 system. This task will provide expertise in support of the RP. This task is created to cover PDS4's review activity including technical meetings as well as data pipeline and access reviews through ORR.

3.3. The RP is responsible for independently assessing the functionality of the PDS4.

3.4. The purpose of this task is to obtain support for the RP review activities through the ORR.

4. Description of the Work to be Performed: The Contractor shall perform the following task requirements:

4.1 The Contractor shall provide the following:

4.2 The RP Team Members are to serve on a non-consensus board.

4.2.1 Review Formulation:

4.2.2.1 Coordinate with the RP Chairman on project risk areas.

4.2.2.2 Plan and prepare for review assignments.

4.2.2 Review Execution:

4.2.2.1 Coordinate and perform assigned review activities for the ORR with the Chairman and the Technical Point of Contact (TPOC).

4.2.2.2 Assure availability to fully participate in each review and caucus.

4.2.2.3 Assure conduct of comprehensive ORR in accordance with NPR 7120.5 and NPR 7123.1 in an integrated manner with the project technical approach and its corresponding programmatic performances.

4.2.2.4 Participate in team discussions of all relevant findings and recommendations on the ORR and related review results.

4.2.2.5 As originator for Requests For Action (RFA), issue/concern, support the detailed documentation (including explicit recommendations or appropriate rationale) and closure of such open items.

Core Disciplines	Areas of Expertise
Data Systems Management	XML, schema, database design, user interface design

4.2.3 Review Reporting:

4.2.3.1 Assure results for each of the reviews are documented and provided to the RP Chairman.

4.2.3.2 A draft may be submitted initially with all sections completed to the best judgment of the RP member with a stipulation that a final version of the IMIR shall be submitted no later than 48 hours from the last caucus day.

4.2.3.3 If recommendations are not needed to be stated explicitly for an issue or a concern, an explanation with adequate rationales shall be provided for clarification.

4.2.3.4 The RP members shall support the RP Chairman for a verbal out-brief to program/project at the conclusion of the site review if needed to clarify findings.

4.2.3.5 Support the RP Chairman for the preparation of a “snap shot” summary after the ORR.

4.2.3.6 Support the RP Chairman for preparation of the RP draft report and briefing package with direct inputs and detailed recommendations.

4.2.3.7 Upon request by the RP Chairman, provide support for the delivery of briefings to the Planetary Data System Program Manager (PM), Program Executive (PE) and Program Scientist (PS), respectively separated or combined.

4.2.4 The RP team members shall have overall responsibility for the full participation of the aforementioned reviews of this task, which includes analysis of the RP in the areas of management, technical, risk, schedule and cost from outside the advocacy chain of this program.

4.2.5 The RP Team Members shall keep the RP Chairman apprised of all correspondences and discussions that pertain to the conduct of the review or dissemination of results.

5. Government Furnished Items: The Government will provide the following:

5.1. The Contractor will have access to technical documents with export control restrictions and to resource and strategic planning documents with Sensitive but Unclassified (SBU) distribution restrictions. All documents with restricted distributions shall be marked with the applicable control restrictions requirements. Additionally, all sensitive information shall be handled in accordance with the terms and conditions of Contract TBD and the OCI Avoidance Plan contained therein.

6. Other Information Needed for Task Performance:

6.1. Performance Objectives:

6.1.1 Quality

This Task shall conform to the goals of the contractor EASSS QA Program by:

- Delivering high-quality products and services that meet contractual requirements and satisfy the stakeholder's technical, cost and schedule needs and expectations.
- Using continuous improvement to develop and deliver low-risk, innovative technical solutions.
- Evaluating performance using objective performance measures together with customer satisfaction, surveillance and performance evaluation inputs.
- Ensuring that the Task Order shall be staffed with only the highest quality non-conflicted SMEs, able to fully conform to necessary standards and procedures, and free of OCI and COI concerns.
- Ensuring prompt visibility and proactive resolution of emerging quality issues.
- Focusing on problem prevention by implementing and continually improving work processes designed to identify and resolve problems early in the development life cycle.
- Reporting comprehensive and accurate EASSS Program performance assessments.
- Undergoing a Quality Audit of our procedures (OCI/COI, training, and process procedures) every six months by our Quality Control Manager who reports findings directly to the TBD CEO.

6.1.2 Timeliness

The contractor Task Leader shall ensure:

- Evaluation Team Members are identified as far in advance as possible; that OCI/COI issues are identified and resolved as far in advance as possible; that required training is provided as far in advance as possible; and that required information/forms to bring consultants, temporary employees, and required subcontractors on board with the prime evaluation contractor are completed in as far in advance as possible to ensure timely development of the Evaluation Team.
- Timely and effective responses to problems or changes in requirements and budgets.
- All contract deliverables are accurate, of high quality, and delivered early or on time.
- Risks are being managed in a timely and effective manner.
- Provide timely staff management for new requirements, vacancies, resignations and terminations (for employees, subcontractors, and consultants).
- Timely deliveries, reporting, and identification of issues or concerns.
- All potential problems are identified early and resolved swiftly and are worked proactively rather than reactively.

6.1.3 Cost

The contractor shall utilize pre-negotiated contract rates for estimating purposes. Subcontractors and/or consultants shall be selected based on best value and their ability to meet the schedule.

Hours (but no ODC charges) shall be assigned to this Task and actual costs incurred shall be reflected on the SF533 submitted as costs are incurred and invoiced per the EASSS contract.

Accrued Task costs shall be available to the NASA TPOC within 10 days following each contractor pay period (twice monthly).

6.1.4 Other

Subcontractor Consent. When consultants and/or subcontractors are identified, subcontract consent documentation shall be provided in accordance with Federal Acquisition Regulation (FAR) Part 44. Adequate price competition shall be conducted unless adequately justified in accordance with FAR Parts 6 and 44.

6.2 Organizational Conflict of Interest and Task Technical Approach

TBD OCI task specific plan and technical approach dated 8/2/13 is hereby referenced and incorporated in its entirety into this task order.

- 6.3** Independence and Conduct. All contractor personnel under this task shall meet and maintain the applicable criteria for independence, conflict of interest and availability to support this task.
- 6.4** All contractor personnel under this task shall be capable of sending and receiving electronic media and shall maintain compatibility with the standard Microsoft Office suite of software and Acrobat (PDF) files.
- 6.5** The contractor shall plan for the following estimated travel. The contractor shall plan for the travel required in section 7, below.
- 6.6** Non-Disclosure Agreements. All contractor personnel shall have a signed non-disclosure agreement prior to commencement of work under this task order.

6.7 Applicable Documents NPR 7120.5 and NPR 7123.1 available at <http://nodis.hq.nasa.gov/>.

7. **Period of Performance/Schedule:** From the date of task issuance through September 23, 2015. Interim event dates may change based on direction of the TPOC. Changes to the completion date shall be approved by the Contracting Officer.

7.1 Current Schedule of Activities – The next scheduled ILCR is the Operations Readiness Review (ORR) in the first quarter of the FY2014. Activities, and associated briefings for the ORR are listed below:

7.2 Number of people per trip is four (4).

Description/Activity	Date (Number of meetings days) *	Location
1. ORR Kickoff Telecon	Week of September 1, 2013 (2 hours)	Telecon (no travel)
2. PDS4 ORR	September 17-19, 2013 (3 days)	GSFC
3. ORR Post-review telecon	Week of September 23, 2013 (2 hours)	Telecom (No Travel)
4. Review Reporting	16 hours	No Travel

*Includes meeting days only and no travel. All approved official travels shall originate from within the contiguous 48 states of the United States; and only economic/coach class fares, if needed, shall be approved for official travels.

7.3 Changes to interim delivery dates shall be coordinated with and approved by the TPOC. Changes to the completion date must be approved by the Contracting Officer. The Government has unlimited rights to all deliverables of this Order.

8. **NASA TPOC:**

NASA TPOC: TBD

Mail Stop (M/S): TBD, Science Mission Directorate

Phone Number: (202)358-TBD/ Fax Number: (202)358-3097

E-Mail Address: TBD

1. Task Order Title:

1.1 Ionospheric Connection Explorer (ICON) and Transiting Exoplanet Survey Satellite (TESS) Programmatic (cost, schedule and risk) Assessments
(POP: 3/19/14 – 9/23/15, ORG: HQ SMD)

2. Contractual References:

2.1 Statement of Work Reference: This requirement is pursuant to contract TBD between National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA) NASA Headquarters, Science Mission Directorate (SMD) and TBD. Refer to Paragraphs 4.0 Assessments, and 5.0 Studies.

2.2 Limitation of Future Contracting Reference: In support of this task order, the contractor:

May have access to proprietary information and various other types of non-public data

2.3 Conflict of Interest: As described in NASA Clause 1852.209-71 (Clause H.3, Limitation of Future Contracting, contained in contract TBD), this work may give rise to a potential conflict of interest. Therefore, the contractor shall comply with Clause H.9, Access to Sensitive Information, and Exhibit D., Organizational Conflict of Interest Avoidance Plan, contained in contract TBD.

3. Purpose, Objective, and Background of Work to be Performed:

3.1 Purpose:

TBD will provide independent programmatic (cost and schedule) and technical risk assessments at major development milestones, which will give SMD a greater level of transparency and insight into the technical and programmatic status of the Ionospheric Connection Explorer (ICON) and Transiting Exoplanet Survey Satellite (TESS) projects. The assessments will also give assurance that NASA HQ SMD has an accurate understanding of ICON and TESS cost, schedule, and risk postures, and is thus able to establish realistic cost and schedule commitments. This assessment task is intended to serve as an additional and an independent source of information that would complement that provided by the project, sponsoring program office, and a Standing Review Board (SRB).

4. Description of the Work to be Performed:

4.1 Technical Assessment and Analysis of Project Reviews

TBD shall attend TESS and ICON reviews as required by the schedule paragraph 7.

TBD shall also assess the information to be provided by the project and from those reviews, and shall deliver relevant analytical assessments of the project's cost, schedule, and technical performance to NASA HQ SMD, and shall brief the results of the analyses to the relevant Program Executives (PE), Program and Cost Analysis Team (PCAT), SMD management, and others upon request.

4.1.1 Preliminary Design Review (PDR), pre-Key Decision Point (KDP) C:

The assessment functions address the goals of establishing a credible technical baseline with sufficient fidelity and confidence that the project can be implemented within the allocated budget and schedule. The contractor shall summarize the data and findings in a report, which shall include

1. Assessment of the project's cost and schedule estimate
2. Identification and quantification of all the known risks to mission success as well as the generic uncertainties that might be affecting the project cost and schedule
3. Development of Independent Cost Estimate (ICE) and Independent Schedule Estimate (ISE) probabilistic analyses to accurately reflect the project's risk posture, which provide SMD a credibility of the cost and schedule estimates. TBD shall also provide an analysis of Joint Cost and Schedule Confidence Level (JCL) upon request.

4.1.2 Critical Design Review (CDR) - Post KDP-C support

This assessment function provides visibility into the evolution of programmatic and technical risk as the projects proceed through design, development, and implementation. TBD shall accomplish this function by identifying technical risks, monitoring metrics that indicate growth in work scope, cost and schedule, and characterizing overall technical and programmatic maturation of the project. TBD shall assess the information from the reviews and data provided by the project to determine whether the risks reported by the projects during their life-cycle-review (LCR) were adequately captured and quantified. TBD shall indicate specific risks and quantify those risks that were not adequately addressed and quantified by the projects.

4.2 Prepare Document and Support Presentation of Findings and Recommendations

The contractor shall prepare supporting documents and presentation materials after each review as required to:

4.2.1 Reviewers shall attend each review as identified under "2013/2014 Project Technical Review Schedule Milestones and Dates".

4.2.2 Reviewers shall participate in a reconciliation presentation with the project, as well as a presentation to the Explorer Program Office and NASA HQ SMD personnel as requested.

4.2.3 TBD shall present the analyses and/or findings and provide reconciliations to the project office within 20 days post PDR, or as specified by the relevant PEs. TBD shall also present the final analyses to the Explorer Program Office, NASA HQ SMD, SRB, and the SMD DPMC boards upon request.

4.2.4 Reviewers shall be available for follow-up consultation (if needed).

4.3 The contractor will work all communications and report all assessments through channels as defined by NASA HQ, SMD Task Monitor. The NASA HQ SMD Task Monitor relevant PE will also define when and how these results should be conveyed to the SMD Program Cost Assessment Team (PCAT), SMD Lead Program Analyst (PA), Project Office, Program Office (PO), Division Director, SMD senior management team/Associate Administrator, NASA Independent Committee results should be conveyed to the SMD Program Cost Assessment Team (PCAT), SMD Lead Program Analyst (PA), Project Office, Program Office (PO), Division Director, SMD senior management team/Associate Administrator, NASA Independent Committee, or any other party.

- 5. Government Furnished Items:** The Government will provide the following: Access to Scienceworks Databases, as coordinated through SMD, and access to project data, as coordinated through SMD.

GOVERNMENT FURNISHED ITEM	DATE TO BE FURNISHED
Scienceworks Database	05/1/2014
Project data	05/1/2014

- 6. Other Information Needed for Task Performance:**

6.1. Performance Objectives:

6.1.1 Quality

This Task shall conform to the goals of the contractor EASSS QA Program by:

- Delivering high-quality products and services that meet contractual requirements and satisfy the stakeholder’s technical, cost and schedule needs and expectations.
- Using continuous improvement to develop and deliver low-risk, innovative technical solutions.
- Evaluating performance using objective performance measures together with customer satisfaction, surveillance and performance evaluation inputs.
- Ensuring that the Task Order shall be staffed with only the highest quality non-conflicted SMEs, able to fully conform to necessary standards and procedures, and free of OCI and COI concerns.
- Ensuring prompt visibility and proactive resolution of emerging quality issues.
- Focusing on problem prevention by implementing and continually improving work processes designed to identify and resolve problems early in the development life cycle.
- Reporting comprehensive and accurate EASSS Program performance assessments.
- Undergoing a Quality Audit of our procedures (OCI/COI, training, and process procedures) every six months by our Quality Control Manager who reports findings directly to the TBD CEO.

6.1.2 Timeliness

The contractor Task Leader shall ensure:

- Evaluation Team Members are identified as far in advance as possible; that OCI/COI issues are identified and resolved as far in advance as possible; that required training is provided as far in advance as possible; and that required information/forms to bring consultants, temporary employees, and required subcontractors on board with the prime evaluation contractor are completed in as far in advance as possible to ensure timely development of the Evaluation Team.
- Timely and effective responses to problems or changes in requirements and budgets.
- All contract deliverables are accurate, of high quality, and delivered early or on time.
- Risks are being managed in a timely and effective manner.
- Provide timely staff management for new requirements, vacancies, resignations and terminations (for employees, subcontractors, and consultants).
- Timely deliveries, reporting, and identification of issues or concerns.
- All potential problems are identified early and resolved swiftly and are worked proactively rather than reactively.

6.1.3 Cost

The contractor shall utilize pre-negotiated contract rates for estimating purposes. Subcontractors and/or consultants shall be selected based on best value and their ability to meet the schedule.

Hours (but no ODC charges) shall be assigned to this Task and actual costs incurred shall be reflected on the SF533 submitted as costs are incurred and invoiced per the EASSS contract.

Accrued Task costs shall be available to the NASA Technical Point of Contact (TPOC) within 10 days following each contractor pay period (twice monthly).

Task Estimate shall be within + or – 5% of the proposed amount, otherwise, fee shall be reduced commensurate with the overestimated cost.

6.1.4 Other

Subcontractor Consent. When consultants and/or subcontractors are identified, subcontract consent documentation shall be provided in accordance with Federal Acquisition Regulation (FAR) Part 44. Adequate price competition shall be conducted unless adequately justified in accordance with FAR Parts 6 and 44.

6.2 Organizational Conflict of Interest and Task Technical Approach

TBD OCI task specific plan and technical approach dated RevA 03-06-14F is hereby referenced and incorporated in its entirety into this task order.

7. **Period of Performance/Schedule:** The period of performance for this task order shall be task signature date through September 23, 2015. Interim event dates may change based on direction of the TPOC. The Contracting Officer (CO) must approve any change to the completion date.

2014/2016 Project Technical Review Schedule Milestones and Dates

Milestone Number	Milestones	Dates
1	Start date	May 01, 2014
2	Attend ICON PDR at UCB/Orbital	May 2014
3	ICON ICE/ISE reconciliation with the project and program office (telecon)	May-June 2014
4	ICON PDR/KDP-C report and presentation	June 2014
5	Attend TESS PDR at MIT	September 01, 2014
6	TESS ICE/ISE presentation and reconciliation with the project and program office (telecon or in person)	September-October 2014
7	TESS PDR/KDP-C report and presentation	October 2014
8	Attend ICON CDR at UBC/Orbital	February 2015
9	ICON CDR report and presentation	February – March 2015
10	Attend TESS CDR at MIT	April 2015
11	TESS CDR report and presentation	April – May 2015
12	Task end	September 23, 2015

8. NASA TPOC:

TBD
 NASA HQ, Science Mission Directorate
 Mail Stop: TBD
 Phone Number: 202 358-TBD
 Email Address: TBD

TPOC Responsibilities:

8.1. The TPOC for the Task Order on the contract, as identified above. The TPOC’s function is to serve as technical liaison between the Contractor and the Contracting Officer’s Representative (COR). The TPOC is responsible for monitoring the overall task performance by the Contractor including delivery of the final product and/or services identified in the Task Order Statement of Work. Specific duties and responsibilities are listed in Paragraph 2 below. Please pay particular attention to the limitations/cautions listed in Paragraph 3 below.

- 8.2. The following authority and responsibilities are hereby assigned to the TPOC:
- a. Monitor contract technical performance. Ensure that the Contractor complies with the Statement of Work or specifications included in the contract. Notify CO of any problem areas or deficiencies in performance.
 - b. Communicate with Contractor personnel as necessary to ensure that Government requirements are understood. Technical information may be exchanged. This exchange should be without any implication of being a directive. Consult CO if the requirement exists to give technical direction. Only the CO can give technical direction.

- c. Monitor Contractor's expenditure of man-hours and cost on the contract. Review periodic reports received from the Contractor on Contract Assignment/Work Order progress/cost. Report any discrepancies, concerns, questions to the CO.
- d. Notify CO of any changes required to the contract. Only the CO can issue these changes.
- e. Notify the CO of any violation of the terms and conditions of the contract or any other Contractor action considered detrimental to the Government.
- f. Send an information copy to the CO of any correspondence exchanged with the Contractor regarding the contract.
- g. Review the contract deliverables and advise CO on acceptability. Recommend to the CO closeout of the contract when all requirements have been completed.
- h. Other duties as follows:
 - (1) Review designated task deliverables then advise if acceptable (533s, OCI Plans, milestones)
 - (2) Recommend to the COR closeout of the Tasks when all requirements have been completed.
 - (3) Identify, evaluate, mitigate OCIs, notify CO immediately of OCI situations.
 - (4) All actions to be coordinated through the SOMA COR.
 - (5) See Task Order paragraph 2 – task monitor is advised of the contract clauses to be monitored during performance or the task.

8.3. The duties delegated in this letter cannot be re-delegated. The TPOC is cautioned that he or she may be personally liable for actions taken or direction given beyond the authorities delegated in this letter.

- a. TPOC is not authorized to direct or supervise Contractor employees in the accomplishment of work assignments. Your primary interface shall be with the TBD Task Lead assigned to your task. Ensure TBD Task lead remains abreast of significant information communicated between TPOC (NASA) and other Contractor/Subcontractor/Consultant employees.
- b. TPOCs are not authorized to approve or direct any changes in the Task Order or to alter the contract in any way. However, changes to the task order milestone schedule are allowable via technical direction to accommodate necessary changes to the milestone schedule. The final completion date can only be changed through a contract modification signed by the CO.
- c. TPOCs are not authorized to approve or direct any expenditure of funds beyond the Task Order specified amounts.
- d. TPOCs are cautioned not to release to the Contractor any proprietary data beyond the Government Furnished Items. If the Contractor requires access to such data, consult the Contracting Officer/ Contract Specialist.
- e. TPOCs are not authorized to request proposals of any nature associated with this contract/task orders.

This appointment is effective signature date of this task order and shall remain in effect until completion of the Task Order or until rescinded in writing by the CO or COR on this contract.

1. Task Order Title

Mars 2020 Investigations (Mars2020) Proposal Evaluation
(POP: 12/13/13 – 11/22/14, ORG: SOMA)

2. Contractual References

2.1. Statement of Work Reference

This requirement is pursuant to contract TBD between National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA) Langley Research Center (LaRC) and TBD, LLC. Refer to Paragraph 3.0 Proposal Evaluation.

2.2 Limitation of Future Contracting Reference

In support of this task order, the contractor:

- shall be required to evaluate proposals and competitive announcements
- may have access to proprietary information and various other types of non-public data

As described in NASA Clause 1852.209-71 (Clause H.3, Limitation of Future Contracting, contained in contract TBD), this work may give rise to a potential conflict of interest. Therefore, the contractor shall comply with Clause H.9, Access to Sensitive Information, and “Exhibit D. Organizational Conflict of Interest Avoidance Plan”, contained in contract TBD.

3. Purpose, Objective, and Background of Work to be Performed

The purpose of this Task Order is to provide technical expertise and administrative support to the NASA Science Office for Mission Assessments (SOMA) (located at NASA LaRC) on the Technical, Management, and Cost (TMC) Feasibility of the Investigation Implementation, including Cost Risk evaluation of proposals submitted as a result of the Mars 2020 Investigations (Mars2020) solicitation. Mars2020 solicits two types of investigations: surface science investigations and exploration technology investigations.

For each proposal evaluated, the contractor shall provide a Form C, which is the form that serves as the report of the TMC evaluation results, and a Cost Evaluation Summary, which documents the cost assessment associated with each Form C. The TMC evaluation is performed according to criteria Factors C-1 to C-5 defined in the Mars 2020 Investigations Solicitation: TBD Announcement of Opportunity (AO).

4. Description of the Work to be Performed

4.1 Preparation for TMC Evaluation Support

The contractor shall perform the TMC Evaluation as follows:

4.1.1 Task Lead/Evaluation Integrators

The contractor shall provide a Task Lead and an Evaluation Integrator who shall be responsible (along with the Program Manager [PM]) for Task requirement completion, shall ensure the high quality and timeliness of all deliverables. The Task Lead and Evaluation Integrator may be the same person.

The contractor shall participate in planning the TMC Evaluation Process, including defining the roles and responsibilities and skill mix needed. Responsibilities shall include, but are not limited to:

- 4.1.1.1. Assisting with searching for potential Evaluation Team candidates.
- 4.1.1.2. Identifying and documenting Organizational Conflict of Interest (OCI) and individual Conflict of Interest (COI) issues and obtaining required forms/certifications from required members of the Evaluation Team for the subpanels for the two types of investigations; surface science and exploration technology.
- 4.1.1.3. Maintaining an updated Evaluation Team Contact Lists.
- 4.1.1.4. Assisting and facilitating with the Kickoff Meeting.
- 4.1.1.5. Documenting Technical Compliance of all Proposals.
- 4.1.1.6. Completing an OCI/COI scan on all proposal materials to document potential, perceived, or actual OCI/COI.
- 4.1.1.7. Coordinating teleconferences for team meetings, the Kickoff meeting, subpanel teleconferences, and the Plenary Meeting.
- 4.1.1.8. Coordinating with the NRESS logistics contractor for the Plenary Meeting.
- 4.1.1.9. Assisting with conducting the Plenary Meetings (ensuring the room is set up) and assisting with coordinating activities during the meeting to ensure it flows efficiently and smoothly.
- 4.1.1.10. Providing assistance to ensure the high quality and timeliness of all deliverables.
- 4.1.1.11. Providing miscellaneous support to Evaluation Team members, as required, to facilitate accomplishment of the evaluation.
- 4.1.1.12. Providing any other support to the NASA Technical Point of Contact (TPOC), as required, to ensure the evaluation process proceeds in accordance to plan, efficiently and smoothly.

4.1.2 Proposal Evaluation Schedule

The contractor will be provided an Evaluation Schedule by the Contracting Officer (CO). Prior to the Kick-off meeting, the contractor shall scan proposals for and document OCI/COIs and check technical compliance. Subsequently the contractor shall evaluate the proposals at a cadence of two proposals per week per subpanel. The contractor shall follow the provided schedule to discuss the individual findings, refine Forms C, screen out minors for any subsequent review, send potential major weaknesses to proposers, incorporate clarifications from proposers to the Forms C and refine the Cost Evaluation Summaries before the Plenary Meeting. The Plenary Meeting is scheduled for 2 weeks. The contractor shall keep flexibility as unforeseen events may alter the schedule during the process.

4.1.3 TMC Evaluation Team/ Subpanel Definition

4.1.3.1 The contractors shall familiarize themselves with the Mars2020 AO and the Notices of Intent (NOIs). There were 58 proposals submitted. The task will require 8 subpanels to evaluate the 58 proposals.

4.1.3.2 The contractor shall staff and vet the necessary non conflicted experts to conduct this evaluation. Based on the evaluation criteria in the Mars2020 AO, the contractor shall provide expertise in the following areas per surface science instrument subpanel: 3 Instruments experts, 1 Management and Schedule expert, and 1 Cost expert. The cost model to be used shall be System Evaluations and Estimation of Resources (SEER). In addition, a Level of Difficulty Index (LDI) will be determined for each proposal. Training on the LDI shall be provided to some subpanel members if necessary. The LDI is based on *Earth and Space Science Cost Study March 5, 2009*. The contractor shall provide expertise in the following areas per exploration technology instrument subpanel: 3 Technology experts, 1 Management and Schedule expert, and 1 Cost expert. The cost model to be used shall be System Evaluations and Estimation of Resources (SEER). In addition, a Level of Difficulty Index (LDI) will be determined for each proposal. Training on the LDI shall be provided to some subpanel members if necessary. The LDI is based on *Earth and Space Science Cost Study March 5, 2009*.

4.1.3.3 The contractor shall assign two Form C Leads for each subpanel from this subpanel membership, who shall lead their respective subpanel Form C discussions through the evaluation of their assigned proposals and shall be responsible for the completion of the evaluation products, i.e. Forms C and Cost Evaluation Summaries. At least one Form C lead per subpanel shall be experienced Evaluation Team members who have previous experience leading subpanels and being Form C Lead, or shall be experienced team leaders capable of handling this task.

4.1.3.4 The contractor shall assign a Cost Lead for each proposal. Cost Leads shall be responsible for the completion of the Cost Evaluation Summary for their assigned proposals that includes the results of the cost estimate and the panel's cost related inputs. The contractor shall assign a Cost Lead for the entire panel that shall be responsible to gather all the cost analyses results and prepare and deliver a Cost Summary Presentation during the Plenary Meeting.

4.1.3.5 The contractor shall generate the LDI for each proposal.

4.1.3.6 Although proposals are evaluated independently from other proposals, consistency checks shall be performed during the TMC Evaluation to ensure that all proposals are treated equally and fairly.

4.1.4 TMC Team Contact List

The contractor shall maintain an up-to-date Evaluation Team Contact List of all individuals that are part of the Evaluation Team. This includes all contractor-supplied individuals (employees, consultants, and subcontractor personnel), civil servants or other government personnel added to the Evaluation Team, and any other individuals contracted by NASA (either individuals contracted directly by NASA or contracted via a subcontract directly to NASA). The Evaluation Team Contact List shall include (but is not limited to) each individual's name; role and responsibility on the Evaluation Team; primary area of expertise; Proposals assigned; affiliation; name, address, fax and phone number; email address; current mailing address; and address to which they want their proposals sent.

4.1.5 Training of Evaluation Team on Ethics, OCI/COI and ITAR, and LDI for Instruments

4.1.5.1 The contractor shall provide training and obtain certifications in accordance with the contractor's OCI Mitigation Plan.

4.1.5.2 The contractor shall provide training on LDI for Instruments to evaluators.

4.1.6 Compliance Check

Upon receipt of Proposals, the contractor shall immediately conduct a Technical/Cost Compliance Check (as defined in the AO) and shall document any compliance/non-compliance issues. This information shall be provided to the NASA TPOC to assist in the determination if any proposals are to be determined by NASA Science Mission Directorate (SMD) to be non-compliant.

4.1.7 Proposal OCI/COI Scan

Upon receipt of proposals, the contractor shall copy all data on all CD's provided by the proposers, into a file on a fully encrypted computer. A word search shall be conducted on this file looking for any occurrences of participation by the contractor or by any subcontractors, at all tiers, that are assisting the

prime evaluation contractor in conducting this evaluation, and for the affiliation of any Evaluation Team members. In addition, a search shall also be conducted on the names of all Evaluation Team members, along with a search for any key words or names suggested by the NASA TPOC, the NASA Program Scientist, or Evaluation Team members. All instances of findings shall be recorded with a document name, page and paragraph number associated with the finding, along with the pertinent wording from the paragraph such that identification and evaluation of any OCI/COI issues can be performed adequately and quickly. If there are any instances of any actual, potential, or perceived OCI/COI, these instances shall be reported to the NASA CO, the NASA COR, and NASA TPOC immediately; and if appropriate, the contractor shall develop and recommend OCI mitigation strategies.

4.1.8 Final Resolution on any Potential, Perceived, or Actual OCIs/COIs

4.1.8.1 The prime evaluation contractor employees, subcontractors and consultant personnel (at all tiers) that are to be assigned to the work described on this Task shall be screened for OCI/COIs as indicated in the contractor's OCI Mitigation Plan. The prime evaluation contractor and each subcontractor (regardless of tier) shall certify they have no OCI/COI issues by submitting a signed Certification of Independent Assessment Form.

4.1.8.2 Final resolution of all potential OCI/COI issues shall be documented in the NASA Mars2020 COI Mitigation Plan.

4.1.8.3 No employee or consultant or subcontractor personnel (at any tier) of any company (the prime evaluation contractor or any of subcontractors) shall be engaged to work on this Task until all the required training has been completed and all certifications are complete.

4.1.9 Remote Evaluation System Technical Support for the Evaluation

The NASA TPOC has the sole decision and authority/responsibility for allowing Remote Evaluation System (RES) access to individuals, and for providing file read/write/delete privileges to specified individuals utilizing the RES.

The prime evaluation contractor shall test the RES for functionality prior to the Kickoff Meeting. The contractor shall provide instructions to the Evaluation Team on how to obtain the Kickoff materials from the RES. The contractor shall also provide technical support to any Evaluation Team member having difficulty utilizing the RES.

4.1.10 Kickoff Meeting

4.1.10.1 The contractor shall assist in briefing the Evaluation Team. The contractor shall utilize a NASA-provided teleconference service to secure teleconference facilities with the required number of phone lines to conduct the meeting. The contractor shall notify all participants of the time and date for this meeting/teleconference (or webex) and how to obtain the presentation materials from the RES.

4.1.10.2 All members of the Evaluation Teams shall attend the Kickoff Meeting. Hence, should any Evaluation Team member not be able to attend this meeting, the contractor shall conduct "makeup" meetings for all members that missed the initial meeting, and shall ensure that all Evaluation Team members attend this meeting. The contractor shall also ensure that Proposals are not distributed to any Evaluation Team member until it is confirmed that they have attended one of the Kickoff meetings.

4.2 TMC Evaluation of Mars2020 Proposals

4.2.1 TMC Evaluation

4.2.1.1 The contractor shall perform a detailed evaluation of each proposal. The contractor's Evaluation Team members shall participate in reading and evaluating their assigned aspects (e.g., instruments) of each assigned proposal. For instrument suite proposals, each instrument shall be evaluated individually in addition to the evaluation of the entire suite.

4.2.1.2 The contractor's Cost Evaluators shall perform a life cycle cost estimate for each proposal that the SEER cost model. Each cost estimate shall include all life-cycle elements from Phase A through Phase D for elements in the PI Managed cost, and shall be generated with an approach (parametric models, reference cost data, and analogies) that is independent of the proposer's estimation sources. Included in each Life-Cycle Cost estimate shall be an assessment of cost risk that will identify cost drivers in each proposed implementation approach. Comments shall be provided on costs shown outside the PI-Managed Cost. The contractor shall provide the SEER model parameter settings and cost results for both 50% and 70% likelihood.

4.2.1.3 Each proposal shall be assigned a Form C Lead who will be responsible to guide the subpanel discussions and generate and refine the Form C for their assigned proposals. Each proposal shall be assigned a Cost Lead who will be responsible to guide the subpanel cost discussions and generate and refine the Cost Evaluation Summary for their assigned proposals.

4.2.1.4 The contractor shall remove sections from every proposal as requested by the NASA Science Mission Directorate and place these proposals on the RES for the Mars 2020 Project Office. The removed sections shall be H, I, J.2, J.3, J.4, J.5, J.7, J.8, J.12, J.14A, and J.14B.

4.2.2 Evolution of Findings and the Form C

Evaluation findings undergo a maturation process during the TMC evaluation. They start as individual findings that are discussed and then edited, merged with other findings or disposed. Findings that are kept are further refined through various iterations to be relevant, specific, and clear. The iterations are described below.

4.2.2.1 Individual Findings: The contractor's Evaluation Team members shall review the assigned proposals and develop individual findings before discussion with other subpanel members. For each assigned proposal, each contractor Evaluation Team member shall enter their individual findings into the RES website before each proposal scheduled deadline. For each proposal, the Form C Lead shall organize these individual findings (using the RES software) into a large table of findings referred to as the "Fat Matrix". This Fat Matrix of individual findings is the basis of the Fat Matrix teleconference.

4.2.2.2 Fat Matrix teleconference: A "Fat Matrix teleconference" is held for each proposal to discuss individual findings and to assist the Form C Lead in developing an "Initial Draft Form C" for that proposal. The Form C Lead guides the discussion. During this Fat Matrix teleconference, the entire subpanel discusses each individual finding, and the individual findings are edited, merged with other similar individual findings, or disposed. After the Fat Matrix teleconference, the Form C Lead shall be responsible for further editing, consolidating, and refining this initial form into the Initial Draft Form C. The Initial Draft Form C is the first draft of the final Form C product and is the basis of the "Initial Draft Form C Teleconference" discussion.

4.2.2.3 Initial Draft Form C Teleconference: For each proposal, the Initial Draft Form C Teleconference is held by each subpanel to refine the findings. The Form C Lead guides the discussion. In this teleconference the LDI results are presented, the initial results of the Independent Cost Estimates (ICE) and cost threats are discussed and the findings can be edited, merged with other similar findings, or disposed. The results from these Initial Draft Form C teleconferences will be discussed at a weekly teleconference with the other subpanel Form C Leads to ensure consistency in findings between the subpanels and to prepare potential major weaknesses to be sent to the proposers for clarification. TMC evaluators will review the subfactor from his or her expertise area in one Form C from another subpanel each week to ensure findings are treated the same between each subpanel.

4.2.2.4 Second Draft Form C Teleconference: For each proposal, the subpanel holds a second Draft Form C Teleconference to further refine the findings and prepare potential major weaknesses to be sent to the proposers for clarification. All Draft Forms C are reviewed during these teleconferences. The Form C Lead for each subpanel guides the discussion. Findings can be edited, merged with other similar findings, or disposed. The resulting third drafts of the Forms C are the basis of the “Pre-Plenary Draft Form C Teleconference”. The potential major weaknesses from each Form C are captured and sent to the proposers.

4.2.2.5

Pre-Plenary Draft Form C Teleconference: For each proposal, each subpanel holds a Third Draft Form C Teleconference before the plenary meeting to further refine the findings and consider the proposer-provided clarifications to the major weaknesses. All Draft Forms C are reviewed during this teleconference. The Form C Lead for each proposal guides the discussion. Findings can be edited, merged with other similar findings, or disposed. The Consistency Lead ensures consistency between findings on proposals, the disposition of clarification responses, and that all proposals are treated equally and fairly. The resulting “Plenary Draft Form C” is the basis of the Plenary Meeting discussions.

4.2.2.6 Form C Lead teleconferences shall be held weekly, and additionally as needed, to discuss and resolve consistency issues.

4.2.2.7 Unless previously approved by the Form C leads and NASA TPOC, all Evaluation Team members must attend their assigned teleconferences to review draft Forms C and address consistency issues.

4.2.3 Plenary Meeting: Finalizing the Findings and Form C

The contractor shall attend the TMC Plenary Meeting. The TMC Plenary Meetings is a two week face-to-face meeting where all evaluators come together to discuss all proposal findings, finalize the findings and Form C and be polled for the proposed investigation risk rating. This will be accomplished in 2 rounds of discussion for each proposal. The Form C and Cost Leads for each proposal guide the discussions. The contractor shall also provide a summary presentation on cost that includes the results of the Cost analysis for each proposal. At the end of the Plenary Meetings the Evaluation Team shall;

4.2.3.1. Document the findings in final versions of the Forms C for each proposal.

4.2.3.2. Judge the completeness, accuracy, and consistent treatment of each proposal’s evaluation.

4.2.3.3. Determine, via a polling process, the final assignment of risk ratings for each proposal as directed by the Government. The contractor shall also prepare a “polling log” indicating who can be polled for each proposal and that shall automatically (via

formulas developed in an Excel Spreadsheet) determine the median, average, or mode of each tallied poll for each proposal.

4.2.3.4. Deliver the final form documents in time to support the categorization meeting.

4.3 Post-evaluation Support

The contractor shall:

- 4.3.1. Finalize the Forms C and the Cost Evaluation Summaries. This includes a review by a professional technical editor after Form Cs have been finalized by Form C leads.
- 4.3.2. Providing 1 instrument evaluator to attend the Science Plenary Meeting.
- 4.3.3. Assist with preparation of categorization and steering committee books.
- 4.3.4. Assist with preparation for debriefings of proposing teams.
- 4.3.5. Participate in a Lessons Learned activity to capture the lessons learned and best practices of the evaluation process.
- 4.3.6. Develop and assist in the presentation of a Transition Briefing to the Program Office that captures the characteristics of the selected instruments.
- 4.3.7. Prepare or provide input to briefing books and/or a history book documenting all evaluation panel activity, findings, and recommendations, as directed by the NASA TPOC.
- 4.3.8. Upload final forms, as well as copies of presentation materials and summaries to the evaluation website; after which, the entire contents of the site shall be captured on CD-ROM for entry into the SOMA archive.
- 4.3.9. Print a hardcopy of each electronic proposal and archive all proposal copies and documents pertaining to the evaluation cycle in the SOMA archive.

5. **Government Furnished Items:** The Government will provide the following.

GOVERNMENT FURNISHED ITEM	DATE TO BE FURNISHED
Notices of Intent	November 2013
Proposals	January 2014
Form C Lead Training	January 2014

6. Other Information Needed for Task Performance

6.1. Performance Objectives:

6.1.1 Quality

This Task shall conform to the goals of the contractor EASSS QA Program by:

- Using continuous improvement to develop and deliver low-risk, innovative technical solutions.
- Ensuring that the Task Order shall be staffed with only the highest quality non-conflicted SMEs, able to fully conform to necessary standards and procedures, and free of OCI and COI concerns.
- Ensuring prompt visibility and proactive resolution of emerging quality issues.

- Focusing on problem prevention by implementing and continually improving work processes designed to identify and resolve problems early in the development life cycle.
- Reporting comprehensive and accurate EASSS Program performance assessments.
- Undergoing a Quality Audit of our procedures (OCI/COI, training, and process procedures) every six months by our Quality Control Manager who reports findings directly to the TBD CEO.

6.1.2 Timeliness

The contractor Task Leader shall ensure:

- Evaluation Team members are identified as far in advance as possible; that OCI/COI issues are identified and resolved as far in advance as possible; that required training is provided as far in advance as possible; and that required information/forms to bring consultants, temporary employees, and required subcontractors on board with the prime evaluation contractor are completed in as far in advance as possible to ensure timely development of the Evaluation Team.
- Timely and effective responses to problems or changes in requirements and budgets.
- All contract deliverables are accurate, of high quality, and delivered early or on time. (Section 7 SOW)
- Risks (Schedule, cost, and OCI) are being managed in a timely and effective manner.
- Provide timely staff management for new task requirements, vacancies, resignations and terminations (for employees, subcontractors, and consultants).
- Timely deliveries, reporting, and identification of issues or concerns.
- All potential problems are identified early and resolved swiftly and are worked proactively rather than reactively.

6.1.3 Cost

The contractor shall utilize pre-negotiated contract rates for estimating purposes. Subcontractors and/or consultants shall be selected based on best value and their ability to meet the schedule.

Task and actual costs incurred shall be reflected on the SF533 submitted as costs are incurred and invoiced per the EASSS contract.

Accrued Task costs shall be available to the NASA TPOC within 10 days following each contractor pay period (twice monthly).

6.1.4 Other Subcontractor Consent.

When consultants and/or subcontractors are identified, subcontract consent documentation shall be provided in accordance with Federal Acquisition Regulation (FAR) Part 44. Adequate price competition shall be conducted unless adequately justified in accordance with FAR Parts 6 and 44.

6.2 Organizational Conflict of Interest and Task Technical Approach

TBD OCI task plan and technical approach dated 2/11/14 RevC is hereby referenced and incorporated in its entirety into this task order.

7. Period of Performance/Schedule

The period of performance for this task order shall be from the date of this order through June 30, 2014. Interim event dates may change based on direction of the TPOC. The CO will approve changes to the completion date.

Milestone Number	SOW Reference Paragraph	Milestones	Dates
1	N/A	Start Date	Signed task order
2	4.1.1, 4.1.3, 4.1.4, 4.1.5	Initial OCI Checks and Documentation	1 month after receipt of NOIs
3	4.1.1, 4.1.6-4.1.8	OCI and Compliance Checks	January 31, 2014
4	4.1.3	LDI training	January 17, 2014
5	4.1.1, 4.1.10	TMC Kickoff Teleconference	Week of January 10, 2014
6	4.2, 4.3.2	TMC Evaluations: Fat Matrix and Form C Teleconferences/TMC Plenary (location TBD)	February 3, 2014 – March 28, 2014/April 14 – April 25, 2014
7	3, 4.2.1-4.2.3, and 4.3.1.	Final Forms C, Cost Evaluation Summaries, and SEER model parameter settings and costs at both 50% and 70% likelihood for each proposal	February 3, 2014 – April 25, 2014
8	4.3	Complete Documentation/Assistance for Accommodation including summary, Categorization and Steering Committees, and Transition Briefing/Lessons Learned Activities	April 2014 – June 2014
9	4.3	Proposal Debriefings (as needed)	June 2014
10	4.3	Timely archiving of evaluation documentation (forms, working documents, proposals, briefing books, CD-ROM)/Completion Date	June 2014

8. NASA TPOC

NASA TPOC: TBD
 Mail Stop (M/S): TBD
 Phone Number: (757) 864-TBD/ Fax Number: (757) 864-8894
 Email: TBD

TPOC Responsibilities:

8.1. The TPOC for the Task Order on the contract, as identified above. The TPOC's function is to serve as technical liaison between the Contractor and the Contracting Officer's Representative (COR). The TPOC is responsible for monitoring the overall task performance by the Contractor including delivery of the final product and/or services identified in the Task Order SOW. Specific duties and responsibilities are listed in Paragraph 2 below. Please pay particular attention to the limitations/cautions listed in Paragraph 3 below.

8.2. The following authority and responsibilities are hereby assigned to the TPOC:

- a. Monitor contract technical performance. Ensure that the Contractor complies with the Statement of Work or specifications included in the contract. Notify CO of any problem areas or deficiencies in performance.
- b. Communicate with Contractor personnel as necessary to ensure that Government requirements are understood. Technical information may be exchanged. This exchange should be without any implication of being a directive. Consult CO if the requirement exists to give technical direction. Only the CO can give technical direction.
- c. Monitor Contractor's expenditure of man-hours and cost on the contract. Review periodic reports received from the Contractor on Contract Assignment/Work Order progress/cost. Report any discrepancies, concerns, questions to the CO.
- d. Notify CO of any changes required to the contract. Only the CO can issue these changes.
- e. Notify the CO of any violation of the terms and conditions of the contract or any other Contractor action considered detrimental to the Government.
- f. Send an information copy to the CO of any correspondence exchanged with the Contractor regarding the contract.
- g. Review the contract deliverables and advise CO on acceptability. Recommend to the CO closeout of the contract when all requirements have been completed.
- h. Other duties as follows:
 - (1) Review designated task deliverables then advise if acceptable (533s, OCI Plans, milestones)
 - (2) Recommend to the COR closeout of the Tasks when all requirements have been completed.
 - (3) Identify, evaluate, mitigate OCIs, notify CO immediately of OCI situations.
 - (4) All actions to be coordinated through the SOMA COR.
 - (5) See Task Order paragraph 2 – task monitor is advised of the contract clauses to be monitored during performance or the task.

8.3. The duties delegated in this letter cannot be re-delegated. The TPOC is cautioned that he or she may be personally liable for actions taken or direction given beyond the authorities delegated in this letter.

- a. TPOC is not authorized to direct or supervise Contractor employees in the accomplishment of work assignments. Your primary interface shall be with the TBD Task Lead assigned to your task. Ensure TBD Task lead remains abreast of significant information communicated between Task Manager (NASA) and other Contractor/Subcontractor/Consultant employees.
- b. TPOC is not authorized to approve or direct any changes in the Task Order or to alter the contract in any way. However, changes to the task order milestone schedule are allowable via technical direction to accommodate necessary changes to the milestone schedule. The final completion date can only be changed through a contract modification signed by the CO.
- c. TPOC is not authorized to approve or direct any expenditure of funds beyond the Task Order specified amounts.
- d. TPOC is cautioned not to release to the Contractor any proprietary data beyond the Government Furnished Items. If the Contractor requires access to such data, consult the CO.

e. TPOC is not authorized to request proposals of any nature associated with this contract/task orders.

This appointment is effective signature date of this task order and shall remain in effect until completion of the Task Order or until rescinded in writing by the CO or COR on this contract.

1. Task Order Title

Science Office for Mission Assessments (SOMA) Evaluation Planning Effort
(POP: 8/11/14 – 9/23/15, ORG: SOMA)

2. Contractual References

2.1. Statement of Work Reference

This requirement is pursuant to contract TBD between National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA) Langley Research Center (LaRC) and TBD. Refer to Paragraphs 3.0 Proposal Evaluation, 4.0 Assessments, and 5.0 Studies.

2.2 Limitation of Future Contracting Reference

In support of this task order, the contractor:

- Will have access to Sensitive But Unclassified (SBU) information on planned solicitations.
- May have access to proprietary information and various other types of non-public data

As described in NASA Clause 1852.209-71 (Clause H.3, Limitation of Future Contracting, contained in contract TBD), this work may give rise to a potential conflict of interest. Therefore, the contractor shall comply with Clause H.9, Access to Sensitive Information, and “Exhibit D. Organizational Conflict of Interest Avoidance Plan”, contained in contract TBD.

3. Purpose, Objective, and Background of Work to be Performed

The purpose of this Task Order is to plan the evaluation staff for all the Technical, Management and Cost (TMC) evaluations through September 23, 2015 to handle the expected historically large number of proposals with overlapping TMC panels. A substantial number of new evaluators will be needed, which requires orientation on TMC processes to ensure an effective process to integrate first time TMC evaluators into TMC evaluations conducted by the NASA Science Office for Mission Assessments (SOMA) (located at NASA LaRC).

4. Description of the Work to be Performed

The contractor shall be required to provide staff planning for multiple overlapping TMC Evaluations from October 2014 through September 23, 2015. The contractor shall be required to provide deliverables of complete lists of individual evaluators for specific TMC acquisitions at SOMA Gate Reviews. The SOMA Gate Reviews will be chaired by the SOMA Director or the SOMA Associate Director for Procurement for SOMA (the EASSS COR). The SOMA Director may delegate a SOMA Acquisition Manager (AM) to Chair a Gate review if the SOMA Director and the Associate Director for Procurement for SOMA are not available. Only the SOMA Gate Review Chair is authorized to approve personnel to serve on SOMA TMC evaluations. The contractor will be required to deliver proposed staffing plans and each proposed evaluator’s qualifications at each of the SOMA Gate Reviews described below for all TMC evaluation panels. The contractor must provide a deliverable of the staffing plan for all TMC evaluations and maintain configuration control of any changes approved to the staffing plan by the SOMA Gate Review Chair. The contractor must maintain documentation on approved changes to the staff planned for each TMC evaluation panel that documents the rationale for any changes.

4.1 Preparation for FY 2015 TMC Evaluation Support

The contractor shall perform the following activities as follows:

4.1.1 Planning Gate Review (PGR) for Integrated SOMA Staffing for FY2015

The contractor shall provide an integrated approach to staffing the following evaluations from October 2014 to September 23, 2015. This includes the following AOs: Europa Instrument Program Element Appendix (PEA), Discovery Mission AO, Astrophysics SMEX Mission AO, Astrophysics Mission of Opportunity PEA, Earth Systematic Mission (ESM) SLI AO, ESM PACE Mission or Instrument AO, Hands On Project Experience (HOPE) Training Opportunity (TO), Earth Venture Mission (EVM) 2 AO, Earth Science Directorate (ESD) Senior Review of Operating Missions,

The contractor shall provide an integrated plan to staff all TMC evaluations panels stated in the prior paragraph. The contractor will provide a specific plan of milestones over the task period to conduct staffing reviews for all AO evaluations and finalize all staff for each evaluation. The contractor shall provide a plan on how new TMC evaluators will quickly be oriented to be productive members of TMC panels in advance of specific evaluations. This orientation plan will be implemented over the task performance schedule.

The Gate Review Chair will formally approve the contractor's integrated SOMA staffing plan to meet SOMAs staffing requirements for FY 2015. The PGR for the Integrated SOMA staffing requirements in FY 2015 will be approved when the Chair certifies that the contractor has proposed qualified staff for at least 75% of all panels. If necessary, the Gate Review Chair may hold several PGR meetings to review the contractors proposed integrated SOMA staffing plan for FY2015.

Starting Assumptions:

AO/PEA	AO Release	Proposal Due Date	Expected Proposals	Expected no. of subpanels
Europa	July 15, 2014	Oct 17, 2014	TBD	TBD
Discovery		December 2014	TBD	TBD
Explorer Astro Mission	September 2014	December 2014	TBD	TBD
Explorer Astro MO	September 2014	December 2014	TBD	TBD
TBD Mission		April 2015	TBD	TBD
ESM PACE-M		TBD 2015	TBD	TBD
EVI-3	Jan – March 2015	Q3 2015	TBD	TBD
HOPE	Q1 2015	Q2 2015	TBD	TBD
EVM-2	Q3 2015	Q4 2015	TBD	TBD
Senior review		Q2 2015	TBD	TBD
Totals		Dec 2014 - June 2015	~170	~24

Schedule Assumptions

The contractor should assume that Full Mission evaluations will take 24 weeks from Proposals due to the end of the TMC panel. For instrument evaluations the contractor should assume that it will take 20 weeks from Proposals due to the end of the TMC panel.

4.1.2 Planning Gate Review (PGR) for Specific Evaluations

A Planning Gate Review (PGR) for each specific Evaluation Task will be held within one week of the contractor receiving the evaluation Performance Work Statement (PWS) for a specific evaluation. This normally occurs before Notices of Intent (NOIs) have been received. The contractor will review the evaluation PWS and update the integrated staffing plan based on the specific skills identified in the PWS. The Chair of the PGR with the assistance of the AM of the evaluation will review the proposed staff and their qualifications. When the Chair is satisfied that qualified staff have been proposed for all skills identified (100%), the Chair will certify that the PGR is complete for that specific evaluation. If qualified staff are not presented at the first meeting for all required skills, then the contractor will be given an action to search for the required skills and reschedule the PGR for that evaluation panel. The Chair will approve any changes to the integrated staffing plan.

4.1.3 Staffing Gate Review (SGR) after NOIs

A Staffing Gate Review (SGR) for each specific Evaluation Task will be held within one week of the contractor receiving the NOI data for a specific evaluation. The contractor will review the NOI data and update the integrated staffing plan based on the specific skills required to address the NOI data. The data in the NOIs 1) may result in additional or different skills required for that evaluation and 2) will provide a list of institutions that plan on proposing, which may engender Conflicts of Interest (COIs). A contractor will provide as a deliverable a list of additional or different skills required based on the NOIs and propose qualified evaluators to provide those skills. The contractor will also review the list of their proposed evaluators for potential COIs and propose replacement evaluators for any previously proposed evaluators that must be deleted based on a Conflict of Interest (COI). The Chair of the SGR with the assistance of the AM of the evaluation will review the proposed staff and their qualifications to meet any new required skills or to replace a conflicted evaluator. When the Chair is satisfied that qualified staff have been proposed for all skills identified (100%), the Chair will certify that the Staffing Gate Review is complete for that specific evaluation. If qualified staff are not presented at the first meeting for all required skills, then the contractor will be given an action to search for the required skills and reschedule the SGR for that evaluation panel. The Chair will approve any changes to the integrated staffing plan.

4.1.4 Organizational Conflict of Interest/COI (OCI/COI) Gate Review (OGR).

The OCI/COI Gate Review (OGR) for each specific Evaluation Task will be held within two weeks of the contractor receiving the final list of proposed personnel and institutions from NASA and the proposals.

The contractor will review the organizations and personnel and proposals as described in 4.1.4.1 and 4.1.4.2 and provide any necessary adjudication requests at the OGR attended by the Chair and the AM of the evaluation. The adjudication request must clearly identify and describe the nature of the conflict. The contractor may propose a mitigation to address the conflict. NASA is under no obligation to accept a proposed OCI/COI mitigation and the contractor may be required to propose a replacement evaluator without conflicts within one week of the OGR. The Chair will approve any changes to the integrated staffing plan.

The contractor is required to deliver the final complete list of evaluators within one week after the OGR.

The prime evaluation contractor employees, subcontractors, and consultant personnel (at all tiers) that are to be assigned to the work described on this Task shall be screened for OCI/COIs as indicated in the contractor's OCI Mitigation Plan. The prime evaluation contractor and each subcontractor (regardless of tier) shall certify they have no OCI/COI issues by submitting a signed Certification of Independent Assessment Form for each SOMA Evaluation task.

Final resolution of all potential OCI/COI issues will be documented in the NASA TMC Acquisition COI Mitigation Plan.

No employee or consultant or subcontractor personnel (at any tier) of any company (the prime evaluation contractor or any of subcontractors) shall be engaged to work on any SOMA TMC Acquisition Task until all the required training has been completed and all certifications are complete.

When the Chair is satisfied that qualified staff have been proposed for all skills identified (100%) and that all COI/OCI issues have been resolved, the Chair will certify that the OCI/COI Gate Review is complete for that specific evaluation.

4.1.4.1 Proposal OCI/COI Scan

Upon receipt of proposals, the contractor – with prior permission of the NASA TMC Evaluation task TPOC (usually the AM) to copy proposal related materials – shall copy all data on all CDs provided by the proposers, onto a fully encrypted computer. A word search shall be conducted on this data for any occurrences of participation by the contractor or by any subcontractors (at all tiers), and consultants that are assisting the prime evaluation contractor in conducting this evaluation, and for any affiliations to Evaluation Team members. In addition, a search shall also be conducted on the names of all Evaluation Team members, along with a search for any key words or names suggested by the NASA AM, the NASA Program Scientist, or Evaluation Team members. All instances of findings shall be recorded with a document name, page and paragraph number associated with the finding, along with the pertinent wording from the paragraph such that identification and evaluation of any OCI/COI issues can be performed adequately and quickly. If there are any instances of any actual, potential, or perceived OCI/COI, these instances shall be reported to the NASA CO, the NASA COR, and NASA AM immediately; the contractor shall develop an adjudication request for the OCI/COI Gate Review.

4.1.4.2 OCI/COI Scan based on Proposers Parties list

NASA will provide a "Proposers Parties List" which will include all organizations and personnel provided by proposers through the submission of proposals on the NSPIRES system. A word search shall be conducted on this file looking for any occurrences of participation by the contractor or by any subcontractors, at all tiers, that are assisting the prime evaluation contractor in conducting this evaluation, and for the affiliation of any Evaluation Team members. In addition, a search shall also be conducted on the names of all Evaluation Team members, along with a search for any key words or names suggested by the NASA Acquisition Manager, the NASA Program Scientist, or Evaluation Team members. All instances of findings shall be recorded with a document name, page and paragraph number associated with the finding, along with the pertinent wording from the paragraph such that identification and evaluation of any OCI/COI issues can be performed adequately and quickly. If there are any instances of any actual, potential, or perceived OCI/COI, these instances shall be reported to the NASA CO, the NASA COR, and NASA Acquisition Manager immediately; the contractor shall develop an adjudication request for the OCI/COI Gate Review.

4.1.5 Evaluation Gate Review (EGR)

An Evaluation Gate Review (EGR) for any specific Evaluation Task will be held within a week of notification, for any reason, of any change to the contractor employees, subcontractors, or consultant personnel subsequent to the completion of the OCI/COI Gate Review. The Chair of the EGR with the assistance of the Acquisition Manager of the evaluation will review the proposed staff changes and the qualifications of new staff to meet required skills. When the Chair is satisfied that qualified staff have been proposed for all skills identified (100%), the Chair will certify that the EGR is complete for that specific evaluation. If qualified staff are not presented at the first meeting for all required skills, then the contractor will be given an action to search for the required skills and reschedule the SGR for that evaluation panel.

4.1.6 TMC Team Contact List

The contractor shall maintain an up-to-date Evaluation Team Contact List of all individuals that are part of each separate Evaluation Team. This list will be initiated for each evaluation as a result of the Planning Gate Review and will be updated and finalized as a result of the OCI/COI Gate Review. The Team Contact List includes all contractor-supplied individuals (employees, consultants, and subcontractor personnel), civil servants or other government personnel added to the Evaluation Team, and any other individuals contracted by NASA (either individuals contracted directly by NASA or via a subcontract to NASA). The Evaluation Team Contact List shall include (but is not limited to) each individual's name; email address; role and responsibility on the Evaluation Team; primary area of expertise; proposals assigned; affiliation; phone number(s) (e.g., business, home, mobile, and fax); and current mailing address

4.1.7 Training of Evaluation Team on Ethics, OCI/COI, and International Traffic in Arms Regulations (ITAR)

4.1.7.1 The contractor shall provide training and obtain certifications in accordance with the contractor's OCI Mitigation Plan

4.1.8 Processing Evaluators in the Identity and Access Management (IdMAX) Tool

SOMA will utilize an electronic system called the Remote Evaluation System (RES) for the purpose of evaluating proposals. In order for evaluators to access this system all evaluators shall have an established identity. The contractor shall enter all evaluators into the IdMAX tool for the CORs review and approval to establish the identities as soon as an evaluator is approved to support an evaluation. No evaluator will be allowed to access the RES without an established identity. For each TMC evaluation all evaluators shall have established identities through IdMAX in order to access the RES. A list of approved evaluators shall be provided at all staffing gate reviews. All approved evaluators for a specific evaluation task shall be approved in IdMAX in time to begin proposal evaluation in accordance with the evaluation task schedule.

4.1.9 TMC Panel/Subpanel Experience Levels

All TMC panels/subpanels shall be staffed with a minimum of 60% experienced TMC evaluators. Larger cost cap and more complex acquisitions should have a higher percentage of experienced evaluators on the each panel/subpanel. Past experience only counts toward this metric if SOMA AM, the SOMA Director, or the Chair view the past experience as positive. The SOMA

Director may waive this requirement on a case-by-case basis.

4.3 Post-evaluation Panel Support

The contractor shall schedule a PGR with the Gate Review Chair and the evaluation AM for feedback on the evaluators that supported the specific review.

5. Government Furnished Items: The Government will provide the following.

GOVERNMENT FURNISHED ITEM	DATE TO BE FURNISHED
Schedule of opportunity releases, NOI dates, and evaluation schedules.	July 2014. Updates will be provided monthly.
Assumptions on the numbers of proposal a subpanels and proposal due dates on the number of proposals, subpanels, and proposal due dates	July 2014
Preliminary skills list based on past similar evaluations.	Updates will be provide with each evaluation task
NOI information for each opportunity	Varies by opportunity, but within a week of SOMA receiving the data
Final list of proposed institutions and individuals for each opportunity	Varies by opportunity, but within a week of SOMA receiving the data
Proposals for each opportunity	Varies by opportunity, but within a week of SOMA receiving the proposals

6. Other Information Needed for Task Performance

6.1. Performance Objectives:

6.1.1 Quality

This Task shall conform to the goals of the contractor EASSS QA Program by:

- Delivering high-quality products and services that meet contractual requirements and satisfy the stakeholder’s technical, cost and schedule needs and expectations.
- Using continuous improvement to develop and deliver low-risk, innovative technical solutions.
- Evaluating performance using objective performance measures together with customer satisfaction, surveillance and performance evaluation inputs.
- Ensuring that the Task Order shall be staffed with only the highest quality non-conflicted SMEs, able to fully conform to necessary standards and procedures, and free of OCI and COI concerns.
- Ensuring prompt visibility and proactive resolution of emerging quality issues.
- Focusing on problem prevention by implementing and continually improving work processes designed to identify and resolve problems early in the development life cycle.
- Reporting comprehensive and accurate EASSS Program performance assessments.

- Undergoing a Quality Audit of our procedures (OCI/COI, training, and process procedures) every six months by our Quality Control Manager who reports findings directly to the TBD CEO.

6.1.2 Timeliness

The contractor Task Leader shall ensure:

- Evaluation Team members are identified as far in advance as possible; that OCI/COI issues are identified and resolved as far in advance as possible; that required training is provided as far in advance as possible; and that required information/forms to bring consultants, temporary employees, and required subcontractors on board with the prime evaluation contractor are completed in as far in advance as possible to ensure timely development of the Evaluation Team.
- Timely and effective responses to problems or changes in requirements and budgets.
- All contract deliverables are accurate, of high quality, and delivered early or on time. (Section 7 SOW)
- Risks are being managed in a timely and effective manner.
- Provide timely staff management for new requirements, vacancies, resignations and terminations (for employees, subcontractors, and consultants).
- Timely deliveries, reporting, and identification of issues or concerns.
- All potential problems are identified early and resolved swiftly and are worked proactively rather than reactively.

6.1.3 Cost

The contractor shall utilize pre-negotiated contract rates for estimating purposes. Subcontractors and/or consultants shall be selected based on best value and their ability to meet the schedule.

Hours (but no ODC charges) shall be assigned to this Task and actual costs incurred will be reflected on the SF533 submitted as costs are incurred and invoiced per the EASSS contract.

Accrued Task costs shall be available to the NASA TPOC within 10 days following each contractor pay period (twice monthly).

6.1.4 Other Subcontractor Consent.

When consultants and/or subcontractors are identified, subcontract consent documentation shall be provided in accordance with Federal Acquisition Regulation (FAR) Part 44. Adequate price competition shall be conducted unless adequately justified in accordance with FAR Parts 6 and 44.

6.2 Organizational Conflict of Interest and Task Technical Approach

TBD OCI task plan and technical approach dated RevA1 08-07-14F is hereby referenced and incorporated in its entirety into this task order.

7. Period of Performance/Schedule

The period of performance for this task order shall be from the date of this order through September 30, 2014. Interim event dates may change based on direction of the TPOC. The Contracting Officer (CO) will approve changes to the completion date.

Milestone Number	SOW Reference Paragraph	Milestones	Dates
1	N/A	Start Date	Signed task order
2	4.1.1	TBD integrated approach and schedule to SOMA staffing of TMC panels through September 23, 2015.	August 2014
3	4.1.1	PGR of all TMC panels planned through September 23, 2015	August 2014
4	4.1.1	Provide plan on orienting new evaluators and implement over task period	Plan due in August 2014
5	4.1.2	PGR for each specific evaluation task	Held within one week of TBD receipt of the evaluation task
6	4.1.3	SGR for each specific evaluation task and provide final SGR report	Held within one week of the contractor receiving the NOI data. Report due one week after approval by Chair
7	4.1.3	Provide all OCI/COI adjudication requests to NASA.	Within two weeks after TBD receives conflicted institution list based on proposals
8	4.1.4.1, 4.1.4.2	OCI/COI scans	Held within two weeks of the contractor receiving proposals.

8. NASA TPOC

NASA TPOC: TBD

Mail Stop (M/S): TBD SOMA

Phone Number: (757) 864-TBD/ Fax Number: (757) 864-8894

Email: TBD

1. Task Order Title

Payload Risk Classification and Technology Readiness Level Study
(POP: 7/23/13 – 10/31/13, ORG: SOMA)

2. Contractual References

2.1. Statement of Work Reference: This requirement is pursuant to contract NNL12AA00B between National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA) Langley Research Center (LaRC) and TBD. Refer to Paragraphs 3.0 Proposal Evaluation, 4.0 Assessments, and 5.0 Studies.

2.2 Limitation of Future Contracting Reference: In support of this task order, the contractor

- will have access to non-public information as part of its performance of a government contract which may provide a competitive advantage in a later competition
- may have access to proprietary information and various other types of non-public data

2.3 Conflict of Interest: As described in NASA Clause 1852.209-71 (Clause H.3, Limitation of Future Contracting, contained in contract TBD), this work may give rise to a potential conflict of interest. Therefore, the contractor shall comply with Clause H.9, Access to Sensitive Information, and “Exhibit D. Organizational Conflict of Interest Avoidance Plan”, contained in contract TBD.

3. Purpose, Objective, and Background of Work to be Performed

3.1. Various NASA Science Mission Directorate (SMD) programs are scheduled to solicit investigations that may propose Class C and/or Class D payload classes. The TMC Evaluation Panels shall appropriately evaluate each proposal according to the applicable payload risk classification requirements. The first objective of this task is to convene a team of experts to document the TMC Panel expectations of a proposed development approach for Class C and Class D payloads (e.g. design, testing), 2) provide recommendations on performing a TMC evaluation of mixed payload classes (instruments and CubeSats), and 3) enumerate guidelines for proposers on the proposal content expected for Class D and Class C payloads.

3.2. Technology Readiness Levels (TRLs) are a metric developed for assessments of the maturity of a particular technology and the consistent comparison of maturity between different types of technologies. The TRL approach has been used by NASA for several years. The Standard Announcement of Opportunity (AO) Template published by NASA SMD (http://soma.larc.nasa.gov/standardao/sao_templates.html) and the Second Stand Alone Missions of Opportunity Notice (SALMON-2) AO state that proposals that use technologies currently at less than TRL 6 shall include a plan for technology maturation to TRL 6 no later than KDP-C. Therefore TMC Panels must have a good understanding of the exit criteria for TRLs in order to assess the TRLs of components, subsystems, and systems in proposals that are being evaluated. Therefore, the second objective of this task is to convene a team of experts to 1) prepare a tutorial workshop for prospective TMC evaluators on the updated definitions for TRLs, and 2) develop guidelines on how to assess TRLs for proposals undergoing a TMC Evaluation.

4. Description of the Work to be Performed

4.1 Preparation for Study

The contractor shall participate in the preparation for the Study as follows:

4.1.1 Task Lead/Integrators

The Contractor shall provide a Task Lead and an Integrator from the Hampton Roads, VA office, who shall be responsible (along with the Program Manager [PM]) for Task requirement completion, shall ensure the high quality and timeliness of all deliverables, and shall control cost to stay on budget. The Task Lead and Integrator can be the same person.

The Contractor shall participate in planning, including defining the roles and responsibilities and skill mix needed. Responsibilities shall include, but are not limited to:

4.1.1.1 Assisting with searching for potential Study Team candidates.

4.1.1.2 Obtaining required forms/certifications from members of the Study Team.

4.1.1.3 Maintaining an updated Study Team Contact List.

4.1.1.4 Assisting and facilitating with the Kickoff Meeting.

4.1.1.5 Coordinating teleconferences for team meetings as needed.

4.1.1.6 Providing assistance to ensure the high quality and timeliness of all deliverables.

4.1.1.7 Providing miscellaneous support to Study Team members, as required, to facilitate accomplishment of the study.

4.1.1.8 Providing any other support to the NASA Technical Point of Contact (TPOC), as required, to ensure the study process proceeds in accordance to plan, efficiently and smoothly.

4.1.2 Study Schedule

The Contractor shall be provided a Study Schedule. The Contractor shall maintain flexibility in case of schedule changes.

4.1.3 Study Team

The Contractor shall search out and obtain the required non-conflicted Subject Matter Experts (SMEs) to conduct this study. This study team shall be comprised of 6 prospective evaluators; 4 instrument experts, 1 flight systems expert, and another prospective evaluator. Three of these prospective evaluators shall be potential Form C Leads for an instrument/CubeSat evaluation. The contractor shall appoint a study lead.

The Study Team shall familiarize themselves with the all the relevant documents related to payload risk classifications and TRL.

4.1.4 Study Team Contact List

The Contractor shall maintain an up-to-date Study Team Contact List of all individuals that are part of the Study Team. The Contact List shall include (but is not limited to) each individual's name; role and responsibility on the Study Team; primary area of expertise; affiliation; name, address, fax and phone number; email address; current mailing address.

4.1.5 Training of Study Team on Ethics, OCI/COI and ITAR

The Contractor shall provide training and obtain certifications in accordance with the Contractor's OCI Mitigation Plan.

4.1.6 Remote Evaluation System Technical Support for the Study

The NASA TPOC has the sole decision and authority/responsibility for allowing Remote Evaluation System (RES) access to individuals, and for providing file read/write/delete privileges to specified individuals utilizing the RES.

The Contractor shall test the RES for functionality prior to the Kickoff Meeting. The contractor shall provide instructions to the Study Team on how to obtain the Kickoff materials from the RES. The contractor shall also provide technical support to any Study Team member having difficulty utilizing the RES.

4.1.7 Kickoff Teleconference

The contractor shall assist in briefing the Study Team. The contractor shall utilize a NASA-provided teleconference service. The contractor shall notify all participants of the time and date for this meeting/teleconference and how to obtain the presentation materials from the RES.

All members of the Study Team shall attend the Kickoff Meeting. Hence, should any Study Team Member not be able to attend this meeting, the contractor shall conduct "makeup" meetings for all members that missed the initial meeting, and shall ensure that all Study Team Members attend this meeting.

4.2 Payload Risk Classification Study

4.2.1 Kickoff Teleconference

The Kickoff Teleconference shall be held to discuss the goals of the study, provide a consistent understanding of the process and the role of the study team and its members, and describe the expected products. The NASA Science Office for Mission Assessments (SOMA) will lead the Kickoff Teleconference.

4.2.2 Organization Teleconference

The Organization Teleconference shall be held to organize the study team and assign individual roles. This teleconference is led by the Study Lead.

4.2.3 Information Sources

The Study Team shall review all applicable documents for this study (e.g. NPR 8705.4). The Study Team shall hold teleconferences with individuals from organizations that have had experience with Class C and Class D payload development (e.g. NASA Goddard Space Flight Center, Jet Propulsion Laboratory). They will inform the team on many aspects of the development of these classes of payloads. These teleconferences will be scheduled and led by NASA SOMA.

4.2.4 Discussion Teleconferences

The Study Team shall hold teleconferences (4-6) to discuss the individual work and develop the final products. The Study Lead shall lead these teleconferences.

4.2.5 Product Teleconference

The Study Team shall hold a teleconference with NASA SOMA to present the final products.

The results are expected to be reported as three Powerpoint presentations on, 1) the TMC expectations of a proposed development approach for Class C and Class D payloads (e.g. design, testing) and proposed evaluation process, 2) recommendations on performing a TMC evaluation of mixed payload classes and mixed types of items, specifically instruments and CubeSats, and 3) guidelines for proposers on proposal content for Class C and Class D payloads. The first two will be procurement sensitive for SOMA internal use only and the latter shall be appropriate for public release.

4.3 Technology Readiness Level Study

4.3.1 Kickoff Teleconference

The Kickoff Teleconference shall be held to discuss the goals of the study, provide a consistent understanding of the process and the role of the study team and its members, and describe the expected products. NASA SOMA will lead the Kickoff Teleconference.

4.3.2 Organization Teleconference

The Organization Teleconference shall be held to organize the study team and assign individual roles. This teleconference is led by the Study Lead.

4.3.3 Information Sources

The Study Team shall review all applicable documents for this study (e.g. NPR 7123.1B).

4.3.4 Discussion Teleconferences

The Study Team shall hold teleconferences (3-5) to discuss the individual work and develop the final products. The Study Lead shall lead these teleconferences.

4.3.5 Product Teleconference

The Study Team shall hold a teleconference with NASA SOMA to present the final products.

The results shall be reported in a Powerpoint presentation that includes 1) a tutorial for prospective TMC evaluators on the updated definitions for TRLs and on the identification of TRL by component, subsystem, and system and 2) a Powerpoint presentation with guidelines on how to assess TRLs for proposals undergoing a TMC Evaluation, 3) guidelines for proposers on TMC evaluation expectations

for meeting the requirement to be at TRL 6 by PDR and other expectation related to clarifying evaluation of TRL levels. The first two will be procurement sensitive for SOMA internal use only and the latter may be appropriate for public release.

4.4 Post-study Support

The contractor shall:

- 4.4.1. Refine and finalize the products.
- 4.4.2. Upload final reports to the study website.
- 4.4.3. Archive all documents in the NASA SOMA archive.

5. Deliverables: The contractor shall provide all deliverables as specified below.

- 5.1 A trained (ethics, OCI/COI, ITAR), SME Study Team as described in Sections 4.1.3 and 4.1.5.
- 5.2 A Powerpoint presentation of the TMC expectations of a proposed development approach for Class C and Class D payloads (e.g. design, testing) as described in Sections 3, and 4.2.5.
- 5.3 A Powerpoint presentation of the recommendations on performing a TMC evaluation of mixed payload classes (instruments and CubeSats) as described in Sections 3, and 4.2.5.
- 5.4 A Powerpoint presentation of the guidelines for proposers on proposal content for Class C and Class D payloads as described in Sections 3, and 4.2.5.
- 5.5 Powerpoint presentation that includes a tutorial for prospective TMC evaluators on the updated definitions for TRLs and on the identification of TRL by component, subsystem, and system as described in Sections 3 and 4.3.5.
- 5.6 Powerpoint presentation with guidelines on how to assess TRLs for proposals undergoing a TMC Evaluation as described in Sections 3 and 4.3.5.
- 5.7 Powerpoint presentation with guidelines for proposers on TMC evaluation expectations for meeting the requirement to be at TRL 6 by PDR and other expectation related to clarifying evaluation of TRL levels.
- 5.8 Timely archiving of documentation (e.g., presentations) as described in Section 4.4.

6. Government Furnished Items: The Government will provide the following.

GOVERNMENT FURNISHED ITEM	DATE TO BE FURNISHED
Payload Classification and TRL related documents	July 2013

7. Other Information Needed for Task Performance

7.1. Performance Objectives:

7.1.1 Quality

This Task shall conform to the goals of the contractor EASSS QA Program by:

- Delivering high-quality products and services that meet contractual requirements and satisfy the stakeholder’s technical, cost and schedule needs and expectations.
- Using continuous improvement to develop and deliver low-risk, innovative technical solutions.

- Evaluating performance using objective performance measures together with customer satisfaction, surveillance and performance evaluation inputs.
- Ensuring that the Task Order shall be staffed with only the highest quality non-conflicted SMEs, able to fully conform to necessary standards and procedures, and free of OCI and COI concerns.
- Ensuring prompt visibility and proactive resolution of emerging quality issues.
- Focusing on problem prevention by implementing and continually improving work processes designed to identify and resolve problems early in the development life cycle.
- Reporting comprehensive and accurate EASSS Program performance assessments.
- Undergoing a Quality Audit of our procedures (OCI/COI, training, and process procedures) every six months by our Quality Control Manager who reports findings directly to the TBD CEO.

7.1.2 Timeliness

The contractor Task Leader shall ensure:

- Study Team Members are identified as far in advance as possible; that OCI/COI issues are identified and resolved as far in advance as possible; that required training is provided as far in advance as possible; and that required information/forms to bring consultants, temporary employees, and required subcontractors on board with the prime contractor are completed in as far in advance as possible to ensure timely development of the Study Team.
- Timely and effective responses to problems or changes in requirements and budgets.
- All contract deliverables are accurate, of high quality, and delivered early or on time.
- Risks are being managed in a timely and effective manner.
- Provide timely staff management for new requirements, vacancies, resignations and terminations (for employees, subcontractors, and consultants).
- Timely deliveries, reporting, and identification of issues or concerns.
- All potential problems are identified early and resolved swiftly and are worked proactively rather than reactively.

7.1.3 Cost

The contractor shall utilize pre-negotiated contract rates for estimating purposes. Subcontractors and/or consultants shall be selected based on best value and their ability to meet the schedule.

Hours (but no ODC charges) shall be assigned to this Task and actual costs incurred shall be reflected on the SF533 submitted as costs are incurred and invoiced per the EASSS contract.

Accrued Task costs shall be available to the NASA TPOC within 10 days following each contractor pay period (twice monthly).

7.1.4 Other Subcontractor Consent. When consultants and/or subcontractors are identified, subcontract consent documentation shall be provided in accordance with Federal Acquisition Regulation (FAR) Part 44. Adequate price competition shall be conducted unless adequately justified in accordance with FAR Parts 6 and 44. Consent is hereby granted based on consent letters submitted to the Contracting Officer (CO).

7.2 Organizational Conflict of Interest

TBD OCI task specific plan and technical approach dated 7/15/13 is hereby referenced and incorporated in its entirety into this task order.

7.3 Independence and Conduct. All contractor personnel under this task shall meet and maintain the applicable criteria for independence, conflict of interest and availability to support this task.

- 7.4 All contractor personnel under this task shall be capable of sending and receiving electronic media and shall maintain compatibility with the standard Microsoft Office suite of software and Acrobat (PDF) files.
- 7.5 The contractor shall plan for the following estimated travel. The contractor shall plan for the travel required in section 7 below.
- 7.6 Non-Disclosure Agreements. All contractor personnel shall have a signed non-disclosure agreement prior to commencement of work under this task order.
- 7.7 Applicable Documents NPR 7120.5 and NPR 7123.1 available at <http://nodis.hq.nasa.gov/>.

8. Period of Performance/Schedule

From the date of task issuance through October 31, 2013. Interim event dates may change based on direction of the TM. Changes to the completion date shall be approved by the Contracting Officer.

8.1 Current Schedule of Activities:

Milestone Number	SOW Reference Paragraph	Milestones	Dates
1	N/A	Start Date	July 23, 2013
2	4.2.1	Payload Risk Classification Study Kickoff	July 25, 2013
3	4.2.2	Payload Risk Classification Study Organization Teleconference	July 26, 2013
4	4.2.3	Payload Risk Classification Study Information Sources Teleconferences	July 31, August 7, 2013
5	4.2.4	Payload Risk Classification Study Discussion Teleconferences	August 9-14, 2013
6	4.2.5	Payload Risk Classification Study Product Teleconference	August 19, 2013
7	3, 4.2.5	Payload Risk Classification Study Product Delivery	August 21, 2013
8	4.3.1	TRL Study Kickoff	September 4, 2013
9	4.3.2	TRL Study Organization Teleconference	September 5, 2013
10	4.3.3	TRL Study Information Sources Review	September 5-13, 2013
11	4.3.4	TRL Study Discussion Teleconferences	September 16-20, 2013
12	4.3.5	TRL Study Product Teleconference	September 26, 2013
13	3, 4.3.5	TRL Study Product Delivery	September 30, 2013
14		End Date	October 31, 2013

9. NASA TPOC

NASA TPOC: TBD

Mail Stop (M/S): 380 SOMA

Phone Number: (757) 864-TBD/Fax Number: (757) 864-8894

Email: TBD

1. Task Order Title:

1.1 TMC Reviewed Instrument and Mission Technical Review Support
(POP: 8/9/13 – 9/23/15, ORG: SOMA)

2. Contractual References:

2.1 Statement of Work Reference: This requirement is pursuant to contract TBD between National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA) Langley Research Center (LaRC) and TBD. Refer to Paragraphs 3.0 Proposal Evaluation, 4.0 Assessments, and 5.0 Studies.

2.2 Limitation of Future Contracting Reference: In support of this task order, the contractor:

- may have access to proprietary information and various other types of non-public data

2.3 Conflict of Interest: As described in NASA Clause 1852.209-71 (Clause H.3, Limitation of Future Contracting, contained in contract TBD), this work may give rise to a potential conflict of interest. Therefore, the contractor shall comply with Clause H.9, Access to Sensitive Information, and Exhibit D., Organizational Conflict of Interest Avoidance Plan, contained in contract TBD.

3. Purpose, Objective, and Background of Work to be Performed:

3.1 Purpose: The Contractor shall support the NASA SOMA by attending Design Review meetings (System Requirements Review (SRR), Preliminary Design Review (PDR), Critical Design Review (CDR)) for select SOMA Technical, Management, and Cost (TMC) evaluated missions and instruments. The task includes attending design reviews, reporting back to SOMA about cost and technical performance versus the TMC estimates, reporting on technical problems, assessing whether TMC reported risks were resolved by the project, determining if there are new risks that were not identified by the TMC and, if so, whether the TMC could have identified them during the evaluation and how they could have been identified.

4. Description of the Work to be Performed:

4.1 Technical Assessment and Analysis of Project Reviews

4.1.1 The Contractor shall attend project reviews for select missions; TESS, ICON, GOLD, NICER, INSIGHT, and OSIRIS REx, and select instruments; CYGNSS and TEMPO. The Contractor (Evaluation Team Members) shall assess the information provided in those reviews to provide relevant feedback regarding the project cost and technical performance and this performance compared to findings by the TMC panel during evaluations for this mission or instrument. The Contractor shall attend 10 project reviews. The government will provide the relevant TMC review data to be compared.

- 4.1.2 The Contractor (Evaluation Team Members) shall assess the information from the reviews to determine whether the risks reported by the TMC during the evaluation were resolved by the project. If the risks were not resolved, assess why they weren't resolved.
- 4.1.3 The Contractor shall assess any new risks identified by the project that were not identified by the TMC during the proposal or CSR evaluation and determine whether they could have been identified by the TMC given the information at the time and how they would have been identified. The Contractor shall suggest changes to the TMC processes or criteria as appropriate.
- 4.1.4 The Contractor shall conduct an in-depth cost review for the specified projects.
- 4.1.5 The Contractor shall search out and obtain non-conflicted Subject Matter Experts (SMEs) to support this review. Based on the requirements of this review, the Contractor shall provide 4 technical personnel; 2 systems engineers/technical experts, 1 management/schedule expert, and 1 cost expert.

4.2 Prepare Document and Support Presentation of Findings and Recommendations

The Contractor shall prepare supporting documents and presentation materials after each review as required to:

- 4.2.1 Reviewers shall attend each review focusing on the areas of their particular expertise.
- 4.2.2 Reviewers shall upload their individual report to the RES website.
- 4.2.3 Reviewers shall participate in a presentation to SOMA or Headquarters personnel as requested.
- 4.2.4 Reviewers shall be available for follow-up consultation (if needed).

5. Government Furnished Items: The Government will provide the following:

GOVERNMENT FURNISHED ITEM	DATE TO BE FURNISHED
TMC evaluation material	As required
RES access	As required

6. Other Information Needed for Task Performance:

6.1. Performance Objectives:

6.1.1 Quality

This Task shall conform to the goals of the Contractor EASSS QA Program by:

- Delivering high-quality products and services that meet contractual requirements and satisfy the stakeholder's technical, cost, and schedule needs and expectations.
- Using continuous improvement to develop and deliver low-risk, innovative technical solutions.
- Evaluating performance using objective performance measures together with customer satisfaction, surveillance, and performance evaluation inputs.
- Ensuring that the Task Order shall be staffed with only the highest quality, non-conflicted SMEs, able to fully conform to necessary standards and procedures, and free of OCI and COI concerns.
- Ensuring prompt visibility and proactive resolution of emerging quality issues.
- Focusing on problem prevention by implementing and continually improving work processes designed to identify and resolve problems early in the development life cycle.
- Reporting comprehensive and accurate EASSS Program performance assessments.
- Undergoing a Quality Audit of our procedures (OCI/COI, training, and process procedures) every six months by our Quality Control Manager who reports findings directly to the TBD CEO.

6.1.2 Timeliness

The Contractor Task Leader shall ensure:

- Evaluation Team Members are identified as far in advance as possible; that OCI/COI issues are identified and resolved as far in advance as possible; that required training is provided as far in advance as possible; and that required information/forms to bring consultants, temporary employees, and required subcontractors on board with the prime evaluation contractor are completed in as far in advance as possible to ensure timely development of the Evaluation Team.
- Timely and effective responses to problems or changes in requirements and budgets.
- All contract deliverables are accurate, of high quality, and delivered early or on time.
- Risks are being managed in a timely and effective manner.
- Provide timely staff management for new requirements, vacancies, resignations, and terminations (for employees, subcontractors, and consultants).
- Timely deliveries, reporting, and identification of issues or concerns.
- All potential problems are identified early and resolved swiftly and are worked proactively rather than reactively.

6.1.3 Cost

The Contractor shall utilize pre-negotiated contract rates for estimating purposes. Subcontractors and/or consultants shall be selected based on best value and their ability to meet the schedule.

Hours (but no ODC charges) shall be assigned to this Task and actual costs incurred shall be reflected on the SF533 submitted as costs are incurred and invoiced per the EASSS contract.

Accrued Task costs shall be available to the NASA Review Manager within 10 days following each contractor pay period (twice monthly).

Task Estimate shall be within + or – 5% of the proposed amount, otherwise, fee shall be reduced commensurate with the overestimated cost.

6.1.4 Other

Subcontractor Consent. When consultants and/or subcontractors are identified, subcontract consent documentation shall be provided in accordance with Federal Acquisition Regulation (FAR) Part 44. Adequate price competition shall be conducted unless adequately justified in accordance with FAR Parts 6 and 44.

6.2 Organizational Conflict of Interest and Task Technical Approach

TBD OCI task specific plan and technical approach dated Jul 3, 2012, is hereby referenced and incorporated in its entirety into this Task Order.

6.3 NASA will furnish additional TMC evaluation information required to conduct the comparison between the TMC evaluation results and the actual project review information.

- 7. Period of Performance/Schedule:** The period of performance for this task order shall be Aug 9, 2013, through July 31, 2014. Interim event dates may change based on direction of the Technical Point of Contact (TPOC). The Contracting Officer must approve any change to the completion date.

2013/2014 Project Technical Review Schedule Milestones and Dates

Milestone Number	Milestones	Dates
1	Start date	Aug 9, 2013
2	Proposal/Individual Assessment Plan	August 9, 2013
3	Attend INSIGHT PDR at JPL	August 13, 2013
4	INSIGHT PDR report and presentation	August 20, 2013
5	Attend NICER PDR at GSFC	October 2, 2013
6	NICER PDR report and presentation	October 9, 2013
7	Attend GOLD SRR at LASP-Boulder	November 1, 2013
8	GOLD SRR report and presentation	November 8, 2013
9	Attend TESS SRR at GSFC	November 15, 2013
10	TESS SRR report and presentation	November 22, 2013
11	Attend ICON PDR at UCB	January 17, 2014
12	ICON PDR report and presentation	January 24, 2014
13	Attend OSIRIS-REx CDR at GSFC	April 23, 2014
14	OSIRIS-REx CDR report and presentation	April 30, 2014

15	Attend CYGNSS CDR at SwRI-San Antonio	May 1, 2014
16	CYGNSS CDR report and presentation	May 8, 2014
17	Attend INSIGHT CDR at JPL	May 6, 2014
18	INSIGHT CDR report and presentation	May 13, 2014
19	Attend TEMPO PDR at LaRC	June 4, 2014
20	TEMPO PDR report and presentation	June 11, 2014
21	Attend TESS PDR at GSFC	June 11, 2014
22	TESS PDR report and presentation	June 18, 2014
23	Task end	July 31, 2014

8. NASA TPOC:

TBD

Science Office for Mission Assessments

Mail Stop (M/S): 380

Phone Number: (757) 864-TBD

Fax Number: (757) 864-TBD

E-Mail Address: TBD

1. Task Order Title:

1.1 Technical Management Cost (TMC) Analysis for Instruments and Cubesats for Explorer and Discovery Missions
(POP: 8/22/13 – 9/23/15, ORG: SOMA)

2. Contractual References:

2.1 Statement of Work Reference: This requirement is pursuant to contract TBD between National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA) Langley Research Center (LaRC) and TBD. Refer to Paragraphs 3.0 Proposal Evaluation, 4.0 Assessments, and 5.0 Studies.

2.2 Limitation of Future Contracting Reference: In support of this Task Order, the Contractor:

- shall be required to evaluate past instrument and cubesats for Explorer and Discovery mission proposals
- may have access to proprietary information and various other types of non-public data

2.3 Conflict of Interest: As described in NASA Clause 1852.209-71 (Clause H.3, Limitation of Future Contracting, contained in contract NNL12AA00B), this work may give rise to a potential conflict of interest. Therefore, the contractor shall comply with Clause H.9, Access to Sensitive Information, and Exhibit D., Organizational Conflict of Interest Avoidance Plan, contained in contract NNL12AA00B.

3. Purpose, Objective, and Background of Work to be Performed:

3.1 This study shall assess the System Evaluations and Estimation of Resources (SEER) PRICE True Planning., and NASA Instrument Cost Model (NICM) cost model performance and Level of Difficulty Index (LDI) for use in the upcoming NASA Science Mission Directorate (SMD) Technical, Management and Cost (TMC) evaluations for instruments, cubesats, missions of SMD Announcement of Opportunity (AO), and Missions of Opportunity (MO) proposals to determine the accuracy of the SEER and NICM models and LDI. This study shall use past proposals on selected investigations for estimating and then compare to the actual cost on the proposals for selected instrument and mission investigations. The accuracy and error band shall be presented as a result of the study. The study must also recommend changes in the requested proposal data or other methods to increase the accuracy of estimating the cost of instrument and mission proposals.

Description of the Work to be Performed:

4.1 SEER Cost Model Study – The Contractor shall perform the following:

4.1.1 SEER Prediction Case:

The SEER estimate based on past proposal parameters shall be compared to the actual cost. Determine the accuracy of the SEER cost model on instrument and cubesat investigations based

on analysis of past proposal parameters. Validate the SEER cost model using data from SOMA provided instrument proposals for past selected instrument AO investigations and the technical evaluations reflected in the technical TMC evaluation documented on Form C. Determine the error band for using the SEER cost model for instrument proposals based on this analysis.

4.1.2 SEER Validation Case:

Compare the actual cost of the selected investigation proposal parameters to the SEER estimate based on the as-built configurations in CADRE or other databases. Determine the accuracy of the SEER cost model on instrument and cubesat investigations based on the as built configuration and schedule data parameters from the most current information available in CADRE for selected and developed instruments. Determine the error band for using the SEER cost model for instrument proposals based on this as built data in CADRE.

4.1.3 An assessment of mass growth from proposals to completed instrument. Demonstrate, through analysis, what percent of total cost growth in instruments and cubesat investigations (studied previously under subtask 4.1.1) is attributable only to mass growth in instruments. Generate the cost of proposed instruments with all proposal data except use the most current actual mass of instrument as documented in CADRE. Compare this to proposed total cost in subtask 4.1.1 cost estimates. Provide the proposed mass and the final mass of all instruments previously studied in subtask 4.1.1 and 4.1.2.

4.1.4 Estimating most likely instrument cost. Recommend how SEER ICE estimates for instruments and cubesats based on proposals should be adjusted to accommodate likely cost growth due to mass growth or other factors. Determine how the result of cost analysis is related to risk for past selected missions. Demonstrate, through analysis, how to estimate instrument cost at the 50% confidence level and the 70% confidence level. Propose how mass and other critical parameters in SEER should be set to best model to the actual cost.

4.1.5 SEER Instrument Cost Workshop. The Contractor shall provide documentation explaining rationale on all critical parameters for instruments and cubesat investigations, and describe for each input whether there was any subjective judgment involved. The Contractor shall provide rationale to support why the specific inputs were utilized and most appropriate for each input. Demonstrate the proposed settings for all SEER critical parameters for instruments with all SOMA personnel during a 1- to 2-day workshop to discuss how the TMC evaluation should best use SEER on instruments and cubesats for cost estimating. Propose a detailed cost evaluation timeline.

4.1.6 SEER Prediction Case:

The SEER estimate based on past proposal parameters shall be compared to the actual cost. Determine the accuracy of the SEER cost model on Explorer and Discovery investigations based on analysis of past proposal parameters. Validate the SEER cost model using data from SOMA provided AO and MO proposals for past selected Explorer and Discovery investigations and the technical evaluations reflected in the technical TMC evaluation documented on Form C. Determine the error band for using the SEER cost model for mission and instrument proposals based on this analysis.

4.1.7 SEER Validation Case:

Compare the actual cost of the selected investigation proposal parameters to the SEER estimate based on the as-built configurations in CADRE or other databases. Determine the accuracy of the SEER cost model on Explorer and Discovery investigations based on the as built configuration and schedule data parameters from the most current information available in CADRE for selected and developed missions. Determine the error band for using the SEER cost model for Explorer and Discovery proposals based on this as built data in CADRE.

4.1.8 An assessment of mass growth from proposals to completed Explorer and Discovery investigations. Demonstrate, through analysis, what percent of total cost growth in Explorer and Discovery investigations (studied previously under subtask 4.1.6) is attributable only to mass growth in instruments. Generate the cost of proposed instruments with all proposal data except use the most current actual mass of instrument as documented in CADRE. Compare this to proposed total cost in subtask 4.1.6 cost estimates. Provide the proposed mass and the final mass of all instruments previously studied in subtask 4.1.6 and 4.1.7.

4.1.9 Estimating most likely Explorer and Discovery mission cost. Recommend how SEER ICE estimates for Explorer and Discovery missions based on proposals should be adjusted to accommodate likely cost growth due to mass growth or other factors. Determine how the result of cost analysis is related to risk for past selected missions. Demonstrate, through analysis, how to estimate cost at the 50% confidence level and the 70% confidence level. Propose how mass and other critical parameters in SEER should be set to best model to the actual cost.

4.1.10 SEER Explorer and Discovery Mission Cost Workshop. The Contractor shall provide documentation explaining rationale on all critical parameters for Explorer and Discovery investigations, and describe for each input whether there was any subjective judgment involved. The Contractor shall provide rationale to support why the specific inputs were utilized and most appropriate for each input. Demonstrate the proposed settings for all SEER critical parameters for Explorer and Discovery investigations with all SOMA personnel during a 2-day workshop to discuss how the TMC evaluation should best use SEER on Explorer and Discovery investigations for cost estimating. Propose a detailed cost evaluation timeline. Explorer and Discovery investigations should be studied separately. There should be two separate customized settings for Explorer and Discovery investigations. However, if outcome from findings in subtasks 4.1.6 through 4.1.9 show results are very similar, then a consolidated setting may be presented for both types of investigations.

4.2 NICM Cost Model Study – The Contractor shall perform the following:

4.2.1 NICM Prediction Case:

The NICM estimate based on past proposal parameters will be compared to the actual cost. Determine the accuracy of the NICM cost model on instrument and cubesat investigations based on analysis of past proposal parameters. Validate the NICM cost model using data from SOMA provided instrument proposals for past selected instrument AO investigations and the technical evaluations reflected in the technical TMC evaluation documented on Form C. Determine the error band for using the NICM cost model for instrument proposals based on this analysis.

4.2.2 NICM Validation Case:

Compare the actual cost of the selected investigation proposal parameters to the NICM estimate based on the as-built configurations in CADRE. Determine the accuracy of the NICM cost model on instrument and cubesat investigations based on the as built configuration and schedule data parameters from the most current information available in CADRE for selected and developed instruments. Determine the error band for using the NICM cost model for instrument proposals based on this as built data in CADRE.

4.2.3 An assessment of mass growth from proposals to completed instrument.

Demonstrate, through analysis, what percent of total cost growth in instruments and cubesat investigations (studied previously under subtask 5.1) is attributable only to mass growth in instruments. Generate the cost of proposed instruments with all proposal data except use the most current actual mass of instrument as documented in CADRE. Compare this to proposed total cost in subtask 5.1 cost estimates. Provide the proposed mass and the final mass of all instruments previously studied in subtask 5.1 and 5.2.

4.2.4 Estimating most likely instrument cost. Recommend how NICM ICE estimates for instruments and cubesat investigations based on proposals should be adjusted to accommodate likely cost growth due to mass growth or other factors. Determine how the result of cost analysis is related to risk for past selected missions. Demonstrate, through analysis, how to estimate instrument cost at the 50% confidence level and the 70% confidence level. Propose how mass and other critical parameters in NICM should be set to best model to the actual cost.

4.2.5 NICM Instrument Cost Workshop. The Contractor shall provide documentation explaining rationale on all critical parameters for instruments and cubesat investigations and describe for each input whether there was any subjective judgment involved. The contractor shall provide rationale to support why the specific inputs were utilized and most appropriate for each input. Demonstrate the proposed settings for all NICM critical parameters for instruments with all SOMA personnel during a 1-day or less workshop to discuss how the TMC evaluation should best use NICM on instruments for cost estimating. Propose a detailed cost evaluation timeline.

4.2.6 NAFCOM/NICM Prediction Case:

The NAFCOM/NICM estimate based on past proposal parameters will be compared to the actual cost. Determine the accuracy of the NAFCOM/NICM cost model on Explorer and Discovery investigations based on analysis of past proposal parameters. Validate the NAFCOM/NICM cost model using data from SOMA provided Explorer and Discovery AO and MO proposals for past selected Explorer and Discovery investigations and the technical evaluations reflected in the technical TMC evaluation documented on Form C. Determine the error band for using the NAFCOM/NICM cost model for Explorer and Discovery proposals based on this analysis.

4.2.7 NAFCOM/NICM Validation Case:

Compare the actual cost of the selected investigation proposal parameters to the NAFCOM/NICM estimate based on the as-built configurations in CADRE. Determine the accuracy of the NAFCOM/NICM cost model on Explorer and Discovery investigations based on the as built configuration and schedule data parameters from the most current information available in CADRE for selected and developed Explorer and Discovery investigations.

Determine the error band for using the NAFCOM/NICM cost model for Explorer and Discovery proposals based on this as built data in CADRE.

4.2.8 An assessment of mass growth from proposals to completed Explorer and Discovery missions.

Demonstrate, through analysis, what percent of total cost growth in Explorer and Discovery investigations (studied previously under subtask 4.2.6) is attributable only to mass growth in Explorer and Discovery missions. Generate the cost of proposed Explorer and Discovery missions with all proposal data except use the most current actual mass of Explorer and Discovery missions as documented in CADRE. Compare this to proposed total cost in subtask 4.2.6 cost estimates. Provide the proposed mass and the final mass of all Explorer and Discovery missions previously studied in subtask 4.2.6 and 4.2.7.

4.2.9 Estimating most likely Explorer and Discovery mission cost. Recommend how NAFCOM/NICM ICE estimates for Explorer and Discovery investigations based on proposals should be adjusted to accommodate likely cost growth due to mass growth or other factors. Determine how the result of cost analysis is related to risk for past selected missions. Demonstrate, through analysis, how to estimate cost at the 50% confidence level and the 70% confidence level. Propose how mass and other critical parameters in NAFCOM/NICM should be set to best model to the actual cost.

4.2.10 NAFCOM/NICM Explorer and Discovery Mission Cost Workshop. The Contractor shall provide documentation explaining rationale on all critical parameters for Explorer and Discovery investigations and describe for each input whether there was any subjective judgment involved. The Contractor shall provide rationale to support why the specific inputs were utilized and most appropriate for each input. Demonstrate the proposed settings for all NAFCOM/NICM critical parameters for Explorer and Discovery investigations with all SOMA personnel during a 1-day workshop to discuss how the TMC evaluation should best use NAFCOM/NICM on Explorer and Discovery investigations for cost estimating. Propose a detailed cost evaluation timeline. Explorer and Discovery investigations should be studied separately. There should be two separate customized settings for Explorer and Discovery investigations. However, if outcome from findings in subtasks 4.2.6 through 4.2.9 show results are very similar, then a consolidated setting may be presented for both types of investigations.

4.4 PRICE-H Cost Model Study – The Contractor shall perform the following:

4.4.1 PRICE-H Prediction Case:

The PRICE-H estimate based on past proposal parameters shall be compared to the actual cost. Determine the accuracy of the PRICE-H cost model on Explorer and Discovery investigations based on analysis of past proposal parameters. Validate the PRICE-H cost model using data from SOMA provided AO and MO proposals for past selected Explorer and Discovery investigations and the technical evaluations reflected in the technical TMC evaluation documented on Form C. Determine the error band for using the PRICE-H cost model for mission and instrument proposals based on this analysis.

4.4.2 PRICE-H Validation Case:

Compare the actual cost of the selected investigation proposal parameters to the PRICE-H estimate based on the as-built configurations in CADRE or other databases. Determine the accuracy of the PRICE-H cost model on Explorer and Discovery investigations based on the as built configuration and schedule data parameters from the most current information available in CADRE for selected and developed missions. Determine the error band for using the PRICE-H cost model for Explorer and Discovery proposals based on this as built data in CADRE.

4.4.3 An assessment of mass growth from proposals to completed Explorer and Discovery investigations. Demonstrate, through analysis, what percent of total cost growth in Explorer and Discovery investigations (studied previously under subtask 4.1.1) is attributable only to mass growth in instruments. Generate the cost of proposed instruments with all proposal data except use the most current actual mass of instrument as documented in CADRE. Compare this to proposed total cost in subtask 4.1.6 cost estimates. Provide the proposed mass and the final mass of all instruments previously studied in subtask 4.1.1 and 4.1.2.

4.4.4 Estimating most likely Explorer and Discovery mission cost. Recommend how PRICE-H ICE estimates for Explorer and Discovery missions based on proposals should be adjusted to accommodate likely cost growth due to mass growth or other factors. Determine how the result of cost analysis is related to risk for past selected missions. Demonstrate, through analysis, how to estimate cost at the 50% confidence level and the 70% confidence level. Propose how mass and other critical parameters in PRICE-H should be set to best model to the actual cost.

4.4.5 PRICE-H Explorer and Discovery Mission Cost Workshop. The Contractor shall provide documentation explaining rationale on all critical parameters for Explorer and Discovery investigations, and describe for each input whether there was any subjective judgment involved. The Contractor shall provide rationale to support why the specific inputs were utilized and most appropriate for each input. Demonstrate the proposed settings for all PRICE-H critical parameters for Explorer and Discovery investigations with all SOMA personnel during a 2-day workshop to discuss how the TMC evaluation should best use PRICE-H on Explorer and Discovery investigations for cost estimating. Propose a detailed cost evaluation timeline. Explorer and Discovery investigations should be studied separately. There should be two separate customized settings for Explorer and Discovery investigations. However, if outcome from findings in subtasks 4.1.1 through 4.1.4 show results are very similar, then a consolidated setting may be presented for both types of investigations.

4.4.6 Provide training on how to use the PRICE-H Cost Estimating Model. After the Workshop, TBD shall provide real time training on how to use the cost model to those who have not had any official training and are interested in learning how it works.

4.3 LDI Validation Study – The Contractor shall perform the following:

4.3.1 Review the new NASA NPR 7123.1B Technology Readiness Level (TRL) definitions and incorporate them into the LDI definitions.

4.3.2 Review Mars 2020 Science Definition Team (SDT) report and update LDI to include instrument types anticipated by the report.

4.3.3 Review standard AO requirement 30 and how that can be assessed in the LDI.

4.3.4 Optimize weighting of each LDI parameter to best correlate to the TMC risk rating. Optimize weighting of each LDI parameter to best correlate to the final cost. Compare the two optimizations and propose to use one or the other or some combination of them calculate an optimized LDI.

4.3.5 Provide an optimized LDI for each JUICE proposal and compare to the TMC evaluators' LDI. Discuss and resolve differences of the LDI in JUICE proposals.

4.3.6 Optimize weighting of each LDI parameter to best correlate to the TMC risk Rating for Explorer and Discovery instruments. Optimize weighting of each LDI parameter to best correlate to the final cost. Compare the two optimizations and propose to use one or the other or some combination of them to calculate an optimized LDI for Explorer and Discovery instruments. The Contractor shall demonstrate the optimized LDI for Explorer and Discovery instruments with all SOMA personnel during a 1-day or less workshop to discuss how to best use LDI on instruments for cost estimating. Propose a detailed cost evaluation timeline.

4.5 Schedule Evaluation Model (SEM) Update – The Contractor shall perform the following:

4.5.1 The Schedule Evaluation Model provides an organized and consistent framework for schedule evaluation through assessment of a wide range of schedule attributes to be used for Step 1 and Step 2 evaluations. This model was presented a couple years ago to the SOMA office. The Contractor shall update the model and demonstrate how to keep the model maintained and up-to-date to SOMA personnel.

4.5.2 The Contractor shall provide updated documentation on the SEM and demonstrate the proposed settings for Explorer and Discovery investigations with all SOMA personnel during a 1-day or less workshop to discuss how the TMC evaluation should best use SEM on Explorer and Discovery investigations for scheduling.

5. Government Furnished Items: The Government will provide the following:

GOVERNMENT FURNISHED ITEM	DATE TO BE FURNISHED
RES access	Task Award
CADRE access	As required – after subtask 4.1 and/or 5.1 is complete
Instrument and Cubesat Proposals	Task Award
New TRL Definitions	Task Award

6. Other Information Needed for Task Performance: NASA will furnish additional cost and instrument technical information required to conduct the study and provide contractor access to NASA databases.

7. Other Information Needed for Task Performance

7.1. Performance Objectives:

7.1.1 Quality

This Task shall conform to the goals of the contractor EASSS QA Program by:

- Delivering high-quality products and services that meet contractual requirements and satisfy the stakeholder's technical, cost and schedule needs and expectations.
- Using continuous improvement to develop and deliver low-risk, innovative technical solutions.
- Evaluating performance using objective performance measures together with customer satisfaction, surveillance and performance evaluation inputs.
- Ensuring that the Task Order shall be staffed with only the highest quality non-conflicted SMEs, able to fully conform to necessary standards and procedures, and free of OCI and COI concerns.
- Ensuring prompt visibility and proactive resolution of emerging quality issues.
- Focusing on problem prevention by implementing and continually improving work processes designed to identify and resolve problems early in the development life cycle.
- Reporting comprehensive and accurate EASSS Program performance assessments.
- Undergoing a Quality Audit of our procedures (OCI/COI, training, and process procedures) every six months by our Quality Control Manager who reports findings directly to the TBD CEO.

7.1.2 Timeliness

The Contractor Task Leader shall ensure:

- Study Team Members are identified as far in advance as possible; that OCI/COI issues are identified and resolved as far in advance as possible; that required training is provided as far in advance as possible; and that required information/forms to bring consultants, temporary employees, and required subcontractors on board with the prime contractor are completed in as far in advance as possible to ensure timely development of the Study Team.
- Timely and effective responses to problems or changes in requirements and budgets.
- All contract deliverables are accurate, of high quality, and delivered early or on time.
- Risks are being managed in a timely and effective manner.
- Provide timely staff management for new requirements, vacancies, resignations and terminations (for employees, subcontractors, and consultants).
- Timely deliveries, reporting, and identification of issues or concerns.
- All potential problems are identified early and resolved swiftly and are worked proactively rather than reactively.

7.1.3 Cost

The Contractor shall utilize pre-negotiated contract rates for estimating purposes. Subcontractors and/or consultants shall be selected based on best value and their ability to meet the schedule.

Hours (but no ODC charges) shall be assigned to this Task and actual costs incurred shall be reflected on the SF533 submitted as costs are incurred and invoiced per the EASSS contract.

Accrued Task costs shall be available to the NASA Technical Point of Contact (TPOC) within 10 days following each contractor pay period (twice monthly).

7.1.4 Other Subcontractor Consent. When consultants and/or subcontractors are identified, subcontract consent documentation shall be provided in accordance with Federal Acquisition Regulation (FAR) Part 44. Adequate price competition shall be conducted unless adequately justified in accordance with FAR Parts 6 and 44. Consent is hereby granted based on consent letters submitted to the Contracting Officer.

7.2 Organizational Conflict of Interest and Approved Technical Approach

TBD OCI task plan and technical approach dated Rev E 8/28/14F is hereby referenced and incorporated in its entirety into this task order.

7.3 Independence and Conduct. All contractor personnel under this task shall meet and maintain the applicable criteria for independence, conflict of interest, and availability to support this task.

7.4 All Contractor personnel under this task shall be capable of sending and receiving electronic media and shall maintain compatibility with the standard Microsoft Office suite of software and Acrobat (PDF) files.

7.5 The Contractor shall plan for the following estimated travel. The Contractor shall plan for the travel required in section 8 below.

7.6 Non-Disclosure Agreements. All Contractor personnel shall have a signed non-disclosure agreement prior to commencement of work under this task order.

7.7 Applicable Documents NPR 7120.5 and NPR 7123.1 available at <http://nodis.hq.nasa.gov/>.

8. Period of Performance/Schedule: The period of performance for this task order shall be signature date of this order through September 23, 2015. Interim event dates may change based on direction of the TPOC. The Contracting Officer (CO) must approve any change to the completion date.

8.1 Current Schedule of Activities:

Milestone Number	SOW Reference Paragraph	Milestones	Dates
1	N/A	Start Date	Task Award
	4.1.1 through 4.1.4, 4.2.1 through 4.2.4, 4.3.1 through	Submit a proposed approach and identify any required instrument and cubesat proposal data to be furnished by the Government (4.1.1	Task Award

	4.3.5	through 4.1.4, 4.2.1 through 4.2.4). Submit a proposed approach and identify any required data to be furnished by the Government (4.3.1, 4.3.2, 4.3.3, 4.3.4, 4.3.5)	
2	4.1.1, 4.2.1, 4.3.1	A report and briefing shall be provided on this subtask via email (i.e., Microsoft Word, Excel and/or PowerPoint <u>and</u> PDF format) to the Technical Monitor.	August 30, 2013
3	4.1.2, 4.2.2	A report and briefing shall be provided on this subtask via email (i.e., Microsoft Word, Excel and/or PowerPoint <u>and</u> PDF format) to the Technical Monitor.	September 20, 2013
4	4.1.3, 4.1.4, 4.2.3, 4.2.4	A report and briefing shall be provided on this subtask by via email (i.e., Microsoft Word, Excel and/or PowerPoint <u>and</u> PDF format) to the Technical Monitor	October 10, 2013
5	4.1.1, through 4.1.5; 4.2.1 through 4.2.5	Report Updates	October 23, 2013
6	4.1.1 through 4.1.5; 4.2.1 through 4.2.5	Present findings of subtasks at NASA Langley Research Center at the SEER and NICM Instrument Cost Workshop	October 29, 2013 @ LaRC
7	4.3.1	A report and briefing shall be provided on this subtask via email (i.e., Microsoft Word, Excel and/or PowerPoint <u>and</u> PDF format) to the Technical Monitor	August 30, 2013
8	4.3.2	A report and briefing shall be provided on this subtask via email (i.e., Microsoft Word, Excel and/or PowerPoint <u>and</u> PDF format) to the Technical Monitor	September 13, 2013
9	4.3.3	A report and briefing shall be provided on this subtask by via email (i.e., Microsoft Word, Excel and/or PowerPoint <u>and</u> PDF format) to the Technical Monitor	September 27, 2013
10	4.3.4	A report and briefing shall be provided on this subtask by via email (i.e., Microsoft Word, Excel and/or PowerPoint <u>and</u> PDF format) to the Technical Monitor	October 11, 2013

11	4.3.5	A report and briefing shall be provided on this subtask by via email (i.e., Microsoft Word, Excel and/or PowerPoint and PDF format) to the Technical Monitor	October 25, 2013
12	4.3.1 through 4.3.5	Report and briefing updates	November 8, 2013
13	4.3.1 through 4.3.5	Present findings of subtasks at NASA Langley Research Center	November 20, 2013
	4.1.6 through 4.1.10, 4.2.6 through 4.2.10, 4.4.1 through 4.4.5, 4.3.6, 4.5.1 through 4.5.2	Submit a proposed approach and identify any required Explorer and Discovery proposal data to be furnished by the Government (4.1.6 through 4.1.10, 4.2.6 through 4.2.10, 4.4.1 through 4.4.5, 4.3.6, and 4.5.1 through 4.5.2).	March 7, 2014
14	4.3.6, 4.5.1 through 4.5.2	A report and briefing shall be provided on this subtask via email (i.e., Microsoft Word, Excel and/or PowerPoint and PDF format) to the Technical Monitor.	March 28, 2014
15	4.1.6, 4.2.6, 4.4.1	A report and briefing shall be provided on this subtask via email (i.e., Microsoft Word, Excel and/or PowerPoint and PDF format) to the Technical Monitor.	May 30, 2014
16	4.3.6, 4.5.1 through 4.5.2	Report Update	April 11, 2014
19	4.1.7, 4.2.7, 4.4.2	A report and briefing shall be provided on this subtask via email (i.e., Microsoft Word, Excel and/or PowerPoint and PDF format) to the Technical Monitor.	June 20, 2014
20	4.1.8, 4.2.8, 4.4.3	A report and briefing shall be provided on this subtask via email (i.e., Microsoft Word, Excel and/or PowerPoint and PDF format) to the Technical Monitor.	July 1, 2014
21	4.1.9, 4.2.9, 4.4.4	A report and briefing shall be provided on this subtask by via email (i.e., Microsoft Word, Excel and/or PowerPoint and PDF format) to the Technical Monitor	July 18, 2014
22	4.1.6, through 4.1.10; 4.2.6 through 4.2.10, 4.4.1	Report Updates	July 25, 2014

	through 4.4.5		
23	4.1.6 through 4.1.10; 4.2.6 through 4.2.10, 4.4.1 through 4.4.5	Present findings of subtasks at NASA Langley Research Center at the SEER and PRICE-H, Explorer/Discovery Mission Cost Workshop	September 8, 2014 @ LaRC
24	4.3.6, 4.5.1	Present findings of subtasks at NASA Langley Research Center the NAFCOM/NICM, LDI, and SEM Update at the Explorer/Discovery Mission Cost Workshop	September 8, 2014@LaRC
25	4.4.6	Submit a proposed approach and identify any required Explorer and Discovery proposal data to be furnished by the Government (4.6.1 through 4.6.5).	August 29, 2014

ALL DELIVERABLES SHOULD BE UPLOADED TO THE RES

8. NASA TPOC:

TBD

Science Office for Mission Assessments

Mail Stop (M/S): 380

Phone Number: (757) 864-TBD

Fax Number: (757) 864-TBD

E-Mail Address: TBD

TPOC Responsibilities:

- 8.1. The TPOC for the Task Order on the contract, as identified above. The TPOC’s function is to serve as technical liaison between the Contractor and the Contracting Officer’s Representative (COR). The TPOC is responsible for monitoring the overall task performance by the Contractor including delivery of the final product and/or services identified in the Task Order/Delivery Order Statement of Work. Specific duties and responsibilities are listed in Paragraph 2 below. Please pay particular attention to the limitations/cautions listed in Paragraph 3 below.
- 8.2. The following authority and responsibilities are hereby assigned to the TPOC:
 - a. Monitor contract technical performance. Ensure that the Contractor complies with the Statement of Work or specifications included in the contract. Notify CO of any problem areas or deficiencies in performance.
 - b. Communicate with Contractor personnel as necessary to ensure that Government requirements are understood. Technical information may be exchanged. This exchange should be without any implication of being a directive. Consult CO if the requirement exists to give technical direction. Only the CO can give technical direction.
 - c. Monitor Contractor's expenditure of man-hours and cost on the contract. Review periodic reports received from the Contractor on Contract Assignment/Work Order progress/cost. Report any discrepancies, concerns, questions to the CO.
 - d. Notify CO of any changes required to the contract. Only the CO can issue these changes.

- e. Notify the CO of any violation of the terms and conditions of the contract or any other Contractor action considered detrimental to the Government.
 - f. Send an information copy to the CO of any correspondence exchanged with the Contractor regarding the contract.
 - g. Review the contract deliverables and advise CO on acceptability. Recommend to the CO closeout of the contract when all requirements have been completed.
 - h. Other duties as follows:
 - (1) Review designated task deliverables then advise if acceptable (533s, OCI Plans, milestones)
 - (2) Recommend to the COR closeout of the Tasks when all requirements have been completed.
 - (3) Identify, evaluate, mitigate OCIs, notify CO immediately of OCI situations.
 - (4) All actions to be coordinated through the SOMA COR.
 - (5) See Task Order paragraph 2 – task monitor is advised of the contract clauses to be monitored during performance or the task.
- 8.3. The duties delegated in this letter cannot be re-delegated. The TPOC is cautioned that he or she may be personally liable for actions taken or direction given beyond the authorities delegated in this letter.
- a. TPOC is not authorized to direct or supervise Contractor employees in the accomplishment of work assignments. Your primary interface shall be with the TBD Task Lead assigned to your task. Ensure TBD Task lead remains abreast of significant information communicated between TPOC (NASA) and other Contractor/Subcontractor/Consultant employees.
 - b. TPOCs are not authorized to approve or direct any changes in the Task Order or to alter the contract in any way. However, changes to the task order milestone schedule are allowable via technical direction to accommodate necessary changes to the milestone schedule. The final completion date can only be changed through a contract modification signed by the CO.
 - c. TPOCs are not authorized to approve or direct any expenditure of funds beyond the Task Order specified amounts.
 - d. TPOCs are cautioned not to release to the Contractor any proprietary data beyond the Government Furnished Items. If the Contractor requires access to such data, consult the CO/ Contract Specialist.
 - e. TPOCs are not authorized to request proposals of any nature associated with this contract/task orders.

This appointment is effective signature date of this task order and shall remain in effect until completion of the Task Order or until rescinded in writing by the CO or COR on this contract.

1. Task Order Title

Earth Venture Instrument-2 (EVI-2) Proposal Evaluation
(POP: 8/30/13 – 11/30/14, ORG: SOMA)

2. Contractual References

2.1. Statement of Work Reference

This requirement is pursuant to contract NNL12AA00B between National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA) Langley Research Center (LaRC) and TBD. Refer to Paragraphs 3.0 Proposal Evaluation, 4.0 Assessments, and 5.0 Studies.

2.2 Limitation of Future Contracting Reference

In support of this task order, the contractor:

- shall be required to evaluate proposals and competitive announcements
- may have access to proprietary information and various other types of non-public data

As described in NASA Clause 1852.209-71 (Clause H.3, Limitation of Future Contracting, contained in contract NNL12AA00B), this work may give rise to a potential conflict of interest. Therefore, the contractor shall comply with Clause H.9, Access to Sensitive Information, and “Exhibit D. Organizational Conflict of Interest Avoidance Plan”, contained in contract TBD.

3. Purpose, Objective, and Background of Work to be Performed

The purpose of this Task Order is to provide technical expertise and administrative support to the NASA Science Office for Mission Assessments (SOMA) (located at NASA LaRC) on the Technical, Management, and Cost (TMC) Feasibility of the Investigation Implementation, Including Cost Risk evaluation of proposals submitted as a result of the Earth Venture Instrument-2 (EVI-2) solicitation. EVI-2 solicits two types of investigations: instrument investigations (Class C and/or Class D) and CubeSat investigations (Class D).

For each proposal evaluated, the contractor shall provide a Form C, which is the form that serves as the report of the TMC evaluation results, and a Cost Evaluation Summary, which documents the cost assessment associated with each Form C. The TMC evaluation is performed according to criteria Factors C-1 to C-5 defined in the Second Stand Alone Missions of Opportunity Notice (SALMON-2) Announcement of Opportunity (AO) and requirements defined in the EVI-2 SALMON-2 AO Program Element Appendix (PEA) M.

In addition, the EVI-2 PEA M requires the TMC Evaluation Team to “also provide comments to NASA regarding the extent to which the proposed instrument is compatible with potential satellite platform interfaces and operations. These comments will not contribute to the TMC feasibility risk rating”. The comments on compatibility with potential satellite platform interfaces and operations will be referred to as “accommodation comments”. The Evaluation Team will document accommodation comments on each proposal at the end of Form C. A subset of the Evaluation Team will prepare a summary of accommodation comments for a subset of the proposals after the TMC evaluation is complete.

4. Description of the Work to be Performed

4.1 Preparation for TMC Evaluation Support

The contractor shall perform the TMC Evaluation as follows:

4.1.1 Task Lead/Evaluation Integrators

The contractor shall provide a Task Lead and an Evaluation Integrator who shall be responsible (along with the Program Manager [PM]) for Task requirement completion, shall ensure the high quality and timeliness of all deliverables, and shall control cost to stay on budget. The Task Lead and Evaluation Integrator can be the same person.

The contractor shall participate in planning the TMC Evaluation Process, including defining the roles and responsibilities and skill mix needed. Responsibilities shall include, but are not limited to:

- 4.1.1.1.** Assisting with searching for potential Evaluation Team candidates.
- 4.1.1.2.** Identifying and documenting Organizational Conflict of Interest (OCI) and individual Conflict of Interest (COI) issues and obtaining required forms/certifications from required members of the Evaluation Team.
- 4.1.1.3.** Maintaining an updated Evaluation Team Contact List.
- 4.1.1.4.** Assisting and facilitating with the Kickoff Meeting.
- 4.1.1.5.** Documenting Technical Compliance of all Proposals.
- 4.1.1.6.** Completing an OCI/COI scan on all proposal materials to document potential, perceived, or actual OCI/COI.
- 4.1.1.7.** Coordinating teleconferences for team meetings, the Kickoff meeting, subpanel teleconferences, and the Plenary Meeting.
- 4.1.1.8.** Coordinating with the NRESS logistics contractor for the Plenary Meeting.
- 4.1.1.9.** Assisting with conducting the Plenary Meetings (ensuring the room is set up) and assisting with coordinating activities during the meeting to ensure it flows efficiently and smoothly.
- 4.1.1.10.** Providing assistance to ensure the high quality and timeliness of all deliverables.
- 4.1.1.11.** Providing miscellaneous support to Evaluation Team members, as required, to facilitate accomplishment of the evaluation.
- 4.1.1.12.** Providing any other support to the NASA Technical Point of Contact (TPOC), as required, to ensure the evaluation process proceeds in accordance to plan, efficiently and smoothly.

4.1.2 Proposal Evaluation Schedule

The contractor will be provided an Evaluation Schedule by the Contracting Officer. Prior to the Kick-off meeting, the contractor shall scan proposals for and document OCI/COIs and check technical compliance. Subsequently the contractor shall evaluate the proposals at a cadence of two proposals per week per subpanel. The contractor shall follow the provided schedule to discuss the individual findings, refine Forms C, screen out minors for any subsequent review, send potential major weaknesses to proposers, incorporate clarifications from proposers to the Forms C and refine the Cost Evaluation Summaries before the Plenary Meeting. The proposal review time shall include a briefing on findings related to any classified heritage appendix that may be included in the proposals. The Plenary Meeting is scheduled for 1 week. The contractor shall keep flexibility as unforeseen events may alter the schedule during the process.

4.1.3 TMC Evaluation Team/ Subpanel Definition

4.1.3.1 The contractors shall familiarize themselves with the SALMON-2 AO and the EVI-2 PEA M and the Notices Of Intent (NOIs) (to be submitted by Proposers in early September, 2013). The subpanels may consist of 1 CubeSat subpanel and 2 instrument subpanels that are organized by instrument type.

4.1.3.2 The contractor shall staff and vet the necessary non conflicted experts to conduct this evaluation. The cost models to be used shall be System Evaluations and Estimation of Resources (SEER) and either NAFCOM or NASA Instrument Cost Model (NICM). In addition, a Level of Difficulty Index (LDI) will be determined for each proposal. Training on the LDI shall be provided to some subpanel members if necessary. The LDI is based on *Earth and Space Science Cost Study March 5, 2009*. In addition one or two instrument experts are required with a security clearance to review classified heritage appendices and report to the TMC subpanels.

4.1.3.3 The contractor shall assign Form C Leads for each subpanel from this subpanel membership, who shall lead their respective subpanel Form C discussions through the evaluation of their assigned proposals and shall be responsible for the completion of the evaluation products, i.e. Forms C and Cost Evaluation Summaries. At least one Form C lead per subpanel shall be experienced Evaluation Team members who have previous experience leading subpanels and being Form C Lead, or shall be experienced team leaders capable of handling this task.

4.1.3.4 The contractor shall Cost Lead for each proposal. Cost Leads shall be responsible for the completion of the Cost Evaluation Summary for their assigned proposals that includes the results of the two cost estimates and the panel's cost related inputs. The contractor shall assign a Cost Lead for the entire panel that shall be responsible to gather all the cost analyses results and prepare and deliver a Cost Summary Presentation during the Plenary Meeting.

4.1.3.5 The contractor shall generate the LDI for each proposal.

4.1.3.6 Although proposals are evaluated independently from other proposals, consistency checks shall be performed during the TMC Evaluation to ensure that all proposals are treated equally and fairly.

4.1.4 TMC Team Contact List

The contractor shall maintain an up-to-date Evaluation Team Contact List of all individuals that are part of the Evaluation Team. This includes all contractor-supplied individuals (employees, consultants, and subcontractor personnel), civil servants or other government personnel added to the Evaluation Team, and any other individuals contracted by NASA (either individuals contracted directly by NASA or contracted via a subcontract directly to NASA). The Evaluation Team Contact List shall include (but is not limited to) each individual's name; role and responsibility on the Evaluation Team; primary area of expertise; Proposals assigned; affiliation; name, address, fax and phone number; email address; current mailing address; and address to which they want their proposals sent.

4.1.5 Training of Evaluation Team on Ethics, OCI/COI and ITAR, and Level of Difficulty Index for Instruments

4.1.5.1 The contractor shall provide training and obtain certifications in accordance with the contractor's OCI Mitigation Plan.

4.1.5.2 The contractor shall provide training on Level of Difficulty Index for Instruments to evaluators.

4.1.6 Compliance Check

Upon receipt of Proposals, the contractor shall immediately conduct a Technical/Cost Compliance Check (as defined in the AO) and shall document any compliance/non-compliance issues. This information shall be provided to the NASA TM to assist in the determination if any proposals are to be determined by NASA Science Mission Directorate (SMD) to be non-compliant.

4.1.7 Proposal OCI/COI Scan

Upon receipt of proposals, the contractor, with prior permission of the NASA TPOC to copy proposal related materials, shall copy all data on all CD's provided by the proposers, into a file on a fully encrypted computer. A word search shall be conducted on this file looking for any occurrences of participation by the contractor or by any subcontractors, at all tiers, that are assisting the prime evaluation contractor in conducting this evaluation, and for the affiliation of any Evaluation Team members. In addition, a search shall also be conducted on the names of all Evaluation Team members, along with a search for any key words or names suggested by the NASA TPOC, the NASA Program Scientist, or Evaluation Team members. All instances of findings shall be recorded with a document name, page and paragraph number associated with the finding, along with the pertinent wording from the paragraph such that identification and evaluation of any OCI/COI issues can be performed adequately and quickly. If there are any instances of any actual, potential, or perceived OCI/COI, these instances shall be reported to the NASA CO, the NASA COR, and NASA TPOC immediately; and if appropriate, the contractor shall develop and recommend OCI mitigation strategies.

4.1.8 Final Resolution on any Potential, Perceived, or Actual OCIs/COIs

4.1.8.1 The prime evaluation contractor employees, subcontractors and consultant personnel (at all tiers) that are to be assigned to the work described on this Task shall be screened for OCI/COIs as indicated in the contractor's OCI Mitigation Plan. The prime evaluation contractor and each subcontractor (regardless of tier) shall certify they have no OCI/COI issues by submitting a signed Certification of Independent Assessment Form.

4.1.8.2 Final resolution of all potential OCI/COI issues will be documented in the NASA EVI-2 COI Mitigation Plan.

4.1.8.3 No employee or consultant or subcontractor personnel (at any tier) of any company (the prime evaluation contractor or any of subcontractors) shall be engaged to work on this Task until all the required training has been completed and all certifications are complete.

4.1.9 Remote Evaluation System Technical Support for the Evaluation

The NASA TPOC has the sole decision and authority/responsibility for allowing Remote Evaluation System (RES) access to individuals, and for providing file read/write/delete privileges to specified individuals utilizing the RES.

The prime evaluation contractor shall test the RES for functionality prior to the Kickoff Meeting. The contractor shall provide instructions to the Evaluation Team on how to obtain the Kickoff materials from the RES. The contractor shall also provide technical support to any Evaluation Team member having difficulty utilizing the RES.

4.1.10 Kickoff Meeting

4.1.10.1 The contractor shall assist in briefing the Evaluation Team. The contractor shall utilize a NASA-provided teleconference service to secure teleconference facilities with the required number of phone lines to conduct the meeting. The contractor shall notify all participants of the time and date for this meeting/teleconference (or webinar) and how to obtain the presentation materials from the RES.

4.1.10.2 All members of the Evaluation Team shall attend the Kickoff Meeting. Hence, should any Evaluation Team member not be able to attend this meeting, the contractor shall conduct “makeup” meetings for all members that missed the initial meeting, and shall ensure that all Evaluation Team members attend this meeting. The contractor shall also ensure that Proposals are not distributed to any Evaluation Team member until it is confirmed that they have attended one of the Kickoff meetings.

4.2 TMC Evaluation of EVI-2 Proposals

4.2.1 TMC Evaluation

4.2.1.1 The contractor shall perform a detailed evaluation of each proposal. The contractor’s Evaluation Team members shall participate in reading and evaluating their assigned aspects (e.g. instruments) of each assigned proposal.

4.2.1.2 The contractor’s Cost Evaluators shall perform 2 fully independent life cycle cost estimates for each proposal that use different approaches such as a bottoms-up model versus a parametric model. The cost models to be used shall be SEER and either NAFCOM or NICM. Each cost estimate shall include all life-cycle elements from Phase A through Phase F for elements in the PI Managed cost, and shall be generated with an approach (parametric models, reference cost data, and analogies) that is independent of the proposer’s estimation sources. Included in each Life-Cycle Cost estimate shall be an assessment of cost risk that will identify cost drivers in each proposed implementation approach. Comments shall be provided on costs shown outside the PI-Managed Cost. The contractor shall provide the SEER model parameter settings and cost results for both 50% and 70% likelihood.

4.2.1.3 Each proposal shall be assigned a Form C Lead who will be responsible to guide the subpanel discussions and generate and refine the Form C for their assigned proposals. Each proposal shall be assigned a Cost Lead who will be responsible to guide the subpanel cost discussions and generate and refine the Cost Evaluation Summary for their assigned proposals.

4.2.2 Evolution of Findings and the Form C

Evaluation findings undergo a maturation process during the TMC evaluation. They start as individual findings that are discussed and then edited, merged with other findings or disposed. Findings that are kept are further refined through various iterations to be relevant, specific, and clear. The iterations are described below.

4.2.2.1 Individual Findings: The contractor’s Evaluation Team members shall review the assigned proposals and develop individual findings before discussion with other subpanel members. For each assigned proposal, each contractor Evaluation Team member shall enter their individual findings into the RES website before each proposal scheduled deadline. For each proposal, the Form C Lead shall organize these individual findings (using the RES software) into a large table of findings referred as the “Fat Matrix”. This Fat Matrix of individual findings is the basis of the Fat Matrix teleconference.

4.2.2.2 Fat Matrix teleconference: A “Fat Matrix teleconference” is held for each proposal to discuss individual findings and to assist the Form C Lead in developing an “Initial Draft Form C” for that proposal. The Form C Lead guides the discussion. During this Fat Matrix teleconference, the entire subpanel discusses each individual finding, and the individual findings are edited, merged with other similar individual findings, or disposed. After the Fat Matrix teleconference, the Form C Lead shall be responsible for further editing, consolidating, and refining this initial form into the Initial Draft Form C. The Initial Draft Form C is the first draft of the final Form C product and is the basis of the “Initial Draft Form C Teleconference” discussion.

4.2.2.3 Initial Draft Form C Teleconference: For each proposal, the Initial Draft Form C Teleconference is held by each subpanel to refine the findings. The Form C Lead guides the discussion. In this teleconference the LDI results are presented, the initial results of the Independent Cost Estimates (ICE) and cost threats are discussed and the findings can be edited, merged with other similar findings, or disposed. The resulting second draft of the Form C is the basis of the “Second Draft Form C Teleconference”.

4.2.2.4 Second Draft Form C Teleconference: At this point in the evaluation, the subpanels come together as one panel. One evaluator shall serve as Consistency Lead and is responsible for Form C consistency checks across all proposals. For each proposal, the panel holds a Second Draft Form C Teleconference to further refine the findings and prepare potential major weaknesses to be sent to the proposers for clarification. All Draft Forms C are reviewed during this teleconference. For each proposal, the LDI updates are presented, the (ICE) and cost threats updates are discussed and all parts of the Form C are reviewed, so that any minors in need of promotion to majors may be done at this time. The Form C Lead for each proposal guides the discussion. Findings can be edited, merged with other similar findings, or disposed. The Consistency Lead ensures consistency between findings on proposals from different subpanels and that all proposals are treated equally and fairly. The resulting third drafts of the Forms C are the basis of the “Third Draft Form C Teleconference”. The potential major weaknesses from each Form C are captured and sent to the proposers.

4.2.2.5 Third Draft Form C Teleconference: For each proposal, the combined panel holds a Third Draft Form C Teleconference before the plenary meeting to further refine the findings and consider the proposer-provided clarifications to the major weaknesses. All Draft Forms C are reviewed during this teleconference. The Form C Lead for each proposal guides the discussion. Findings can be edited, merged with other similar findings, or disposed. The Consistency Lead ensures consistency between findings on proposals, the disposition of clarification responses, and that all proposals are treated equally and fairly. The resulting “Plenary Draft Form C” is the basis of the Plenary Meeting discussions.

4.2.2.6 Additional teleconferences as needed shall be held to discuss and resolve consistency issues. Unless previously approved by the Form C leads and NASA TM, all Evaluation Team members must attend their assigned teleconferences to review draft Forms C and address consistency issues.

4.2.3 Plenary Meeting: Finalizing the Findings and Form C

The contractor shall attend the TMC Plenary Meeting. The TMC Plenary Meeting is a 5-day face-to-face meeting that expands for a period of 1 week where all evaluators come together to discuss all proposal findings, finalize the findings and Form C and be polled for the proposed investigation risk rating. This will be accomplished in 3 rounds of discussion for each proposal. The Form C and Cost Leads for each proposal guide the discussions. The contractor shall also provide a summary

presentation on cost that includes the results of the Cost analysis for each proposal. At the end of the Plenary Meeting the Evaluation Team shall;

- 4.2.3.1. Document the findings in final versions of the Forms C for each proposal.
- 4.2.3.2. Judge the completeness, accuracy, and consistent treatment of each proposal’s evaluation.
- 4.2.3.3. Determine, via a polling process, the final assignment of risk ratings for each proposal as directed by the Government. The contractor shall also prepare a “polling log” indicating who can be polled for each proposal and that shall automatically (via formulas developed in an Excel Spreadsheet) determine the median, average, or mode of each tallied poll for each proposal.
- 4.2.3.4. Deliver the final form documents in time to support the selection meeting.

4.3 Post-evaluation Support

The contractor shall:

- 4.3.1. Finalize the Forms C and the Cost Evaluation Summaries. This includes a review by a professional technical editor after Form Cs have been finalized by Form C leads.
- 4.3.2. Providing 1 instrument evaluator to attend the Science Plenary Meeting.
- 4.3.3. Assist with preparation of categorization and steering committee books.
- 4.3.4. Assist with preparation for debriefings of proposing teams.
- 4.3.5. Participate in a Lessons Learned activity to capture the lessons learned and best practices of the evaluation process.
- 4.3.6. Develop and assist in the presentation of a Transition Briefing to the Program Office that captures the characteristics of the selected mission.
- 4.3.7. Prepare or provide input to briefing books and/or a history book documenting all evaluation panel activity, findings, and recommendations, as directed by the NASA TPOC.
- 4.3.8. Upload final forms, as well as copies of presentation materials and summaries to the evaluation website; after which, the entire contents of the site shall be captured on CD-ROM for entry into the SOMA archive.
- 4.3.9. Archive all proposal copies and documents pertaining to the evaluation cycle in the SOMA archive.
- 4.3.10. Develop an Accommodation Summary of proposals.

5. Government Furnished Items: The Government will provide the following.

GOVERNMENT FURNISHED ITEM	DATE TO BE FURNISHED
Proposals	November, 2013
Form C Lead Training	November, 2013

6. Other Information Needed for Task Performance

6.1. Performance Objectives:

6.1.1 Quality

This Task shall conform to the goals of the contractor EASSS QA Program by:

- Delivering high-quality products and services that meet contractual requirements and satisfy the stakeholder's technical, cost and schedule needs and expectations.
- Using continuous improvement to develop and deliver low-risk, innovative technical solutions.
- Evaluating performance using objective performance measures together with customer satisfaction, surveillance and performance evaluation inputs.
- Ensuring that the Task Order shall be staffed with only the highest quality non-conflicted SMEs, able to fully conform to necessary standards and procedures, and free of OCI and COI concerns.
- Ensuring prompt visibility and proactive resolution of emerging quality issues.
- Focusing on problem prevention by implementing and continually improving work processes designed to identify and resolve problems early in the development life cycle.
- Reporting comprehensive and accurate EASSS Program performance assessments.
- Undergoing a Quality Audit of our procedures (OCI/COI, training, and process procedures) every six months by our Quality Control Manager who reports findings directly to the EASSS CEO.

6.1.2 Timeliness

The contractor Task Leader shall ensure:

- Evaluation Team members are identified as far in advance as possible; that OCI/COI issues are identified and resolved as far in advance as possible; that required training is provided as far in advance as possible; and that required information/forms to bring consultants, temporary employees, and required subcontractors on board with the prime evaluation contractor are completed in as far in advance as possible to ensure timely development of the Evaluation Team.
- Timely and effective responses to problems or changes in requirements and budgets.
- All contract deliverables are accurate, of high quality, and delivered early or on time. (Section 7 SOW)
- Risks are being managed in a timely and effective manner.
- Provide timely staff management for new requirements, vacancies, resignations and terminations (for employees, subcontractors, and consultants).
- Timely deliveries, reporting, and identification of issues or concerns.
- All potential problems are identified early and resolved swiftly and are worked proactively rather than reactively.

6.1.3 Cost

The contractor shall utilize pre-negotiated contract rates for estimating purposes. Subcontractors and/or consultants shall be selected based on best value and their ability to meet the schedule.

Hours (but no ODC charges) shall be assigned to this Task and actual costs incurred will be reflected on the SF533 submitted as costs are incurred and invoiced per the EASSS contract.

Accrued Task costs shall be available to the NASA TPOC within 10 days following each contractor pay period (twice monthly).

6.1.4 Other Subcontractor Consent.

When consultants and/or subcontractors are identified, subcontract consent documentation shall be provided in accordance with Federal Acquisition Regulation (FAR) Part 44. Adequate price competition shall be conducted unless adequately justified in accordance with FAR Parts 6 and 44.

6.2 Organizational Conflict of Interest and Task Technical Approach

TBD OCI task plan and technical approach dated 8/21/13 is hereby referenced and incorporated in its entirety into this task order.

7. Period of Performance/Schedule

The period of performance for this task order shall be from the date of this order through July 31, 2014. Interim event dates may change based on direction of the TPOC. The Contracting Officer will approve changes to the completion date.

Milestone Number	SOW Reference Paragraph	Milestones	Dates
1	N/A	Start Date	Signed task order
2	4.1.1, 4.1.3, 4.1.4, 4.1.5	Initial OCI Checks and Documentation	1 month after receipt of NOIs
3	4.1.1, 4.1.6-4.1.8	OCI and Compliance Checks and LDI training	November 30, 2013
4	4.1.1, 4.1.10	TMC Kickoff Teleconference	December 3, 2013
5	4.2, 4.3.2	TMC Evaluations: Fat Matrix and Form C Teleconferences/TMC Plenary (location TBD)	December 5, 2013 – March 28, 2014/March 31 – April 4, 2014
6	3., 4.2.1-4.2.3, and 4.3.1.	Final Forms C, Cost Evaluation Summaries, and SEER model parameter settings and costs at both 50% and 70% likelihood for each proposal	December 5, 2013 – April 4, 2014
7	4.3	Participate in Science Meeting	April 14 – April 18, 2014
8	4.3	Complete Documentation/Assistance for Accommodation including summary, Categorization and Steering Committees, and Transition Briefing/Lessons Learned Activities	April 2014 – July 2014
9	4.3	Proposal Debriefings (as needed)	July 2014
10	4.3	Timely archiving of evaluation documentation (forms, working documents, proposals, briefing books, CD-ROM)/Completion Date	July 2014

8. NASA TPOC:

NASA TPOC: TBD

Mail Stop (M/S): 380 Science Office for Mission Assessments

Phone Number: (757) 864-TBD / Fax Number: (757) 864-8894

Email: TBD

TPOC Responsibilities:

8.1. The TPOC for the Task Order/Delivery Order on the contract, as identified above. The TPOC's function is to serve as technical liaison between the Contractor and the Contracting Officer's Representative (COR). The TPOC is responsible for monitoring the overall task performance by the Contractor including delivery of the final product and/or services identified in the Task Order/Delivery Order Statement of Work. Specific duties and responsibilities are listed in Paragraph 2 below. Please pay particular attention to the limitations/cautions listed in Paragraph 3 below.

8.2. The following authority and responsibilities are hereby assigned to the TPOC:

- a. Monitor contract technical performance. Ensure that the Contractor complies with the Statement of Work or specifications included in the contract. Notify CO of any problem areas or deficiencies in performance.
- b. Communicate with Contractor personnel as necessary to ensure that Government requirements are understood. Technical information may be exchanged. This exchange should be without any implication of being a directive. Consult CO if the requirement exists to give technical direction. Only the CO can give technical direction.
- c. Monitor Contractor's expenditure of man-hours and cost on the contract. Review periodic reports received from the Contractor on Contract Assignment/Work Order progress/cost. Report any discrepancies, concerns, questions to the CO.
- d. Notify CO of any changes required to the contract. Only the CO can issue these changes.
- e. Notify the CO of any violation of the terms and conditions of the contract or any other Contractor action considered detrimental to the Government.
- f. Send an information copy to the CO of any correspondence exchanged with the Contractor regarding the contract.
- g. Review the contract deliverables and advise CO on acceptability. Recommend to the CO closeout of the contract when all requirements have been completed.
- h. Other duties as follows:
 - (1) Review designated task deliverables then advise if acceptable (533s, OCI Plans, milestones)
 - (2) Recommend to the COR closeout of the Tasks when all requirements have been completed.
 - (3) Identify, evaluate, mitigate OCIs, notify CO immediately of OCI situations.
 - (4) All actions to be coordinated through the SOMA COR.
 - (5) See Task Order paragraph 2 – task monitor is advised of the contract clauses to be monitored during performance or the task.

8.3. The duties delegated in this letter cannot be re-delegated. The TPOC is cautioned that he or she may be personally liable for actions taken or direction given beyond the authorities delegated in this letter.

- a. TPOC is not authorized to direct or supervise Contractor employees in the accomplishment of work assignments. Your primary interface shall be with the TBD Task Lead assigned to your task. Ensure TBD Task lead remains abreast of significant information communicated between TPOC (NASA) and other Contractor/Subcontractor/Consultant employees.
- b. TPOC is not authorized to approve or direct any changes in the Task Order/Delivery Order or to alter the contract in any way. However, changes to the task order milestone schedule are allowable via technical direction to accommodate necessary changes to the milestone schedule. The final completion date can only be changed through a contract modification signed by the CO.
- c. TPOCs are not authorized to approve or direct any expenditure of funds beyond the Task Order/Delivery Order specified amounts.
- d. TPOCs are cautioned not to release to the Contractor any proprietary data. If the Contractor requires access to such data, consult the CO.
- e. TPOCs are not authorized to request proposals of any nature associated with this contract/task orders. This appointment is effective signature date of this task order and shall remain in effect until completion of the Task Order or until rescinded in writing by the CO or COR on this contract.

1. Task Order Title

Earth Venture Suborbital-2 Technical, Management, Logistics and Cost Proposal Evaluation
(POP: 9/24/13 – 12/31/14, ORG: SOMA)

2. Contractual References

2.1 Statement of Work Reference

This requirement is pursuant to contract NNL12AA00B between National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA) Langley Research Center (LaRC) and TBD. Refer to Paragraphs 3.0 Proposal Evaluation, 4.0 Assessments, and 5.0 Studies.

2.2 Limitation of Future Contracting Reference

In support of this task order, the contractor:

- shall be required to evaluate proposals and competitive announcements
- may have access to proprietary information and various other types of non-public data

As described in NASA Clause 1852.209-71 (Clause H.3, Limitation of Future Contracting, contained in contract TBD), this work may give rise to a potential conflict of interest. Therefore, the contractor shall comply with Clause H.9, Access to Sensitive Information, and “Exhibit D. Organizational Conflict of Interest Avoidance Plan”, contained in contract TBD.

3. Purpose, Objective, and Background of Work to be Performed

The purpose of this Task Order is to provide technical expertise and administrative support to the NASA Science Office for Mission Assessments (SOMA) (located at NASA LaRC) on the Technical, Management, Logistics, and Cost (TMLC) Feasibility of the Investigation Implementation, Including Cost Risk evaluation of proposals submitted as a result of the Earth Venture Suborbital-2 (EVS-2) solicitation.

For each proposal evaluated, the contractor shall provide a Form C, which is the form that serves as the report of the TMLC evaluation results. The TMLC evaluation is performed according to implementation and cost risk factors outlined in the Research Opportunities in Earth and Space Sciences (ROSES) 2013 NASA Research Announcement (NRA) EVS-2 Program Element (PE).

4. Description of the Work to be Performed

4.1 Preparation for TMC Evaluation Support

The contractor shall participate in the preparation for the TMC Evaluation as follows:

4.1.1 Task Lead/Evaluator Integrators

The contractor shall provide a Task Lead and an Evaluation Integrator from the TBD office. The Task Lead shall be responsible (along with the Program Manager [PM]) for Task requirement completion, shall ensure the high quality and timeliness of all deliverables, and shall control cost to stay on budget. The Evaluation Integrator shall support the TMLC evaluation team on logistics and day-to-day activities. The Task Lead and Evaluation Integrator can be the same person.

The contractor shall participate in planning the TMC Evaluation Process, including defining the roles and responsibilities and skill mix needed. Responsibilities shall include, but are not limited to:

- 4.1.1.1.** Assisting with searching for potential Evaluation Team candidates.

- 4.1.1.2. Identifying and documenting Organizational Conflict of Interest (OCI) and individual Conflict of Interest (COI) issues and obtaining required forms/certifications from required members of the Evaluation Team.
- 4.1.1.3. Maintaining an updated Evaluation Team Contact List.
- 4.1.1.4. Assisting and facilitating with the Kickoff Meeting.
- 4.1.1.5. Documenting Technical Compliance of all Proposals.
- 4.1.1.6. Completing an OCI/COI scan on all proposal materials to document potential, perceived, or actual OCI/COI.
- 4.1.1.7. Coordinating teleconferences for team meetings, the Kickoff meeting, subpanel teleconferences, and the Plenary Meeting.
- 4.1.1.8. Coordinating with the NRESS logistics contractor for the Plenary Meeting.
- 4.1.1.9. Assisting with conducting the Plenary Meetings (ensuring the room is set up) and assisting with coordinating activities during the meeting to ensure it flows efficiently and smoothly.
- 4.1.1.10. Providing assistance to ensure the high quality and timeliness of all deliverables.
- 4.1.1.11. Providing miscellaneous support to Evaluation Team members, as required, to facilitate accomplishment of the evaluation.
- 4.1.1.12. Providing any other support to the NASA Technical Point of Contact (TPOC), as required, to ensure the evaluation process proceeds in accordance to plan, efficiently and smoothly.

4.1.2 Proposal Evaluation Schedule

The contractor shall be provided an Evaluation Schedule. Prior to the Kick-off meeting, the contractor shall scan proposals for and document OCI/COIs and check technical compliance. Subsequently the contractor shall evaluate the proposals at a cadence of two proposals per week per subpanel. The contractor shall follow the provided schedule to discuss the individual findings, refine Forms C, screen out minors for any subsequent review. The proposal review time shall include a briefing on findings related to any classified heritage appendix that may be included in the proposals. The Plenary Meeting is scheduled for 4.5 days. The contractor shall keep flexibility as unforeseen events may alter the schedule during the process.

4.1.3 TMLC Evaluation Team/Subpanel Definition

The contractors shall familiarize themselves with the ROSES 2013 NRA and the EVS-2 PE. The expertise required for each subpanel is instrument general, suborbital investigation design and logistics, suborbital flight systems and operations, management and schedule, systems engineering, and suborbital investigation cost.

TMLC evaluation team expertise is detailed below:

- Instrument General: Assessment of the investigations' proposed instruments. Including the ability of the instrument to accomplish the performance requirements to achieve the science objectives, the ability of the instrument to produce the required data, and the likelihood that the instruments can be developed, integrated, and operated within the stated schedule and budget. The type of instruments expected may include: solar irradiance radiometers; Infrared, microwave, and humidity sounders; visible, infrared, and microwave radiometers; visible, infrared and microwave scanning radiometers, imaging spectroradiometers; infrared high resolution and microwave limb sounders; UV-VIS wide-field telescope imaging grating spectrometers; infrared emission spectrometers; lidars; infrared imaging radiometers; visible wide field cameras; nadir-looking and precipitation radars; hyperspectral and microwave imagers; microwave K-band ranging instruments; C and Ku band radar altimeters; microwave radar scatterometers; ultraviolet, visible and infrared Fery prism spectrometers; solar and stellar ultraviolet irradiance instruments; visible/infrared emission and reflection radiometers; multi-

angle imaging spectro-radiometer, gas correlation spectroscopy, visible and infrared scanners; and other instruments.

- Suborbital Investigation Design and Logistics expertise: to assess the investigations' design, logistics and data management. Evaluate proposed mission concept and ground systems.
- Suborbital Flight Systems and Operations expertise: to assess the investigations' proposed suborbital platforms, instrument integration, and operation issues.
- Management and Schedule expertise: to assess the management approach and investigations' schedule.
- Systems Engineering expertise: to assess the systems engineering approach.
- Cost Expertise on suborbital science campaigns: to perform independent cost assessments of proposed investigations. The cost evaluators shall perform cost evaluation based on the contents of the proposals only. Cost models or cost summary forms will not be required.

TMLC Form Leads: 4 of the evaluators described above shall serve as TMLC Form Leads, 2 for each subpanel. The TMLC Form Leads shall be responsible for developing the TMLC Forms and leading the discussions.

TMLC Consistency Assessment Team (CAT): It is the responsibility of the CAT to ensure that all proposals are treated equally and fairly. One evaluator from each evaluation factor shall be assigned to the TMLC CAT for a total of 5 members. The members of CAT shall attend the second draft Form C teleconference of the other subpanel for the purpose of assessing consistency amongst different subpanels. The CAT then leads discussions on consistency during the TMLC plenary meeting.

4.1.4 TMLC Team Contact List.

The contractor shall maintain an up-to-date evaluation team contact list of all individuals that are part of the evaluation team. This includes all contractor-supplied individuals, civil servants or other government personnel added to the evaluation team, and any other individuals contracted by NASA (either individuals contracted directly by NASA or contracted via a subcontract directly to NASA). The evaluation team contact list shall include (but is not limited to) each individual's name; role and responsibility on the evaluation team; primary area of expertise; proposals assigned; affiliation; name, address, fax and phone number; email address; current mailing address; and address to which they want their proposals sent.

4.1.5 Training of Evaluation Team on Ethics, OCI/COI and ITAR

The contractor shall provide training and obtain certifications in accordance with the contractor's OCI Mitigation Plan.

4.1.6 Compliance Check

Upon receipt of Proposals, the contractor shall immediately conduct a technical/cost compliance check (as defined in the EVS-2 program element) and shall document any compliance/non-compliance issues. This information shall be provided to the NASA (TPOC) to assist in the determination if any proposals are to be determined by NASA Science Mission Directorate (SMD) to be non-compliant.

4.1.7 Proposal OCI/COI Scan

Upon receipt of proposals, the contractor, with prior permission of the NASA TPOC to copy proposal related materials, shall copy all data on all CD's provided by the proposers, into a file on a fully encrypted computer. A word search shall be conducted on this file looking for any occurrences of participation by the contractor or by any subcontractors, at all tiers, that are assisting the prime evaluation contractor in conducting this evaluation, and for the affiliation of any evaluation team members. In addition, a search shall also be conducted on the names of all evaluation team members, along with a search for any key words or names suggested by the NASA TPOC, the NASA program scientist, or evaluation team members. All instances of findings shall be recorded with a document name, page and paragraph number associated with the finding, along with the pertinent wording from the paragraph such that identification and evaluation of any OCI/COI issues can be performed adequately and quickly. If there are any instances of any actual, potential, or perceived OCI/COI, these instances shall be reported to the NASA CO, the NASA COTR, and NASA TPOC immediately; and if appropriate, the contractor shall develop and recommend OCI mitigation strategies.

4.1.8 Final Resolution on any Potential, Perceived, or Actual OCIs/COIs

The prime evaluation contractor employees, subcontractors and consultant personnel (at all tiers) that are to be assigned to the work described on this task shall be screened for OCI/COIs as indicated in the contractor's OCI mitigation plan. The prime evaluation contractor and each subcontractor (regardless of tier) shall certify they have no OCI/COI issues by submitting a signed certification of independent assessment form.

Final resolution of all potential OCI/COI issues shall be documented in the NASA EVS-2 COI mitigation plan.

No employee or consultant or subcontractor personnel (at any tier) of any company (the prime evaluation contractor or any of subcontractors) shall be engaged to work on this task until all the required training has been completed and all certifications are complete.

4.1.9 Remote Evaluation System Technical Support for the Evaluation

The NASA TPOC has the sole decision and authority/responsibility for allowing Remote Evaluation System (RES) access to individuals, and for providing file read/write/delete privileges to specified individuals utilizing the RES.

The prime evaluation contractor shall test the RES for functionality prior to the Kickoff meeting. The contractor shall provide instructions to the evaluation team on how to obtain the Kickoff materials from the RES. The contractor shall also provide technical support to any evaluation team member having difficulty utilizing the RES.

4.1.10 Kickoff Meeting/Teleconference

The contractor shall assist in briefing the evaluation team. The contractor shall utilize a NASA-provided teleconference service to secure teleconference facilities with the required number of phone lines to conduct the meeting. The contractor shall notify all participants of the time and date for this meeting/teleconference (or webinar) and how to obtain the presentation materials from the RES.

All members of the evaluation team shall attend the Kickoff meeting. Hence, should any evaluation team member not be able to attend this meeting, the contractor shall conduct "makeup" meetings for all members that missed the initial meeting, and shall ensure that all evaluation team members

attend this meeting. The contractor shall also ensure that proposals are not distributed to any evaluation team member until it is confirmed that they have attended one of the Kickoff meetings.

4.2 TMLC Evaluation of EVS-2 Proposals

4.2.1 TMC Evaluation

The contractor shall perform a detailed evaluation of each proposal. The contractor's evaluation team members shall participate in reading and evaluating their assigned aspects (e.g. instruments) of each assigned proposal.

4.2.2 Evolution of Findings and the Form C

Evaluation findings undergo a maturation process during the TMLC evaluation. They start as individual findings that are discussed and then edited, merged with other findings or disposed. Findings that are kept are further refined through various iterations to be relevant, specific, and clear. The iterations are described below.

Individual Findings: The contractor's evaluation team members shall evaluate their assigned proposals and develop individual findings before discussion with other subpanel members. For each assigned proposal, each evaluation team member shall enter their individual findings into the RES before each proposal scheduled deadline. For each proposal, the Form C lead shall organize these individual findings (using the RES software) into a large table of findings referred as the "Fat Matrix". This Fat Matrix of individual findings is the basis of the Fat Matrix teleconference.

Fat Matrix teleconference: A "Fat Matrix teleconference" is held for each proposal to discuss individual findings. The Form C Lead guides the discussion. During this Fat Matrix teleconference, the entire subpanel discusses each individual finding, and the individual findings are edited, merged with other similar individual findings, or disposed. After the Fat Matrix teleconference, the Form C Lead shall be responsible for further editing, consolidating, and refining this initial form into the initial draft Form C. The initial Draft Form C is the first draft of the final Form C product and is the basis of the "Initial Draft Form C Teleconference" discussion.

Initial Draft Form C Teleconference: For each proposal, the initial draft Form C teleconference is held by each subpanel to refine the findings. The Form C lead guides the discussion. Findings can be edited, merged with other similar findings, or disposed. The resulting second draft of the Form C is the basis of the "Second Draft Form C Teleconference". All subpanel members are responsible for ensuring consistency of the evaluation across proposals reviewed by the subpanel.

Second Draft Form C Teleconference: For each proposal, the Second draft Form C teleconference is held by each subpanel to further refine the findings. The Form C lead guides the discussion. Findings can be edited, merged with other similar findings, or disposed. The CAT shall attend all Second Draft Form C teleconferences to ensure consistency of findings across subpanels and that all proposals are treated equally and fairly. The resulting third drafts of the Forms C are the basis of first-round of the plenary meeting discussions.

Additional teleconferences as needed shall be held to discuss and resolve consistency issues. Unless previously approved by the Form C leads and NASA TPOC, all evaluation team members must attend their assigned teleconferences to review draft Forms C and address consistency issues.

4.2.3 Plenary Meeting: Finalizing the Findings and Form C

The contractor shall attend the TMLC plenary meeting. The TMLC Plenary Meeting is a 4.5-day face-to-face meeting where all evaluators come together to discuss all proposal findings, finalize the findings and Form C and be polled for the proposed investigation TMLC rating. This shall be accomplished in 3 rounds of discussion for each proposal. The Form C for each proposal guide the discussions. At the end of the plenary meeting the evaluation team shall:

- 4.2.3.1 Document the findings in final versions of the Forms C for each proposal.
- 4.2.3.2 Judge the completeness, accuracy, and consistent treatment of each proposal's evaluation.
- 4.2.3.3 Determine, via a polling process, the final assignment of TMLC ratings for each proposal. The contractor shall also prepare a "polling log" indicating who can be polled for each proposal and that shall automatically (via formulas developed in an Excel Spreadsheet) determine the median, average, or mode of each tallied poll for each proposal.
- 4.2.3.4 Deliver the final form documents in time to support the selection meeting.
- 4.2.3.5 The CAT shall ensure consistency between findings on proposals.

4.3 Post-evaluation Support

The contractor shall:

- 4.3.1 Finalize the Forms C. This includes a review by an evaluator that may serve as a technical editor after Form Cs have been finalized by Form C leads.
- 4.3.2 Assist with preparation of selection documentation as needed.
- 4.3.3 Assist with preparation for debriefings of proposing teams.
- 4.3.4 Participate in a Lessons Learned activity to capture the lessons learned and best practices of the evaluation process.
- 4.3.5 Develop and assist in the presentation of a Transition Briefing to the Program Office that captures the characteristics of each selected mission.
- 4.3.6 Upload final forms, as well as copies of presentation materials and summaries to the evaluation website; after which, the entire contents of the site shall be captured for entry into the SOMA archive.
- 4.3.7 Archive all proposal copies and documents pertaining to the evaluation cycle in the SOMA archive.
- 4.3.8 Prepare or provide input to briefing books and/or a history book documenting all evaluation panel activity, findings, and recommendations, as directed by the NASA TPOC.

4.4 Other General Duties

The contractor shall:

- 4.4.1 Assisting with conducting the plenary meetings (ensuring the room is set up) and assisting with coordinating activities during the meeting to ensure it flows efficiently and smoothly.
- 4.4.2 Providing assistance to ensure the high quality and timeliness of all deliverables.
- 4.4.3 Providing miscellaneous support to evaluation team members, as required, to facilitate accomplishment of the evaluation.
- 4.4.4 Providing any other support to the NASA TPOC, as required, to ensure the evaluation process proceeds in accordance to plan, efficiently and smoothly.

5. **Government Furnished Items:** The Government will provide the following.

GOVERNMENT FURNISHED ITEM	DATE TO BE FURNISHED
Proposals	January, 2014
Form C Lead Training	January, 2014

6. **Other Information Needed for Task Performance**

6.1. **Performance Objectives:**

6.1.1 **Quality**

This Task shall conform to the goals of the contractor EASSS QA Program by:

- Delivering high-quality products and services that meet contractual requirements and satisfy the stakeholder’s technical, cost and schedule needs and expectations.
- Using continuous improvement to develop and deliver low-risk, innovative technical solutions.
- Evaluating performance using objective performance measures together with customer satisfaction, surveillance and performance evaluation inputs.
- Ensuring that the task order shall be staffed with only the highest quality non-conflicted Subject Matter Experts (SMEs), able to fully conform to necessary standards and procedures, and free of OCI and COI concerns.
- Ensuring prompt visibility and proactive resolution of emerging quality issues.
- Focusing on problem prevention by implementing and continually improving work processes designed to identify and resolve problems early in the development life cycle.
- Reporting comprehensive and accurate EASSS Program performance assessments.
- Undergoing a quality audit of our procedures (OCI/COI, training, and process procedures) every six months by our quality control manager who reports findings directly to the TBD CEO.

6.1.2 **Timeliness**

The contractor task leader shall ensure:

- Evaluation team members are identified as far in advance as possible; that OCI/COI issues are identified and resolved as far in advance as possible; that required training is provided as far in advance as possible; and that required information/forms to bring consultants, temporary employees, and required subcontractors on board with the prime evaluation contractor are completed in as far in advance as possible to ensure timely development of the evaluation team.
- Timely and effective responses to problems or changes in requirements and budgets.
- All contract deliverables are accurate, of high quality, and delivered early or on time.
- Risks are being managed in a timely and effective manner.
- Provide timely staff management for new requirements, vacancies, resignations and terminations (for employees, subcontractors, and consultants).
- Timely deliveries, reporting, and identification of issues or concerns.
- All potential problems are identified early and resolved swiftly and are worked proactively rather than reactively.

6.1.3 **Cost**

The contractor shall utilize pre-negotiated contract rates for estimating purposes. Subcontractors and/or consultants shall be selected based on best value and their ability to meet the schedule.

Hours (but no ODC charges) shall be assigned to this task and actual costs incurred shall be reflected on the SF533 submitted as costs are incurred and invoiced per the EASSS contract.

Accrued task costs shall be available to the NASA TPOC within 10 days following each contractor pay period (twice monthly).

6.1.4 Other Subcontractor Consent.

When consultants and/or subcontractors are identified, subcontract consent documentation shall be provided in accordance with Federal Acquisition Regulation (FAR) Part 44. Adequate price competition shall be conducted unless adequately justified in accordance with FAR Parts 6 and 44. Consent is hereby granted based on consent letters submitted to the Contracting Officer.

6.2 Organizational Conflict of Interest

TBD OCI task specific plan and technical approach dated 9/17/13 is hereby referenced and incorporated in its entirety into this task order.

7. Period of Performance/Schedule

The period of performance for this task order shall be date of this signed task order through August 29, 2014. Interim event dates may change based on direction of the TPOC. The contracting officer shall approve changes to the completion date.

Milestone Number	SOW Reference Paragraph	Milestones	Dates
1	N/A	Start Date	Signature Date
2	N/A	Due date for NOI to propose	November 8, 2013
3	N/A	Due date for proposals	January 10, 2014
4	4.1.7	Initial OCI checks and documentation	January 15, 2014
5	4.1.5, 4.1.6, 4.1.8	OCI and Compliance checks Training/Final Resolution	January 30, 2014
6	4.1.10	TMLC Kickoff Meeting/Teleconference	January 24, 2014
7	4.2.1	TMLC Evaluation	January 24 – April 25, 2014
8	4.2.3	TMLC Plenary Meeting	April 28 – May 2, 2014
9	4.2.3	Final Forms C	May 9, 2014
10	4.3.1, 4.3.2, 4.3.4, 4.3.5, 4.3.6	Complete documentation/Assistance for the selection meeting, transition briefing/lessons learned activities	June/July 2014
11	4.3.3	Proposal debriefings (as needed)	August 2014
12	4.3.7	Timely archiving of evaluation documentation (forms, working documentation, proposals, briefing books, CD-ROM)	August 2014
13	N/A	Task Ends	August 29, 2014

8. NASA Task Monitor

NASA TPOC:
 Mail Stop (M/S): 380 Science Office for Mission Assessments
 Phone Number: (757) 864-TBD / Fax Number: (757) 864-8894
 Email: TBD@nasa.gov

TPOC Responsibilities:

8.1. The TPOC for the Task Order/Delivery Order on the contract, as identified above. The TPOC's function is to serve as technical liaison between the Contractor and the Contracting Officer's Representative (COR). The TPOC is responsible for monitoring the overall task performance by the Contractor including delivery of the final product and/or services identified in the Task Order Statement of Work. Specific duties and responsibilities are listed in Paragraph 2 below. Please pay particular attention to the limitations/cautions listed in Paragraph 3 below.

8.2. The following authority and responsibilities are hereby assigned to the TPOC:

- a. Monitor contract technical performance. Ensure that the Contractor complies with the Statement of Work or specifications included in the contract. Notify CO of any problem areas or deficiencies in performance.
- b. Communicate with Contractor personnel as necessary to ensure that Government requirements are understood. Technical information may be exchanged. This exchange should be without any implication of being a directive. Consult CO if the requirement exists to give technical direction. Only the CO can give technical direction.
- c. Monitor Contractor's expenditure of man-hours and cost on the contract. Review periodic reports received from the Contractor on Contract Assignment/Work Order progress/cost. Report any discrepancies, concerns, questions to the CO.
- d. Notify CO of any changes required to the contract. Only the CO can issue these changes.
- e. Notify the CO of any violation of the terms and conditions of the contract or any other Contractor action considered detrimental to the Government.
- f. Send an information copy to the CO of any correspondence exchanged with the Contractor regarding the contract.
- g. Review the contract deliverables and advise CO on acceptability. Recommend to the CO closeout of the contract when all requirements have been completed.
- h. Other duties as follows:
 - (1) Review designated task deliverables then advise if acceptable (533s, OCI Plans, milestones)
 - (2) Recommend to the COR closeout of the Tasks when all requirements have been completed.
 - (3) Identify, evaluate, mitigate OCIs, notify CO immediately of OCI situations.
 - (4) All actions to be coordinated through the SOMA COR.
 - (5) See Task Order paragraph 2 – task monitor is advised of the contract clauses to be monitored during performance or the task.

8.3. The duties delegated in this letter cannot be re-delegated. The TPOC is cautioned that he or she may be personally liable for actions taken or direction given beyond the authorities delegated in this letter.

- a. TPOCs are not authorized to direct or supervise Contractor employees in the accomplishment of work assignments. Their primary interface shall be with the TBD Task Lead assigned to the task. Ensure TBD Task lead remains abreast of significant information communicated between TPOC (NASA) and other Contractor/Subcontractor/Consultant employees.
- b. TPOCs are not authorized to approve or direct any changes in the Task Order/Delivery Order or to alter the contract in any way. However, changes to the task order milestone schedule are allowable via technical direction to accommodate necessary changes to the milestone schedule. The final completion date can only be changed through a contract modification signed by the Contracting Officer.
- c. TPOCs are not authorized to approve or direct any expenditure of funds beyond the Task Order/Delivery Order specified amounts.
- d. TPOCs are cautioned not to release to the Contractor any proprietary data. If the Contractor requires access to such data, consult the Contracting Officer/ Contract Specialist.
- e. TPOCs are not authorized to request proposals of any nature associated with this contract/task orders. This appointment is effective signature date of this task order and shall remain in effect until completion of the Task Order or until rescinded in writing by the CO or COR on this contract.

1. Task Order Title

Earth Venture-2 Proposal Evaluation
(POP: 9/16/11 – 8/31/12, ORG: SOMA)

2. Contractual References

2.1. Statement of Work Reference

This requirement is pursuant to contract NNL10AA15B between National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA) Langley Research Center (LaRC) TBD. Refer to Paragraphs 3.0 Proposal Evaluation, 4.0 Assessments, and 5.0 Studies.

2.2 Limitation of Future Contracting Reference

In support of this task order, the contractor:

- shall be required to evaluate proposals and competitive announcements
- may have access to proprietary information and various other types of non-public data

As described in NASA Clause 1852.209-71 (Clause H.3, Limitation of Future Contracting, contained in contract NNL10AA15B), this work may give rise to a potential conflict of interest. Therefore, the Contractor shall comply with Clause H.9, Access to Sensitive Information, and Exhibit D. Organizational Conflict of Interest Avoidance Plan, contained in contract TBD.

3. Purpose, Objective, and Background of Work to be Performed

3.1 The purpose of this Task Order is to provide technical expertise and administrative support to the NASA Science Office for Mission Assessments (SOMA) (located at NASA LaRC) on the Technical, Management, and Cost (TMC) Feasibility of the Mission Implementation, Including Cost Risk evaluation of proposals submitted as a result of the Earth Venture-2 (EV-2) Announcement of Opportunity (AO). As the product of this TMC evaluation, the contractor shall provide a Form C, which is the form that serves as the report of the TMC evaluation results, and a Cost Evaluation Summary for each proposal evaluated. The TMC evaluation is performed according to criteria Factors C-1 to C-5 defined in the EV-2 AO. The Cost Evaluation Summary documents the cost assessment performed in support of each Form C.

4. Description of the Work to be Performed

4.1 Preparation for TMC Evaluation Support

Contractor shall assist in preparation of schedule planning, product planning, and preparation of presentation materials for the Technical, Management, and Cost (TMC) evaluation kickoff meeting, and shall participate in the kickoff briefings. The Contractor shall complete the staffing plan with a final roster of competent expert reviewers (staff members and consultants) to cover the anticipated scope of the proposals. The Contractor shall make preparations to initiate the evaluation process.

4.1.1 Task Lead/Evaluation Integrators

Contractor shall be responsible (along with the TBD Program Manager (PM)) for Task requirement completion, shall ensure the high quality and timeliness of all deliverables, and shall control cost to stay on budget.

Contractor shall plan the TMC Evaluation Process, including defining the roles and responsibilities and skill mix needed as follows:

- i. Assisting with searching for potential Evaluation Team candidates.
- ii. Assisting the Task Lead/PM with identifying/resolving OCI/COI issues, and obtaining required forms/certifications from required members of the Evaluation Team.
- iii. Maintaining an updated Evaluation Team Contact List
- iv. Assisting with development of the Proposal Evaluation Schedule.
- v. Development of the Proposal Distribution Plan.
- vi. Assisting and facilitating with the Kickoff Meeting.
- vii. Documenting Technical Compliance of all Proposals.
- viii. Completing an OCI/COI scan on all proposal materials to document potential, perceived, or actual OCI/COI.
- ix. Coordinating teleconferences for team meetings, the Kickoff meeting, subpanel teleconferences, and the Plenary Meeting.
- x. Coordinating with the logistics contractor for the Plenary Meeting.
- xi. Assisting with conducting the Plenary Meetings (ensuring the room is set up), and assisting with coordinating activities during the meeting to ensure it flows efficiently and smoothly.
- xii. Providing assistance to ensure the high quality and timeliness of all deliverables.
- xiii. Technical editing and formatting of Forms C and Cost Evaluation Summaries, as required, to ensure they have proper proposal references, and they are produced in a standardized quality manner.
- xiv. Providing miscellaneous support to Evaluation Team members, as required, to facilitate accomplishment of the evaluation.
- xv. Providing support to ensure the evaluation process proceeds in accordance to plan, efficiently and smoothly.

Contractor shall participate in planning the Science Evaluation Process. Responsibilities shall include, but not limited to:

- i. Assisting with searching for potential Science Evaluation Team candidates.
- ii. Assisting the Program Scientist with identifying/resolving OCI/COI issues, and obtaining required forms/certifications from required members of the Science Evaluation Team.
- iii. Maintaining an updated Science Evaluation Team Contact List
- iv. Assisting with development of the Proposal Science Evaluation Schedule.
- v. Development of the Proposal Distribution Plan for Science Panel.
- vi. Documenting Scientific Compliance of all Proposals.
- vii. Completing an OCI/COI scan on all proposal materials to document potential, perceived, or actual OCI/COI.
- viii. Coordinating a Science Evaluation Kickoff meeting, any teleconferences, and the Science Evaluation Meeting.
- ix. Monitoring of panel to ensure adherence to evaluation criteria.
- x. Assisting with conducting the Science Evaluation Meeting and assisting with coordinating activities during the meeting to ensure it flows efficiently and smoothly.
- xi. Editing and formatting of Forms A and Forms B, as required, to ensure they have proper proposal references, and they are produced in a standardized quality manner.
- xii. Preparing documents for categorization, steering committee, and selection meetings
- xiii. Providing miscellaneous support to Evaluation Team members, as required, to facilitate accomplishment of the evaluation.
- xiv. Providing any other support to the Program Scientist, as required, to ensure the evaluation process proceeds in accordance to plan, efficiently and smoothly.

4.1.2 Proposal Evaluation Schedule

Contractor shall be provided an Evaluation Schedule. It is expected that after the Kick-off meeting, the Contractor shall scan proposals for (1) OCI/COI (2) technical compliance (3) develop and implement a distribution plan in 2 weeks. Subsequently, the Contractor shall evaluate the Proposals at a cadence of one per week per subpanel. This is followed by a period to refine Forms C, send major weaknesses to proposers, incorporate clarifications from proposers to the Forms C and refine the Cost Evaluation Summaries before the Plenary Meeting. The Plenary Meeting is scheduled for 1 week. The Contractor shall keep flexibility as unforeseen events may alter the schedule during the process.

4.1.3 TMC Evaluation Team/ Subpanel Definition

The Contractor shall familiarize themselves with the EV-2 AO and the Notices Of Intent (NOIs) (submitted by Proposers in July 22, 2011). The Contractor shall determine the number of subpanels necessary and shall develop a skill set necessary to conduct the evaluation.

The Contractor shall search out and obtain the required non-conflicted Subject Matter Experts (SMEs) to conduct this evaluation. Based on the evaluation criteria in the EV-2 AO, the Contractor shall provide expertise in the following areas: Instruments, Flight Systems, Mission Design and Operations, Systems Engineering, Management and Schedule, and spaceflight mission Cost. Contractor shall provide at least 2 independent cost estimates for each mission that use different approaches such as a bottoms-up model versus a parametric model.

Contractor shall assign one Subpanel Chair for each subpanel from this TMC Evaluation Team, who shall lead their respective subpanel through the evaluation of their assigned proposals and shall be responsible for the completion of the evaluation products, i.e. Forms C and Cost Evaluation Summary, for their assigned subpanel. These individuals shall be experienced Evaluation Team members who have previous experience leading subpanels and being Subpanel Chairs, or shall be experienced team leaders capable of handling this job. Subpanel Chairs shall serve as Form C leads.

The Contractor shall assign Form C Leads for each proposal. Form C Leads guide the subpanels through the discussions of each proposal and shall be responsible for the completion of the evaluation products, i.e. Forms C and Cost Evaluation Summary, for their assigned proposals. Depending on the number of proposals, each Subpanel Chair may assign other Form C Leads within their subpanel as needed.

The contractor shall assign a Cost Lead for each proposal. Cost Leads shall be responsible for the completion of the Cost Evaluation Summary for their assigned proposals.

The contractor shall assign a Cost Lead the entire panel that shall be responsible to gather all the cost analyses results and prepare and deliver a Cost Summary presentation during the Plenary Meeting.

Consistency checks shall be performed during the TMC Evaluation to ensure that all proposals are treated equally and fairly. The Consistency Check Team shall be comprised of 1 of the evaluators from each evaluation area of Instruments, Flight Systems, Mission Design and Operations, Management and Schedule, and spaceflight mission Cost for a total of 5. These individuals shall review the Fact Sheets and "Initial Draft Forms C" (refer to Section 4.2.2) for all proposals on the assigned evaluation area and will participate on the "Second Draft Form C Teleconference" and "Third Draft Form C Teleconference" (refer to Section 4.2.2) to ensure consistency between findings on proposals from different subpanels.

4.1.4 TMC Team Contact List

The Contractor shall maintain an up-to-date Evaluation Team Contact List of all individuals that are part of the Evaluation Team. This includes all TBD-supplied individuals (employees, consultants, and subcontractor personnel), civil servants or other government personnel added to the Evaluation Team, and any other individuals contracted by NASA (either individuals contracted directly by NASA or contracted via a subcontract directly to NASA). The Evaluation Team Contact List shall include (but is not limited to) each individual's name; role and responsibility on the Evaluation Team; primary area of expertise; proposals assigned; affiliation; name, address, fax and phone number; email address; current mailing address; and address to which they want their proposals sent.

4.1.5 Training of Evaluation Team on Ethics, OCI/COI and ITAR

The Contractor shall provide training and obtain certifications in accordance with TBD's OCI Mitigation Plan.

4.1.6 Compliance Check

Upon receipt of Proposals, Contractor shall immediately conduct a Technical/Cost Compliance Check (as defined in the AO), and shall document any compliance/non-compliance issues. This information shall be provided to the NASA Technical Point of Contact (TPOC) to assist in the determination if any proposals are to be determined by NASA Science Mission Directorate (SMD) to be non-compliant.

4.1.7 Proposal OCI/COI scan

Upon receipt of proposals, TBD, with prior permission of the NASA TPOC to copy proposal related materials, shall copy all data on all CDs provided by the proposers, into a file on a fully encrypted computer. A word search shall be conducted on this file looking for any occurrences of participation by TBD or by any subcontractors, at all tiers, that are assisting TBD in conducting this evaluation, and for the affiliation of any Evaluation Team Members. In addition, a search shall also be conducted on the names of all Evaluation Team Members, along with a search for any key words or names suggested by the NASA TPOC, the NASA Program Scientist, or Evaluation Team Members. All instances of findings shall be recorded with a document name, page, and paragraph number associated with the finding, along with the pertinent wording from the paragraph such that identification and evaluation of any OCI/COI issues can be performed adequately and quickly. If there are any instances of any actual, potential, or perceived OCI/COI, these instances shall be reported to the NASA CO, the NASA COTR, and NASA TPOC immediately; and if appropriate, Contractor shall develop and recommend OCI mitigation strategies.

4.1.8 Final Resolution on any Potential, Perceived, or Actual OCIs/COIs

TBD employees, TBD subcontractors, and TBD consultant personnel (at all tiers) that are to be assigned to the work described on this Task shall be screened for OCI/COIs as indicated in TBD's OCI Mitigation Plan. TBD and each TBD subcontractor (regardless of tier) shall certify they have no OCI/COI issues by submitting a signed Certification of Independent Assessment Form.

Final resolution of any potential, perceived or actual OCI/COIs shall be accomplished as described in TBD's OCI Mitigation Plan.

No employee or consultant or subcontractor personnel (at any tier) of any company (TBD or any of TBD subcontractors) shall be engaged to work on this Task until all the required training has been completed and all certifications are complete.

4.1.9 Proposal Distribution Plan

Based on 3 subpanels, on the expertise needed for each subpanel, and on the specialized evaluators assigned to specific subpanels, the Contractor shall assign proposals to each subpanel for evaluation. The Contractor shall determine how proposals will be distributed between each subpanel and each specialized evaluator. The Contractor shall document this information in a Proposal Distribution Plan that, once approved by the NASA TPOC, shall be sent to the NASA Research and Education Support Services (NRESS) personnel to assist them with proposal distribution.

This Proposal Distribution Plan may also specify the order of distribution as some government personnel and the Cost team shall need the proposals earlier than other evaluators.

4.1.10 Remote Evaluation System Technical Support for the Evaluation

The NASA TPOC has the sole decision and authority/responsibility for allowing Remote Evaluation System (RES) access to individuals, and for providing file read/write/delete privileges to specified individuals utilizing the RES.

Contractor shall test the RES for functionality prior to the Kickoff Meeting. Contractor shall provide instructions to the Evaluation Team on how to obtain the Kickoff materials from the RES. Contractor shall also provide technical support to any Evaluation Team member having difficulty utilizing the RES.

4.1.11 Kickoff Meeting

Contractor shall assist in briefing the Evaluation Team. Contractor shall identify and secure a NASA-supplied meeting room in which to hold the Kickoff Meeting. Contractor shall utilize a NASA-provided teleconference service to secure teleconference facilities with the required number of phone lines to conduct the meeting. Contractor shall notify all participants of the time and date for this meeting/teleconference and how to obtain the presentation materials from the RES. Contractor shall assist in setting up the meeting room by ensuring that electrical connection is provided for hookup of personal computers, shall ensure that all provided audio/visual equipment is functional, that required copies of the briefing are made and distributed to participants attending the meeting in person, and shall set up the meeting to commence.

All members of the Evaluation Team shall attend the Kickoff Meeting. Hence, should any Evaluation Team Member not be able to attend this meeting, Contractor shall conduct “makeup” meetings for all members that missed the initial meeting, and shall ensure that all Evaluation Team Members attend this meeting. Contractor shall also ensure that proposals are not distributed to any Evaluation Team Member until it is confirmed that they have attended one the kickoff meetings.

4.2 TMC Evaluation of EV-2 Proposals

4.2.1 TMC Evaluation

The contractor shall perform a detailed evaluation of each proposal. The contractor's Evaluation Team Members shall participate in reading and evaluating their assigned aspects (e.g. instruments) of each assigned proposal.

The contractor's Cost Evaluators shall perform 2 fully independent life cycle cost estimates for each proposal that use different approaches such as a bottoms-up model versus a parametric model. Each cost estimate shall include all life-cycle elements from Phase A through Phase F, and shall be generated with an approach (parametric models, reference cost data, and analogies) that is independent of the proposer's estimation sources. Included in each Life-Cycle Cost estimate shall be an assessment of cost risk that will identify cost drivers in each proposed implementation approach.

Each proposal shall be assigned a Form C Lead who shall be responsible to guide the subpanel discussions and generate and refine the Form C for their assigned proposals. Each proposal shall be assigned a Cost Lead who shall be responsible to guide the subpanel cost discussions and generate and refine the Cost Evaluation Summary for their assigned proposals.

4.2.2 Evolution of Findings, Questions, and the Form C

Evaluation findings and questions undergo a maturation process during the TMC evaluation. They start as individual findings and questions that are discussed and then edited, merged with other findings and questions or disposed. Findings and questions that are kept are further refined through various iterations to be relevant, specific, and clear. The iterations are described below.

Individual Findings and questions: TBD's Evaluation Team Members shall review the assigned proposals and develop individual findings and questions before discussion with other subpanel members. For each assigned proposal, each TBD Evaluation Team Member shall enter their individual findings and questions into the RES website before each proposal scheduled deadline. For each proposal, the Form C Lead shall organize these individual findings and questions (using the RES software) to a large table of findings and questions referred as the "Fat Matrix". This Fat Matrix of individual findings and questions is the basis of the Fat Matrix teleconference.

Fat Matrix teleconference: A "Fat Matrix teleconference" is held for each proposal to discuss individual findings and questions and to assist the Form C Lead in developing an "Initial Draft Form C" for that proposal. The Form C Lead guides the discussion. During this Fat Matrix teleconference each individual finding and question is discussed by the entire subpanel and they are edited, merged with other similar individual findings and questions, or disposed. After the Fat Matrix teleconference the Form C Lead shall be responsible for further editing, consolidating, and refining this initial form into the Initial Draft Form C. The Initial Draft Form C is the first draft of the final Form C product and is the basis of the "Initial Draft Form C Teleconference" discussion.

Initial Draft Form C Teleconference: For each proposal, the Initial Draft Form C Teleconference is held to refine the findings and questions. The Form C Lead guides the discussion. Findings and questions can be edited, merged with other similar findings and questions, or disposed. The resulting second draft of the Form C is the basis of the "Second Draft Form C Teleconference".

Second Draft Form C Teleconference: For each proposal, each subpanel holds a Second Draft Form C Teleconference to further refine the findings and prepare major weaknesses to be sent to the proposers for clarification. All Draft Forms C assigned to the subpanel are reviewed during this teleconference. The Form C Lead for each proposal guides the discussion. Findings can be edited, merged with other similar findings, or disposed. The Consistency Team participates in these teleconferences to ensure consistency between findings on proposals from different subpanels and that all proposals are treated equally and fairly. The resulting third drafts of the Forms C are the basis of the “Third Draft Form C Teleconference”.

Third Draft Form C Teleconference: For each proposal, each subpanel holds a Third Draft Form C Teleconference before the plenary meeting to further refine the findings and consider the proposer-provided clarifications to the major weaknesses. All Draft Forms C assigned to the subpanel are reviewed during this teleconference. The Form C Lead for each proposal guides the discussion. Findings can be edited, merged with other similar findings, or disposed. The Consistency Team participates in these teleconferences to ensure consistency between findings on proposals from different subpanels and that all proposals are treated equally and fairly. The resulting “Plenary Draft Forms C” are the basis of the Plenary Meeting discussions.

Additional teleconferences shall also be held to discuss and resolve consistency issues. Unless previously approved by the Subpanel Lead and NASA TPOC, all evaluation team members must attend their assigned teleconferences to review draft Forms C and address consistency issues.

4.2.3 Plenary Meeting: Finalizing the Findings and Form C

The contractor shall attend TMC Plenary Meeting. The TMC Plenary Meeting is a 5-day face-to-face meeting that expands for a period of 1 week where all the subpanels come together to discuss all proposal findings and questions, refine the findings and questions, finalize questions to the proposers, review the feedback to the questions from proposers, finalize the findings and Form C and be polled for the proposed missions’ risk rating. This shall be accomplished in 3 rounds of discussion for each proposal. The contractor shall also provide a summary presentation on cost that include the results of the Cost analysis for each proposal. At the end of the Plenary Meeting the Evaluation Team shall;

- i. Document the findings in final versions of the Forms for each proposal.
- ii. Judge the completeness, accuracy, and consistent treatment of each proposal’s evaluation.
- iii. Determine, via a polling process, the final assignment of risk ratings for each proposal as directed by the Government. Contractor shall also prepare a “polling log” indicating who can be polled for each proposal and that shall automatically (via formulas developed in an Excel Spreadsheet) determine the median, average, or mode of each tallied poll for each proposal.
- iv. Deliver the final form documents in time to support the selection meeting.

4.3 Post-evaluation Support

The contractor shall:

- i. Finalize the Forms C and the Cost Evaluation Summaries.
- ii. Providing 3 instrument evaluators to attend the Science Plenary Meeting.
- iii. Assist with preparation of categorization and steering committee books.
- iv. Assist with preparation for debriefings of proposing teams.
- v. Develop and implement of a Lessons Learned activity to capture the lessons learned and best practices of the evaluation process.

- vi. Develop and assist in the presentation of a Transition Briefing to the Program Office that captures the characteristics of the selected mission.
- vii. Prepare or provide input to briefing books and/or a history book documenting all evaluation panel activity, findings, and recommendations, as directed by the NASA TPOC.
- viii. Final forms, as well as copies of presentation materials and summaries shall be uploaded to the evaluation website; after which, the entire contents of the site shall be captured on CD-ROM for entry into the SOMA archive.
- ix. Archive all proposal copies and documents pertaining to the evaluation cycle in the SOMA archive.

5. **Government Furnished Items:** The Government will provide the following.

GOVERNMENT FURNISHED ITEM	DATE TO BE FURNISHED
Proposals	<i>October 14, 2011</i>

6. **Other Information Needed for Task Performance**

6.1. **Performance Objectives:**

6.1.1 **Quality**

This Task shall conform to the goals of the EASSS QA Program by:

- Delivering high-quality products and services that meet contractual requirements and satisfy the stakeholder’s technical, cost and schedule needs and expectations.
- Using continuous improvement to develop and deliver low-risk, innovative technical solutions.
- Evaluating performance using objective performance measures together with customer satisfaction, surveillance and performance evaluation inputs.
- Ensuring that the Task Order shall be staffed with only the highest quality non-conflicted SMEs, able to fully conform to necessary standards and procedures, and free of OCI and COI concerns.
- Ensuring prompt visibility and proactive resolution of emerging quality issues.
- Focusing on problem prevention by implementing and continually improving work processes designed to identify and resolve problems early in the development life cycle.
- Reporting comprehensive and accurate EASSS Program performance assessments.
- Undergoing a Quality Audit of our procedures (OCI/COI, training, and process procedures) every six months by our Quality Control Manager who reports findings directly to the TBD CEO.

6.1.2 **Timeliness**

The TBD Task Leader shall ensure:

- Evaluation Team Members are identified as far in advance as possible; that OCI/COI issues are identified and resolved as far in advance as possible; that required training is provided as far in advance as possible; and that required information/forms to bring consultants, temporary employees, and required subcontractors on board with TBD are completed in as far in advance as possible to ensure timely development of the Evaluation Team.
- Timely and effective responses to problems or changes in requirements and budgets.
- All contract deliverables are accurate, of high quality, and delivered early or on time.
- Risks are being managed in a timely and effective manner.
- Provide timely staff management for new requirements, vacancies, resignations and terminations (for employees, subcontractors, and consultants).
- Timely deliveries, reporting, and identification of issues or concerns.

- All potential problems are identified early and resolved swiftly and are worked proactively rather than reactively.

6.1.3 Cost

Contractor shall utilize pre-negotiated TBD rates for estimating purposes. Subcontractors and/or consultants shall be selected based on best value and their ability to meet the schedule.

Hours (but no ODC charges) shall be assigned to this Task and actual costs incurred shall be reflected on the SF533 submitted as costs are incurred and invoiced per the EASSS contract.

Accrued Task costs shall be available to the NASA Review Manager within 10 days following each TBD pay period (twice monthly).

6.1.4 Other

Subcontractor Consent. When consultants and/or subcontractors are identified, subcontract consent documentation shall be provided in accordance with Federal Acquisition Regulation (FAR) Part 44. Adequate price competition shall be conducted unless adequately justified in accordance with FAR Parts 6 and 44. Consent is hereby granted based on consent letters submitted to the Contracting Officer

6.2 Organizational Conflict of Interest

TBD OCI task specific plan dated 2 Aug 2011 is hereby referenced and incorporated in its entirety into this task order.

7. Deliverables/Milestones

Milestone Number	SOW Reference Paragraph	Milestones	Dates
1	N/A	Start Date	September 09 15, 2011
3	4.1.6-4.1.9	OCI and Compliance Checks and Proposal Distribution	September 19-30, 2011
4	4.1.1, 4.1.11	TMC Kickoff Teleconference	October 14, 2011
5	4.2.2	TMC Evaluations: Fat Matrix and Form C Teleconferences	October 14-December 22, 2011 January 4-February 3, 2012
6	4.2.3	TMC Plenary	February 6- 10, 2012
	4.3	Participate in Science Meeting with Panel Chairs and Co-Chairs	February 13- 17, 2012
7	4.3	Complete Documentation for Categorization and Steering Committees	February 21 – March 9, 2012
8	4.3	Proposal Debriefings (as needed)	March-April, 2012
9	N/A	Completion Date	May, 2012

8. Period of Performance/Schedule

From the date of task issuance through see Optional Form 347, Block 15. Interim event dates may change based on direction of the TPOC. Changes to the completion date shall be approved by the Contracting Officer.

9. NASA TPOC

NASA TPOC: TBD

Mail Stop (M/S): 380 Science Office of Mission Assessments

Phone Number: (757) 864-TBD/ Fax Number: (757) 864-TBD

Email: TBD

1. **Task Order Title:**

1.1 Explorer Announcement of Opportunity (AO) Astrophysics Explorer Concept Study Report (CSR) Evaluation
(POP: 7/6/12 – 6/30/13, ORG: SOMA)

2. **Contractual References:**

2.1 **Statement of Work Reference:** This requirement is pursuant to contract NNL12AA00B between National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA) Langley Research Center (LaRC) and TBD. Refer to Paragraphs 3.0 Proposal Evaluation, 4.0 Assessments, and 5.0 Studies.

2.2 **Limitation of Future Contracting Reference:** In support of this task order, the contractor:

- shall be required to evaluate proposals and competitive announcements
- may have access to proprietary information and various other types of non-public data

2.3 **Conflict of Interest:** As described in NASA Clause 1852.209-71 (Clause H.3, Limitation of Future Contracting, contained in contract TBD), this work may give rise to a potential conflict of interest. Therefore, the contractor shall comply with Clause H.9, Access to Sensitive Information, and Exhibit D., Organizational Conflict of Interest Avoidance Plan, contained in contract TBD.

3. **Purpose, Objective, and Background of Work to be Performed:**

3.1 **Purpose:** The purpose of this Task Order is to provide technical expertise and administrative support to SOMA at NASA/LaRC to assist in the evaluation of Concept Study Reports (CSRs) from the 4 teams selected through AO NNH11ZDA002O, entitled *Explorer 2011*, issued November 1, 2010, and Program Element Appendix (PEA) H7, entitled *Explorer 2011 Science Missions of Opportunity*, appended November 1, 2010, to the *Stand Alone Missions of Opportunity Notice* (SALMON) AO NNH08ZDA009O; these 2 solicitations are referred to jointly as the Explorer AO. The 2 AO NNH11ZDA002O based full mission CSRs and the 2 AO NNH08ZDA009O based mission of opportunity CSRs shall be evaluated as 1 set on this task order. The contractor shall provide the following 3 forms for each CSR: an evaluation form for the Science Implementation Merit and Feasibility of the Investigation (Form B), an evaluation form for the Feasibility of the Mission Implementation including Cost Risk (Form C), and a Cost Evaluation Summary (CES). The criteria by which findings for Forms A, B, and C shall be generated are specified in “Guidelines and Criteria for the Phase A Concept Study” on the Explorer Program Library web page (http://explorers.larc.nasa.gov/EX/ex_Library.html). For those missions that propose a Student Collaboration (SC), the Form C shall include an evaluation of whether the SC is separable for evaluation purposes. The contractor shall perform 3 independent cost estimates for each CSR.

4. Description of the Work to be Performed:

4.1 CSR Assessment Preparations and Process Definition Support: The Contractor shall assist the NASA in preparation of schedule planning, product planning, and preparation of presentation materials for the Forms A, B, C, and CES evaluation kickoff(s) – to be attended by all reviewers (evaluators, specialist reviewers, and analysts). The contractor shall establish the staffing plan with a roster of competent expert reviewers to cover the anticipated scope of the CSRs. The contractor shall support the Task Monitor in making preparations to initiate the evaluation process. This includes developing a contact and proposal distribution spreadsheet. The contractor shall train its reviewers on conflicts of interest (COI) issues, generate a list of proposing parties, solicit COI self-assessments from each of its reviewers, and review the CSRs for any evidence of an organizational or personal conflict of interest. The Contractor shall perform the OCI and PCI analysis in accordance with the OCI Avoidance Plan and relevant contractual provisions.

4.1.1 Assessment and briefing of expected systems and technologies identifying additional information relevant to the evaluation. The contractor shall assess the additional cost and instrument information required to evaluate the 4 selected Astrophysics Explorer concepts. The contractor shall brief NASA SOMA and identify the additional required information. The contractor shall obtain information as required, and prepare a summary briefing of the additional information obtained.

4.1.2 An assessment, review and briefing of relevant cost information needed for the evaluation. The contractor shall identify any additional NASA cost information needed from past missions or missions in development to conduct the cost risk evaluation for the specified missions.

4.1.3 An assessment, review and briefing of the technology of the expected instruments. The Contractor shall identify any additional instrument performance, technology status, or heritage information needed on past instruments or instruments currently in development to conduct the evaluation for the instruments on the specified missions.

4.2 Assessment and Analysis of CSRs:

4.2.1 The Contractor shall perform a detailed evaluation of each CSR. The contractor provided reviewers shall participate in individual and Panel assessments of each CSR. The contractor shall provide expertise to cover the scope of the CSRs, including project management, schedule analysis, systems engineering, mission design, flight systems, flight software, cost, ground system and operations, instrument implementation, science implementation, Ultra Long Duration Balloons (ULDBs), International Space Station, past performance, NPR 7120.5D NID to NPR 7120.5E transition, Small and Small Disadvantaged Business subcontracting, science implementation, and as necessary, science classified heritage. The Contractor shall perform 3 fully independent life-cycle cost estimates and diagram

the flow of funds for each CSR. Each estimate shall include all life-cycle elements from Phase B through Phase F, and shall be generated with an approach that considers parametric models, reference cost data, and analogies; and is independent of the proposer's estimates. Included in each life-cycle cost estimate shall be an assessment of cost risk that identifies cost drivers and threats in each proposed implementation approach. The Contractor shall also conduct ongoing factor based consistency checks to ensure each CSR is evaluated fairly.

- 4.2.2** Contractor shall enter, according to assigned evaluation criteria, individual comments by the evaluators into the SOMA Remote Evaluation System (RES) website in time to support panel level "Fat Matrix" telecons that will result in the generation of findings of strengths and weaknesses for each CSR. The Contractor shall generate Draft1 Forms C, approximately 1 week after each Fat Matrix telecon. Each Draft 1 telecon will result in further refined Draft 2 Forms and a CES, which shall be reviewed in telecons prior to the Initial Plenary. The duration of the Draft 2 Form telecons should be assumed to be the same as the Draft1 telecons. The Contractor shall designate 2 Form Leads for each CSR; these Form Leads will be responsible for editing, consolidating, and refining the Forms B, and the Form C respectively. CESs shall be developed by a Contractor designated Lead Cost Evaluator. Contractor personnel shall participate in a kickoff, Fat Matrix, and Draft Form telecons.
- 4.2.3** Identified Contractor reviewers shall attend the Initial Plenary meeting in the Hampton Roads area for Forms B, and C discussions. At this meeting, the Contractor (reviewers) shall:
- 4.2.3.1** Participate in the Initial Plenary by judging the completeness, accuracy, and consistent treatment of each CSR's evaluation. Provide a presentation reviewing consistency by evaluation criterion.
 - 4.2.3.2** Participate in reviewing Initial Forms B, C, and CES to identify and agree upon Major Strengths, Major Weaknesses, Minor Strengths, Minor Weaknesses, comments, and analysis results.
 - 4.2.3.3** Participate in composing questions for the site visits for significant issues identified in Forms B, C, and CES that are not addressed by defined range weaknesses observed and noted in order to provide CSR teams an opportunity to respond to evaluation concerns.
 - 4.2.3.4** Provide a summary cost presentation reviewing the cost risk evaluation methodology and summarizing the cost risk of all CSRs.
 - 4.2.3.5** Provide a presentation reviewing the schedule of each CSR.

4.4.4 Prepare or provide input to briefing books documenting evaluation panel activity, findings, and recommendations, as directed by the Technical Point of Contact (TPOC).

4.4.5 Archive 2 copies of each CSR and documents pertaining to the evaluation cycle in the SOMA archive library. Final forms, as well as copies of presentation materials and summaries shall be uploaded to the RES.

4.5 Post Processing Tasks: The Contractor shall:

4.5.1 Provide follow-up cost summaries that provide detailed cost profile information and recommendations on each CSR.

4.5.2 Provide the initial Cost Analysis Data Requirement (CADRe) input for the selected missions.

4.5.3 Provide transition briefing(s) on the selected CSRs to the Explorer Program Office and the relevant NASA Headquarters Astrophysics Explorer Program Executive(s).

4.5.4 Provide cost input files for each of the cost models used for the evaluation. Upload these files to the RES.

4.5.5 Provide lessons learned report.

5. Deliverables: The Contractor shall provide all deliverables specified below:

5.1 Contact and proposal distribution spreadsheet 7/13/12 and updates as required

5.2 Briefing to TPOC of needed information for the evaluation 7/30/12

5.3 Summary briefing of the additional information 9/21/12

5.4 Conflict of interest check 9/29/12

5.5 Compliance check of CSRs 9/26/12

5.6 Evaluations of CSRs 9/26/12 – 12/7/12

5.7 Participation at Plenaries 12/10-14/12 and 2/4-8/13

5.8 Final evaluation Forms 2/11/12

5.9 Cost input files for all cost models for all CSRs NLT 5/31/12

5.10 Participation at Site Visits 1/15-29/13

5.11 Technical support for CSR debriefings NLT 5/ 31/12

5.12 Transition briefing(s) NLT 5/31/13

5.13 CADRe information on selected missions 2/11/13

5.14 Archiving of evaluation documentation (Forms, working documents, CSRs, and briefing books) NLT 5/ 31/12

5.15 Development and documentation of RCS estimates for 2 full mission CSRs 2/11/13

Note: TBD dates to be issued by the COR with CO authorization.

5.16 Provide lessons learned report.

6. Government Furnished Items: The Government will provide the following:

GOVERNMENT FURNISHED ITEM	DATE TO BE FURNISHED
RES access	As required
Step 1 proposals for 4 selected missions	As required
CSRs	September 26, 2012

7. Other Information Needed for Task Performance:

7.1. Performance Objectives:

7.1.1 Quality

This Task shall conform to the goals of the Contractor EASSS QA Program by:

- Delivering high-quality products and services that meet contractual requirements and satisfy the stakeholder’s technical, cost and schedule needs and expectations.
- Using continuous improvement to develop and deliver low-risk, innovative technical solutions.
- Evaluating performance using objective performance measures together with customer satisfaction, surveillance and performance evaluation inputs.
- Ensuring that the Task Order shall be staffed with only the highest quality non-conflicted SMEs, able to fully conform to necessary standards and procedures, and free of OCI and COI concerns.
- Ensuring prompt visibility and proactive resolution of emerging quality issues.
- Focusing on problem prevention by implementing and continually improving work processes designed to identify and resolve problems early in the development life cycle.
- Reporting comprehensive and accurate EASSS Program performance assessments.
- Undergoing a Quality Audit of our procedures (OCI/COI, training, and process procedures) every six months by TBD Quality Control Manager who reports findings directly to the TBD CEO.

7.1.2 Timeliness

The Contractor Task Leader shall ensure:

- Evaluation Team Members are identified as far in advance as possible; that OCI/COI issues are identified and resolved as far in advance as possible; that required training is provided as far in advance as possible; and that required information/forms to bring consultants, temporary employees, and required subcontractors on board with the prime evaluation contractor are completed in as far in advance as possible to ensure timely development of the Evaluation Team.
- Timely and effective responses to problems or changes in requirements and budgets.
- All contract deliverables are accurate, of high quality, and delivered early or on time.
- Risks are being managed in a timely and effective manner.
- Provide timely staff management for new requirements, vacancies, resignations and terminations (for employees, subcontractors, and consultants).
- Timely deliveries, reporting, and identification of issues or concerns.

- All potential problems are identified early and resolved swiftly and are worked proactively rather than reactively.

7.1.3 Cost

The Contractor shall utilize pre-negotiated contract rates for estimating purposes. Subcontractors and/or consultants shall be selected based on best value and their ability to meet the schedule.

Hours (but no ODC charges) shall be assigned to this Task and actual costs incurred shall be reflected on the NF533 submitted as costs are incurred and invoiced per the EASSS contract.

Accrued Task costs shall be available to the NASA Review Manager within 10 calendar days following each contractor pay period (twice monthly).

Task Estimate shall be within + or – 5% of the proposed amount, otherwise, fee shall be reduced commensurate with the overestimated cost through a mutually agreed descope.

7.1.4 Other

Subcontractor Consent. When consultants and/or subcontractors are identified, subcontract consent documentation shall be provided in accordance with Federal Acquisition Regulation (FAR) Part 44. Adequate price competition shall be conducted unless adequately justified in accordance with FAR Parts 6 and 44.

7.2 Organizational Conflict of Interest and Task Technical Approach

TBD OCI task specific plan and technical approach dated 3/29/13 is hereby referenced and incorporated in its entirety into this task order.

7.3 NASA will furnish additional cost and mission information required to conduct the evaluation of the CSRs.

8. Period of Performance/Schedule: The period of performance for this task order shall be July 6, 2012 through June 7, 2013. Interim event dates may be coordinated with the TPOC. The Contracting Officer must approve any change to the overall completion date.

Milestone Number	SOW Reference Paragraph	Milestones	Dates
1	*	Start date	July 6, 2012
2	4.1, 5.1	Contact and CSR distribution spreadsheet	July 13, 2012
3	4.1.1, 5.2	Assessment of information needed for evaluation	July 30, 2012
4	4.1.1, 5.3	Provision of additional information	September 21, 2012
5	4.2.1	CSR due date	September 21, 2012
6	4.1	Evaluation kickoff telecon and	September 26, 2012 and

		makeups as necessary	TBD
7	4.1, 5.4, 5.5	Conflict of interest and compliance checks	October 12, 2012
8	4.2.2	Criterion C Fat Matrix telecons	October 25 to November 13, 2012
9	4.2.2	Draft Form B telecons, Draft Form C and CES telecons	November 5, 2012 to January 11, 2013
10	4.2.3	Initial Plenary	January 14 to 18, 2012
11	4.2.4, 5.10	Site Visits to Greenbelt MD, Boston MA, Tucson AZ, and Pasadena CA.	January 29, 2013, January 31, 2013, February 5, 2013, and February 7, 2013
12	4.2.5, 5.7	Final Plenary	February 11 to 15, 2013
13	4.2.6, 5.8	Telecon review of clarifications	February 18, 2013
14	4.3, 5.15	RCS estimates	March 1, 2013
15	4.4	Complete documentation	February 19, 2013
16	4.5, 5.13	Cost summaries	February 18, 2013
17	4.5.3, 5.12	Transition briefing(s)	April 2013
18	5.9, 5.11, 5.14	Completion date	June 7, 2013

9. **NASA TPOC:**

TBD

Science Office for Mission Assessments

Mail Stop (M/S): 380

Phone Number: (757) 864-TBD

Fax Number: (757) 864-TBD

E-Mail Address: TBD

1. Task Order Title:

1.1 Tropospheric Emissions: Monitoring of Pollution (TEMPO) Support
(POP: 10/18/13 – 9/23/15, ORG: ESSPPO)

2. Contractual References:

2.1 Statement of Work Reference: This requirement is pursuant to contract TBD between National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA) Langley Research Center (LaRC) and TBD. Refer to Paragraphs 4.0 Assessments, and 5.0 Studies.

2.2 Limitation of Future Contracting Reference: In support of this task order, the contractor:

- will have access to non-public information as part of its performance of a government contract which may provide a competitive advantage in a later competition
- may have access to proprietary information and various other types of non-public data

2.3 Conflict of Interest: As described in NASA Clause 1852.209-71 (Clause H.3, Limitation of Future Contracting, contained in contract TBD), this work may give rise to a potential conflict of interest. Therefore, the contractor shall comply with Clause H.9, Access to Sensitive Information, and Exhibit D., Organizational Conflict of Interest Avoidance Plan, contained in contract TBD.

3. Purpose, Objective, and Background of Work to be Performed:

3.1. The purpose of this task is to obtain support for the TEMPO independent reviews and associated activities.

3.2. The objective of this task is to support a Standing Review Board (SRB) that is responsible for independently assessing the health of the project. Independent reviews of projects are conducted at defined lifecycle milestones and are used to objectively assess the project's progress against the project plan, its readiness to proceed to the next lifecycle phase, compliance with NPR 7120.5 and NPR 7123.1 requirements, and the Integrated Baseline.

3.3. The (Tropospheric Emissions: Monitoring of Pollution) TEMPO Mission includes the TEMPO Instrument Project and the TEMPO Mission Project. The TEMPO Instrument Project consists of the TEMPO Instrument; Ground Systems; Instrument Operations; and Science Data Processing. The TEMPO Mission Project consist of Mission Systems Engineering and procuring a ride on a commercial Geostationary Earth Orbit (GEO) Host that will include the spacecraft, instrument integration, launch vehicle, data downlink, and the ground system to transfer the data to the TEMPO Instrument Operations Center. The TEMPO Instrument is an Earth Venture Instrument Announcement of Opportunity (AO) selected instrument within the Earth System Science Pathfinder (ESSP) Program, with ultimate project authority under principal investigator Kelly Chance of the Smithsonian Astrophysical Observatory (SAO). The ESSP Program Office (ESSP PO) is located at the NASA Langley Research Center (LaRC) and is responsible for overall program management. The ESSP Program reports to the Earth Science Division (ESD) within the

NASA Science Mission Directorate (SMD) at NASA Headquarters. The TEMPO Mission Project is a directed project at LaRC charged with procuring the Host Mission ride. The TEMPO Instrument is classified as Category 3 (NPR 7120.5E), Class C (NPR 8705.4) with the SMD Associate Administrator (AA) designated as the Decision Authority. The PI has delegated the authority for Project Management, System Engineering, and Safety and Mission Assurance, to LaRC.

TEMPO will measure atmospheric pollution covering most of North America, from Mexico City to the Canadian tar/oil sands, and from the Atlantic to the Pacific hourly and at high spatial resolution. TEMPO's measurements from geostationary orbit (GEO) of tropospheric ozone, ozone precursors, aerosols, and clouds will create a revolutionary dataset that provides understanding and improves prediction of air quality (AQ) and climate forcing.

4. Description of the Work to be Performed: The Contractor shall perform the following task requirements:

- 4.1** The Contractor shall provide SRB member, who shall work with the TEMPO SRB Chair for this task to ensure that SRB personnel are qualified and meet the applicable criteria for independence, conflict of interest, and the availability to support the planned period of performance. The contractor shall provide one SRB member in the area of GEO location - Image Navigation and Registration (INR).
- 4.2** Specific duties of TEMPO SRB Member(s) include, but are not limited to:
 - 4.2.1 Review relevant project milestone documentation, as requested, prior to attending review meetings.
 - 4.2.2 Assess the presented material and maturity of gate products, and identify any findings, comments and/or Requests For Action (RFAs).
 - 4.2.3 Evaluate project progress using the review success criteria for each review, as defined in the TEMPO ToR, to judge whether or not the review objectives have been satisfied.
 - 4.2.4 Assess the basis of estimate (BOE) provided by the project to substantiate its cost and schedule estimate, as appropriate for the associated review or milestone event.
 - 4.2.5 Provide inputs to cost and schedule risk assessments and analyses.
 - 4.2.6 Evaluate project cost and schedule estimates, other project provided programmatic data, technical risks, and independent programmatic analyses to determine individual assessment of project's "programmatic health".
 - 4.2.7 Write the individual member independent report (IMIR) (strengths, issues and concerns, including recommendations, and observations).
 - 4.2.8 Participate in post-review discussions.
 - 4.2.9 Prepare and submit inputs to the SRB report based on guidance from the SRB Chair.
 - 4.2.10 Raise concern to the SRB Chair if the RFA originator disagrees with the project's disposition of the RFA.
 - 4.2.11 Raise concern to the SRB Chair if the proposed action item closeout seems an inadequate response to the RFA and the issue(s) cannot be resolved between the RFA originator and the project.

5. Government Furnished Items: The Government will provide the following:

- 5.1. The Contractor will have access to technical documents with export control restrictions and to resource and strategic planning documents with Sensitive but Unclassified (SBU) distribution restrictions. All documents with restricted distributions shall be marked with the applicable control restrictions requirements. Additionally, all sensitive information shall be handled in accordance with the terms and conditions of Contract TBD and the OCI Avoidance Plan contained therein.

6. Other Information Needed for Task Performance:

6.1. Performance Objectives:

6.1.1 Quality

This Task shall conform to the goals of the contractor EASSS QA Program by:

- Delivering high-quality products and services that meet contractual requirements and satisfy the stakeholder's technical, cost and schedule needs and expectations.
- Using continuous improvement to develop and deliver low-risk, innovative technical solutions.
- Evaluating performance using objective performance measures together with customer satisfaction, surveillance and performance evaluation inputs.
- Ensuring that the Task Order shall be staffed with only the highest quality non-conflicted SMEs, able to fully conform to necessary standards and procedures, and free of OCI and COI concerns.
- Ensuring prompt visibility and proactive resolution of emerging quality issues.
- Focusing on problem prevention by implementing and continually improving work processes designed to identify and resolve problems early in the development life cycle.
- Reporting comprehensive and accurate EASSS Program performance assessments.
- Undergoing a Quality Audit of our procedures (OCI/COI, training, and process procedures) every six months by our Quality Control Manager who reports findings directly to the TBD CEO.

6.1.2 Timeliness

The Contractor Task Leader shall ensure:

- Evaluation Team Members are identified as far in advance as possible; that OCI/COI issues are identified and resolved as far in advance as possible; that required training is provided as far in advance as possible; and that required information/forms to bring consultants, temporary employees, and required subcontractors on board with the prime evaluation contractor are completed in as far in advance as possible to ensure timely development of the Evaluation Team.
- Timely and effective responses to problems or changes in requirements and budgets.
- All contract deliverables are accurate, of high quality, and delivered early or on time.
- Risks are being managed in a timely and effective manner.
- Provide timely staff management for new requirements, vacancies, resignations and terminations (for employees, subcontractors, and consultants).
- Timely deliveries, reporting, and identification of issues or concerns.

- All potential problems are identified early and resolved swiftly and are worked proactively rather than reactively.

6.1.3 Cost

The Contractor shall utilize pre-negotiated contract rates for estimating purposes. Subcontractors and/or consultants shall be selected based on best value and their ability to meet the schedule.

Hours (but no ODC charges) shall be assigned to this Task and actual costs incurred shall be reflected on the SF533 submitted as costs are incurred and invoiced per the EASSS contract.

Accrued Task costs shall be available to the NASA Review Manager within 10 days following each contractor pay period (twice monthly).

Task Estimate shall be within + or – 5% of the proposed amount, otherwise, fee shall be reduced commensurate with the overestimated cost.

6.1.4 Other

Subcontractor Consent. When consultants and/or subcontractors are identified, subcontract consent documentation shall be provided in accordance with Federal Acquisition Regulation (FAR) Part 44. Adequate price competition shall be conducted unless adequately justified in accordance with FAR Parts 6 and 44.

6.2 Organizational Conflict of Interest and Task Technical Approach

TBD OCI task specific plan and technical approach dated 9/18/13 is hereby referenced and incorporated in its entirety into this task order.

6.3 Reserved.

6.4 Independence and Conduct. All contractor personnel under this task shall meet and maintain the applicable criteria for independence, conflict of interest and availability to support this task.

6.5 All Contractor personnel under this task shall be capable of sending and receiving electronic media and shall maintain compatibility with the standard Microsoft Office suite of software and Acrobat (PDF) files.

6.6 The Contractor shall plan for the following estimated travel. The Contractor shall plan for the travel required in section 7, below.

6.6 Non-Disclosure Agreements. All contractor personnel shall have a signed non-disclosure agreement prior to commencement of work under this task order.

6.7 Applicable Documents NPR 7120.5 and NPR 7123.1 available at <http://nodis.hq.nasa.gov/>.

7. **Period of Performance/Schedule:** From the date of task issuance through September 23, 2015. Interim event dates may change based on direction of the Technical Point of Contact (TPOC). Changes to the completion date shall be approved by the Contracting Officer.

7.1 Current Schedule of Activities – The next scheduled event is the TEMPO SRR/MDR in Oct. 2013. Activities are listed below:

Activity	Location	Equivalent Number of Work Days	Start Date (Month/Year)	Deliverables
SRB Kickoff	Virtual (email/Telecon)	0.5	Task Award	
MSRR/MMDR	LaRC, VA	3	10/13	
MSRR/MMDR Follow up Activities	Virtual (email/Telecon)	2	10/13	Indiv. Report
Meetings related to KDP-B (support to SRB chair)	Virtual (email/Telecon)	0.5	11/13	
GEO location subsystem PDR	Ball Aerospace, CO	3	2/14	
GEO location follow up activities	Virtual (email/Telecon)	2	2/14	
SRB PDR Kickoff	Virtual (email/Telecon)	0.5	3/14	
PDR	Ball Aerospace, CO	3	4/14	
PDR Follow up Activities	Virtual (email/Telecon)	2	4/14	Indiv. Report
GEO location subsystem MPDR	Ball Aerospace, CO	3	8/14	
GEO location follow up activities	Virtual (email/Telecon)	2	8/14	
SRB MPDR Kickoff	Virtual (email/Telecon)	0.5	9/14	
MPDR	LaRC, VA	3	10/14	
MPDR Follow up Activities	Virtual (email/Telecon)	2	10/14	Indiv. Report
Meetings related to KDP-C (support to SRB chair)	Virtual (email/Telecon)	0.5	11/14	
GEO location subsystem CDR	Ball Aerospace, CO	3	12/14	
GEO location follow up activities	Virtual (email/Telecon)	2	12/14	
SRB CDR Kickoff	Virtual (email/Telecon)	0.5	1/15	
CDR	Ball Aerospace, CO	3	1/15	
CDR Follow up Activities	Virtual (email/Telecon)	0.5	1/15	Indiv. Report

* All approved official travels shall originate from within the contiguous 48 states of the United States; and only economic/coach class air fares, if needed, shall be approved for official travels.

- 7.2 Changes to interim delivery dates shall be coordinated with and approved by the TPOC. Changes to the completion date must be approved by the Contracting Officer. The Government has unlimited rights to all deliverables of this Order.

8. NASA Technical POC:

NASA TPOC: TBD

Mail Stop (M/S): 145

Phone Number: (757) 864-TBD/ Fax Number: (757) 864-TBD

E-Mail Address: TBD

TPOC Responsibilities:

8.1. The TPOC for the Task Order on the contract, as identified above. The TPOC's function is to serve as technical liaison between the Contractor and the Contracting Officer's Representative (COR). The TPOC is responsible for monitoring the overall task performance by the Contractor including delivery of the final product and/or services identified in the Task Order/Delivery Order Statement of Work. Specific duties and responsibilities are listed in Paragraph 2 below. Please pay particular attention to the limitations/cautions listed in Paragraph 3 below.

8.2. The following authority and responsibilities are hereby assigned to the TPOC:

- a. Monitor contract technical performance. Ensure that the Contractor complies with the Statement of Work or specifications included in the contract. Notify CO of any problem areas or deficiencies in performance.
- b. Communicate with Contractor personnel as necessary to ensure that Government requirements are understood. Technical information may be exchanged. This exchange should be without any implication of being a directive. Consult CO if the requirement exists to give technical direction. Only the CO can give technical direction.
- c. Monitor Contractor's expenditure of man-hours and cost on the contract. Review periodic reports received from the Contractor on Contract Assignment/Work Order progress/cost. Report any discrepancies, concerns, questions to the CO.
- d. Notify CO of any changes required to the contract. Only the CO can issue these changes.
- e. Notify the CO of any violation of the terms and conditions of the contract or any other Contractor action considered detrimental to the Government.
- f. Send an information copy to the CO of any correspondence exchanged with the Contractor regarding the contract.
- g. Review the contract deliverables and advise CO on acceptability. Recommend to the CO closeout of the contract when all requirements have been completed.
- h. Other duties as follows:
 - (1) Review designated task deliverables then advise if acceptable (533s, OCI Plans, milestones)
 - (2) Recommend to the COR closeout of the Tasks when all requirements have been completed.
 - (3) Identify, evaluate, mitigate OCIs, notify CO immediately of OCI situations.
 - (4) All actions to be coordinated through the SOMA COR.
 - (5) See Task Order paragraph 2 – TPOC is advised of the contract clauses to be monitored during performance or the task.

8.3. The duties delegated in this letter cannot be re-delegated. The TPOC is cautioned that he or she may be personally liable for actions taken or direction given beyond the authorities delegated in this letter.

- a. TPOC is not authorized to direct or supervise Contractor employees in the accomplishment of work assignments. Your primary interface shall be with the TBD Task Lead assigned to your task. Ensure TBD Task lead remains abreast of significant information communicated between Task Manager (NASA) and other Contractor/Subcontractor/Consultant employees.
- b. TPOCs are not authorized to approve or direct any changes in the Task Order/Delivery Order or to alter the contract in any way. However, changes to the task order milestone schedule are allowable via technical direction to accommodate necessary changes to the milestone schedule. The final completion date can only be changed through a contract modification signed by the Contracting Officer.
- c. TPOCs are not authorized to approve or direct any expenditure of funds beyond the Task Order/Delivery Order specified amounts.
- d. TPOCs are cautioned not to release to the Contractor any proprietary data. If the Contractor requires access to such data, consult the Contracting Officer/ Contract Specialist.
- e. TPOCs are not authorized to request proposals of any nature associated with this contract/task orders.

This appointment is effective signature date of this task order and shall remain in effect until completion of the Task Order or until rescinded in writing by the CO or COR on this contract.

1. Task Order Title:

- 1.1 Stratospheric Aerosol and Gas Experiment (SAGE) – III on International Space Station (ISS) Project Standing Review Board (SRB) Technical Expert Support for SRB activities concerning the life cycle of the SAGE III on ISS Project: (Critical Design Review (CDR) wrap-up and Re-planning portions, Systems Integration Review (SIR), Operations Readiness Review (ORR).

(POP: 5/1/13 – 9/23/13, ORG: LaRC Office of Director)

2. Contractual References:

- 2.1 **Statement of Work Reference:** This requirement is pursuant to contract TBD between National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA) Langley Research Center (LaRC) and TBD. Refer to Paragraphs 4.0 Assessments, and 5.0 Studies.
- 2.2 **Limitation of Future Contracting Reference:** In support of this task order, the contractor:
- will have access to non-public information as part of its performance of a government contract which may provide a competitive advantage in a later competition
 - may have access to proprietary information and various other types of non-public data
- 2.3 **Conflict of Interest:** As described in NASA Clause 1852.209-71 (Clause H.3, Limitation of Future Contracting, contained in contract NNL12AA00B), this work may give rise to a potential conflict of interest. Therefore, the Contractor shall comply with Clause H.9, Access to Sensitive Information, and Exhibit D., Organizational Conflict of Interest Avoidance Plan, contained in contract NNL12AA00B.

3. Purpose, Objective, and Background of Work to be Performed:

- 3.1. The SAGE III on ISS project is a directed mission, managed by Langley Research Center (LaRC), collaborating with ISS personnel at both the Johnson Space Center (JSC) and the Marshall Space Flight Center (MSFC). SAGE III on ISS is designed to globally monitor from Earth orbit the vertical distributions of aerosols, ozone (O₃), water vapor, and, stratospheric abundances of trace species such as nitrogen oxides (NO₂ and NO₃), and halogens. It is the fifth in a series of space-borne remote sensing instruments developed by the NASA LaRC for monitoring global distribution of aerosols and gaseous constituents using the solar occultation approach. The SAGE III instrument uses many of the design features and systems of its highly successful predecessors. For this mission the instrument will be mounted to the ISS.
- 3.2. An SRB is responsible for independently assessing the health of the project at designated life cycle milestones. Independent reviews of projects are conducted to objectively assess the project's progress against the project plan, its readiness to proceed to the next life cycle phase, and the Integrated Baseline. Each review may include a site visit optionally supplemented by splinter sessions, meetings, and subsystem reviews.
- 3.3. The purpose of this task is to obtain support for the remaining portion of the SAGE III on ISS CDR, including assessment of the Re-planning. Future modifications of this task will

address the specific needs for the SIR, and the ORR. None of the Contractor support personnel shall participate in SRB consensus discussions.

4. Description of the Work to be Performed

4.1 The Contractor shall provide the following:

4.2 Specific duties of the SAGE III on ISS shall include:

4.2.1 General:

4.2.1.1 The Contractor shall participate in review activities by face-to-face meetings, electronic media and/or teleconferences. The Contractor shall be capable of sending and receiving electronic media and shall maintain compatibility with the standard Microsoft Office suite of software and Acrobat (PDF) files. Documentation will be provided to the Technical Expert Consultants via the LaRC NX document sharing system, e-mail, and/or other systems as appropriate. The Contractor shall be responsible for completing forms and training that may be required prior to obtaining access to the LaRC NX document sharing system.

4.2.2 Review Execution:

4.2.2.1 The Contractor shall review pertinent project documentation prior to the site visits or splinter sessions, meetings, or subsystem reviews. The Contractor shall attend and actively participate in the site visit, or splinter sessions, meetings, or subsystem review activities. The Contractor shall provide expert feedback on project status and progress.

4.2.2.2 The Contractor shall prepare for, attend, and participate in post-site visit review (or splinter session, meeting, or subsystem review) communications. The Contractor shall support through expert feedback the disposition of open actions and the development of the final report and briefing and other activities as required. The Contractor shall deliver within five calendar days of the close of any site visit or subsystem review, a brief written summary of his/her feedback. The written summary may be in the form of a completed Individual Member Independent Report (IMIR).

4.2.2.3 The Contractor shall keep the Review Manager (RM) and SRB Chair apprised of all correspondences and discussions that pertain to the review material, the conduct of the review and/or dissemination of results.

4.3 Specific duties of the SAGE III on ISS S&T Specialist shall include:

4.3.1 General

4.3.1.1 The S&T Specialist shall participate in review activities by face-to-face meetings, electronic media and/or teleconferences. The S&T Specialist shall be capable of sending and receiving electronic media and shall maintain compatibility with the standard Microsoft Office suite of software and Acrobat (PDF) files. Documentation will be provided to the S&T Specialist via

the LaRC NX document sharing system, e-mail, and/or other systems as appropriate. The S&T Specialist shall be responsible for completing forms and training that may be required prior to obtaining access to the LaRC NX document sharing system.

4.3.1.2 The S&T Specialist shall provide specific scientific, technical, and programmatic information only. The Review Chairperson may request that some of that information be provided in writing. The S&T Specialist may offer, and/or SRB members may request, specific scientific, technical, and programmatic information only, when required by the SRB during open plenary-session or closed-session discussions (including post-review closeout activities). The S&T Specialist shall not communicate to or appear before the SRB for any purpose other than to provide scientific and technical input to the SRB. Such scientific and technical input may also include information concerning feasibility, risk, cost, and speed of implementation needed to understand the scientific and technical information provided. Unlike the Contractor, the participating S&T Specialist does not provide an IMIR or any objective assessment or evaluation of the project nor make a material contribution to developing such assessments or evaluations, except that the S&T Specialist may provide scientific or technical assessments of a particular scientific or technical approach that the SRB presents to the S&T Specialist for scientific or technical input to assess whether an approach is scientifically or technically acceptable or feasible. Findings and recommendations intended to influence the SRB, or the NASA Decision Authority, in association with NASA's gateway decision-making process, shall not be solicited by the SRB from the S&T Specialist, nor provided by the S&T Specialist. The S&T Specialist may submit Requests for Action (RFAs) to the Review Chair only for the purposes of requesting additional information that the S&T Specialist might need to provide scientific and technical input to or make a scientific and technical assessment for the SRB. The Review Chair will assess their suitability and assign a SRB RFA sponsor as required.

4.3.2 Review Execution:

4.3.2.1 The S&T Specialist shall review pertinent project documentation prior to the site visits or splinter sessions, meetings, or subsystem reviews specified by the TM. The S&T Specialist shall attend and actively participate in site visit or splinter session, meeting, or subsystem review activities as specified by the TM.

4.3.2.2 The S&T Specialist shall prepare for, attend, and participate in post-site visit review (or splinter session, meeting, or subsystem review) communications within the scope of Section 4.3.1.2 above, as specified by the TM. The S&T Specialist shall deliver

within five calendar days of the close of any site visit or subsystem review, a brief written summary of scientific and technical issues, concerns, and observations noted by the S&T Specialist.

4.3.2.3

The S&T Specialist shall keep the RM and SRB Chair apprised of all correspondences and discussions that pertain to the review material, the conduct of the review, and/or dissemination of results.

5. Government Furnished Items: The Government will provide the following:

5.1. The Contractor will have access to technical documents with export control restrictions and to resource and strategic planning documents with Sensitive but Unclassified (SBU) distribution restrictions. All documents with restricted distributions shall be marked with the applicable control restrictions requirements. Additionally, all sensitive information shall be handled in accordance with the terms and conditions of Contract TBD and the OCI Avoidance Plan contained therein.

6. Other Information Needed for Task Performance:

6.1. Performance Objectives:

6.1.1 Quality

This Task shall conform to the goals of the contractor EASSS QA Program by:

- Delivering high-quality products and services that meet contractual requirements and satisfy the stakeholder's technical, cost and schedule needs and expectations.
- Using continuous improvement to develop and deliver low-risk, innovative technical solutions.
- Evaluating performance using objective performance measures together with customer satisfaction, surveillance and performance evaluation inputs.
- Ensuring that the Task Order shall be staffed with only the highest quality non-conflicted SMEs, able to fully conform to necessary standards and procedures, and free of OCI and COI concerns.
- Ensuring prompt visibility and proactive resolution of emerging quality issues.
- Focusing on problem prevention by implementing and continually improving work processes designed to identify and resolve problems early in the development life cycle.
- Reporting comprehensive and accurate EASSS Program performance assessments.
- Undergoing a Quality Audit of our procedures (OCI/COI, training, and process procedures) every six months by our Quality Control Manager who reports findings directly to the TBD CEO.

6.1.2 Timeliness

The Contractor Task Leader shall ensure:

- The Contractor and S&T Specialist are identified as far in advance as possible; that OCI/COI issues are identified and resolved as far in advance as possible; that required training is provided as far in advance as possible; and that required information/forms to bring consultants, temporary employees, and required subcontractors on board with the

prime evaluation contractor are completed in as far in advance as possible to ensure that the reviews are adequately supported.

- Timely and effective responses to problems or changes in requirements and budgets.
- All contract deliverables are accurate, of high quality, and delivered early or on time.
- Risks are being managed in a timely and effective manner.
- Provide timely staff management for new requirements, vacancies, resignations and terminations (for employees, subcontractors, and consultants).
- Timely deliveries, reporting, and identification of issues or concerns.
- All potential problems are identified early and resolved swiftly and are worked proactively rather than reactively.

6.1.3 Cost

The Contractor shall utilize pre-negotiated contract rates for estimating purposes. Subcontractors and/or consultants shall be selected based on best value and their ability to meet the schedule.

Hours (but no ODC charges) shall be assigned to this Task and actual costs incurred shall be reflected on the SF533 submitted as costs are incurred and invoiced per the EASSS contract.

Accrued Task costs shall be available to the NASA Technical Point of Contact (TPOC) within 10 days following each contractor pay period (twice monthly).

Task Estimate shall be within + or – 5% of the proposed amount, otherwise, fee shall be reduced commensurate with the overestimated cost.

6.1.4 Other

Subcontractor Consent. When consultants and/or subcontractors are identified, subcontract consent documentation shall be provided in accordance with Federal Acquisition Regulation (FAR) Part 44. Adequate price competition shall be conducted unless adequately justified in accordance with FAR Parts 6 and 44.

6.2 Organizational Conflict of Interest and Task Technical Approach

TBD OCI task specific plan and technical approach dated 10/2/13 is hereby referenced and incorporated in its entirety into this task order.

6.3 & 6.4 Reserved

- 6.5** The Independence and Conduct of all contractor personnel under this task shall meet and maintain the applicable criteria for independence, conflict of interest and availability to support this task.
- 6.6** All Contractor personnel under this task shall be capable of sending and receiving electronic media and shall maintain compatibility with the standard Microsoft Office suite of software and Acrobat (PDF) files.
- 6.7** The Contractor shall plan for the following estimated travel. The Contractor shall plan for the travel required in section 7, below.

6.8 Non-Disclosure Agreements: All Contractor personnel shall have a signed non-disclosure agreement prior to commencement of work under this task order.

6.9 Applicable Documents: NPR 7120.5E and NPR 7123.1 available at <http://nodis.hq.nasa.gov/>.

7. Period of Performance/Schedule: From the date of task issuance through completion of the SAGE III on ISS ORR; or until the end of this contract vehicle. Interim event dates may change based on direction of the TPOC. Changes to the completion date shall be approved by the Contracting Officer.

- 7.1** Within 5 days of the close of the site visit or subsystem review, the Contractor shall deliver to the SRB RM and Chair a brief written summary of his/her feedback.
- 7.2** Within 5 days of the close of the site visit or subsystem review, the S&T Specialist shall deliver to the SRB RM and Chair a brief written summary of scientific and technical issues, concerns, and observations noted by the S&T Specialist.
- 7.3** Current Schedule of Activities – The activity descriptions and approximate dates provided in the table below are for planning purposes only. Updated activities and definitive dates will be based on direction from the TPOC. Trips, (including number of people per trip) are designated in the table below.

Description/Activity	Approximate Dates*	Location
Post-CDR-site-visit Communications	April-September, 2013 (3 participants)	No Travel Required – Electronic communications provided
Pre-Replanning Documentation review	May, 2013 (Technical and Management Expert only)	No Travel Required – Electronic communications provided
SAGE III Replanning Portion of CDR	May, 2013 (Technical and Management Expert only)	No Travel Required – Electronic communications provided
Post-Replanning Communications	May, 2013 (Technical and Management Expert only)	No Travel Required – Electronic communications provided
Pre-SIR Communications, Document Review, Miscellaneous Meetings	November, 2013 – April, 2014 (3 participants)	No Travel Required – Electronic communications provided
SIR Instrument Assembly Splinter Session	February, 2014 (3 participants)	No Travel Required – Electronic communications provided
SIR In-Depth Programmatic Splinter Session	April, 2014 (1 participant – Technical and Management Expert only)	No Travel Required – Electronic communications provided
SIR site visit	April, 2014 (3 participants)	Travel to LaRC for 2-day event for 3 participants

Instrument Acceptance Review / Radiometric Performance Review	(2 participants – both Technical Expert Consultants)	If travel to LaRC is required by the TPOC, it will add a 1-day event to the SIR site visit travel for 2 participants. If travel is not required, electronic communications will be provided.
Post-SIR Communications	May – September, 2014 (3 participants)	No Travel Required – Electronic communications provided

*Includes meeting days only and no travel. All approved official travels shall originate from within the contiguous 48 states of the United States; and only economic/coach class air fares, if needed, shall be approved for official travels.

- 7.4** Changes to interim delivery dates shall be coordinated with and approved by the TPOC. Changes to the completion date must be approved by the Contracting Officer. The Government has unlimited rights to all deliverables of this Order.

8. NASA TPOC:

NASA TPOC: TBD

Mail Stop (M/S): TBD

Phone Number: (757)864-TBD/ Fax Number: (757) 864-TBD

E-Mail Address: TBD

TPOC Responsibilities:

8.1. The TPOC for the Task Order/Delivery Order on the contract, as identified above. The TPOC’s function is to serve as technical liaison between the Contractor and the Contracting Officer’s Representative (COR). The TPOC is responsible for monitoring the overall task performance by the Contractor including delivery of the final product and/or services identified in the Task Order Statement of Work. Specific duties and responsibilities are listed in Paragraph 2 below. Please pay particular attention to the limitations/cautions listed in Paragraph 3 below.

8.2. The following authority and responsibilities are hereby assigned to the TPOC:

- a. Monitor contract technical performance. Ensure that the Contractor complies with the Statement of Work or specifications included in the contract. Notify CO of any problem areas or deficiencies in performance.
- b. Communicate with Contractor personnel as necessary to ensure that Government requirements are understood. Technical information may be exchanged. This exchange should be without any implication of being a directive. Consult CO if the requirement exists to give technical direction. Only the CO can give technical direction.
- c. Monitor Contractor's expenditure of man-hours and cost on the contract. Review periodic reports received from the Contractor on Contract Assignment/Work Order progress/cost. Report any discrepancies, concerns, questions to the CO.

- d. Notify CO of any changes required to the contract. Only the CO can issue these changes.
- e. Notify the CO of any violation of the terms and conditions of the contract or any other Contractor action considered detrimental to the Government.
- f. Send an information copy to the CO of any correspondence exchanged with the Contractor regarding the contract.
- g. Review the contract deliverables and advise CO on acceptability. Recommend to the CO closeout of the contract when all requirements have been completed.
- h. Other duties as follows:
 - (1) Review designated task deliverables then advise if acceptable (533s, OCI Plans, milestones)
 - (2) Recommend to the COR closeout of the tasks when all requirements have been completed.
 - (3) Identify, evaluate, mitigate OCIs, notify CO immediately of OCI situations.
 - (4) All actions to be coordinated through the SOMA COR.
 - (5) See Task Order paragraph 2 – task monitor is advised of the contract clauses to be monitored during performance or the task.

8.3. The duties delegated in this letter cannot be re-delegated. The TPOC is cautioned that he or she may be personally liable for actions taken or direction given beyond the authorities delegated in this letter.

- a. TPOC is not authorized to direct or supervise Contractor employees in the accomplishment of work assignments. Your primary interface shall be with the TBD Task Lead assigned to your task. Ensure TBD Task lead remains abreast of significant information communicated between Task Manager (NASA) and other Contractor/Subcontractor/Consultant employees.
- b. TPOCs are not authorized to approve or direct any changes in the Task Order/Delivery Order or to alter the contract in any way. However, changes to the task order milestone schedule are allowable via technical direction to accommodate necessary changes to the milestone schedule. The final completion date can only be changed through a contract modification signed by the CO.
- c. TPOCs are not authorized to approve or direct any expenditure of funds beyond the Task Order/Delivery Order specified amounts.
- d. TPOCs are cautioned not to release to the Contractor any proprietary data. If the Contractor requires access to such data, consult the CO/ Contract Specialist.
- e. TPOCs are not authorized to request proposals of any nature associated with this contract/task orders.

This appointment is effective signature date of this task order and shall remain in effect until completion of the Task Order or until rescinded in writing by the CO or COR on this contract.