

**1. Task Order Title:**

**1.1** Commercial Crew Program (CCP) Project Standing Review Board (SRB)  
(POP: 2/19/14 – 9/23/15, ORG: IPA0)

**2. Contractual References:**

**2.1 Statement of Work Reference:** This requirement is pursuant to this contract between National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA) Langley Research Center (LaRC) and the contractor. 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.

As described in NASA Clause 1852.209-71 (Clause H.3, Limitation of Future Contracting, contained in this contract) 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 the contract.

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

**3.1** The purpose of the CCP is to facilitate the development of a U.S. commercial crew space transportation capability with the goal of achieving safe, reliable, and cost effective access to and from Low Earth orbit (LEO) and the International Space Station (ISS). CCP's scope involves design, development, demonstration and certification of end-to-end crew transportation systems, including ground operations and integration, launch, abort, rendezvous, proximity operations, docking, orbital operations, reentry, recovery, and safe disposal or return. The required systems for the contractor are spacecraft, launch vehicle, ground systems, and mission systems.

**3.2** A Standing Review Board is responsible for independently assessing the health of the Program. Independent reviews of Programs 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.

**3.3** The purpose of this task is to obtain support for the CCP Program life cycle reviews, subsystem reviews, and associated activities.

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

- 4.1** The Contractor shall provide the following:
  - 4.1.1** The independent services of SRB Chair for the CCP Program life cycle reviews, subsystem reviews, and associated activities.
- 4.2** The SRB Chair is to serve on a non-consensus board. Specific duties of the Chair shall include, but are not limited to:
  - 4.2.1** Review Formulation:
    - 4.2.1.1 Coordinate with Review Manager (RM), Human Exploration Mission Directorate (HEOMD)/ Program Executive (PE)/Project Manager (PM) or their designated point-of-contact (POC), to prepare the Terms of Reference (ToR) as applicable.
    - 4.2.1.2 Coordinate with RM the identification of the required skill set needed on the SRB to conduct an integrated, holistic, assessment of the CCP.
    - 4.2.1.3 Coordinate with the PE, PM, and the RM on high risk areas and the review agenda.
    - 4.2.1.4 Coordinate the review readiness assessment meetings for the life cycle reviews with the Program and the RM as specified in NPR 7120.5.
    - 4.2.1.5 Coordinate with the RM, SMD/PE/PM or their designated POC, to appropriately structure the SRB for each review.
    - 4.2.1.6 Coordinate with SRB members to assure appropriate team member participation.
  - 4.2.2** Review Execution:
    - 4.2.2.1 Coordinate with RM and set schedule for SRB telecons and kickoff meetings. Conduct a readiness meeting with the program and provide the state of readiness to proceed notification with the review to the IPAO Director via email approximately 30 calendar days prior to the review
    - 4.2.2.2 Assure conduct of comprehensive independent reviews for CCP in accordance with NPR 7120.5 and NPR 7123.1 in an integrated fashion encompassing the project technical approach and its corresponding programmatic performances. The SRB Chair shall be responsible for ensuring the SRB reviews all pertinent program and programmatic requirements, interface documentation, program control plans and maturity products as applicable for the review.
    - 4.2.2.3 Lead SRB for all reviews, SRB caucus, and discussions to deliberate team findings and recommendations for all reviews, as applicable
    - 4.2.2.4 Assure the capture of all SRB inputs including Request For Action (RFA) as well as Individual Member Input Reports (IMIR) from each SRB member

- 4.2.2.5 Monitor performance of SRB members on review assignments to ensure that they are complete and commensurate with the expected quality on the deliverable
- 4.2.2.6 Support reviews as a Subject Matter Expert in Program Management
- 4.2.2.7 Plan and prepare review assignments for the SRB.

#### **4.2.3 Review Reporting:**

- 4.2.3.1 Conduct verbal out-brief to program at the conclusion of the applicable review site visit.
- 4.2.3.2 Within 48 hours (two work days) of the Project site review completion, prepare and coordinate with the project a “snap shot” summary briefing, and brief the Convening Authorities.
- 4.2.3.3 Within approximately one week after the site review prepare and coordinate with the RM an SRB draft report for the site review including the IMIRs.
- 4.2.3.4 The SRB Chair shall perform the following briefings for the site reviews:
  - 4.2.3.4.1 No later than ten calendar days after the site review, present the SRB Dry Run briefing to the IPAO Director.
  - 4.2.3.4.2 After the IPAO Dry Run/CCB, finalize the SRB briefing package.
  - 4.2.3.4.3 After the IPAO Dry Run and within 20 calendar days after the site review one pager summary briefing, present briefings to the Center Management Council (CMC), and the Program Office, respectively separated or combined.
  - 4.2.3.4.4 One week before the SMD Program Management Council (PMC), submit the SRB report/briefing package and present a pre-briefing to the NASA SMD Associate Administrator.
- 4.2.3.5 The CCP SRB Chair shall participate in and lead the review reporting activities, provide expert advice, support the disposition of open actions or RFAs, and develop review findings during the preparation of a final report.
  - 4.2.3.5.1 In accordance with SRB Handbook guidance, the SRB Chair shall coordinate with the SRB to ensure that all identified issues, concerns, and observations are properly and clearly stated with appropriate background information, specific associated risks, and explicit recommendations.

- 4.2.3.5.2 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.
- 4.2.3.5.3 The SRB Chair shall be responsible for providing to the RM, the executive summary, NPR 7120.5 and NPR 7123.1 stop-light assessment rating and explanatory text and conclusion sections of the SRB report.
- 4.2.3.5.4 The SRB Chair is required to review the final edited (for clarification) SRB report, coordinate and accept professional editorial changes, and sign it in a timely fashion.

**4.2.4** The CCP SRB Chair shall have overall responsibility for leading the conduct of the site reviews which includes the analysis of CCP by an independent team composed of management, technical, risk, schedule and cost experts from outside the advocacy chain of this program. The key deliverables for all these reviews shall include the documenting and presenting the review findings in the associated management briefing charts and the SRB Chair Report. In addition, a Chair summary report shall be included as a key deliverable for participating on any project internal reviews. See section 8 for review execution and deliverable details.

**4.2.5** The CCP SRB Chair shall keep the IPAO RM apprised of all correspondences and discussions that pertain to the conduct of the review or dissemination of results. (Note: All reports shall be reviewed and approved by the IPAO prior to release. Official correspondence shall be routed through the IPAO).

**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 this contract and the OCI Avoidance Plan contained therein.

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

6.1 Performance Objectives:

6.1.1 Quality

This Task will 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 will 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 contractor CEO.

#### 6.1.2 Timeliness

The contractor Task Leader will 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 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, 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.

#### 6.1.3 Cost

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

Hours (but no ODC charges) will 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 will 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 will be provided in accordance with Federal Acquisition Regulation (FAR) Part 44. Adequate price competition will be conducted unless adequately justified in accordance with FAR Parts 6 and 44.

#### 6.2 Organizational Conflict of Interest

The contractor OCI task specific plan dated \_\_\_\_\_ is hereby referenced and incorporated in its entirety into this task order.

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

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 8, below.

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

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

### 7 **Deliverables/Period of Performance/Schedule:**

From the date of task issuance through **9/23/15**. 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 eKDP 1 is tentatively scheduled for December 2014. Follow-on review will be scheduled at later dates. Activities, and associated briefings for the eKDP 1 are listed below:
- 7.2** Number of people per trip 1 unless otherwise noted below.
- 7.3** Within 5 days of each review, the CCP SRB Chair shall collect narrative input from all SRB members to develop, with the IPAO RM’s assistance, briefing packages and a final written report.
- 7.4** At least 30 days prior to the site review, the CCP SRB Chair, in conjunction with the IPAO RM, will perform a readiness assessment of the materials and documents, and report the results of that assessment to the convening authorities.
- 7.5** Within 48 hours of the conclusion of the site review, the CCP SRB Chair will develop a snap shot quick look summary of the status of the project and potential findings to be vetted with the CCP and then brief the Convening Authorities.
- 7.6** Within 5 days of each review, the CCP SRB Chair shall collect narrative input from all SRB members to develop, with the IPAO RM’s assistance, briefing packages and a final written report.
- 7.7** Within 30 days of the review, or at a time agreed to by all parties, the CCP SRB Chair shall provide a status briefing to the Agency Program Management Council (APMC) detailing the technical findings of the SRB and addressing the adequacy of the cost and schedule resources.
- 7.8** Within 30 days of the review, and/or following the presentation to Mission Directorate Management, the chair, in conjunction with the review manager, shall provide a final written report for the record.
- 7.9** Current Schedule of Activities – Shown in table below:

Description/Activity	Date (Number of meetings days) *	Location
Coordinate with POCs to review and modify Terms-of-Reference (ToR)	May – June 2014 (Approximately 60 hours)	No Travel
Chair Training	NLT two weeks after chair is brought on board (1 day)	Possible travel to LaRC
Pre-Planning Meeting	June 2014 (1 day)	KSC
SRB Kickoff	July 2014 (2 days)	KSC
eKDP1 Readiness Assessment meeting	November 2014 1 day	No Travel
SRB Site Review	December 2014 – January 2015 (2 days, 2 trips)	KSC

Snap Shot Briefing	February 2015	Preparation, Coordination, and Briefing via Telecon (approx. 20 hrs.)
SRB Chair Draft Briefing Package for SRB Vetting	March 2015	No Travel (approx. 20 hours)
IPAO/IPCE Dry Run	March 2015	Telecon (Four Hours)
CMC Briefing	March 2015 (Date TBD, assume 1 day meeting)	KSC
Briefing to HEOMD PMC	March 2015 (Date TBD, assume 1 day meeting)	HQ
Briefing to APMC	April 2015 (Date TBD, assume 1 day meeting)	HQ
SRB Final Report due by Chair	March 2015 (Date TBD, assume 1 day meeting)	No Travel (10 hours)
Review Follow-up Activities	April - May 2015 (Approximately 80 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 air fares, if needed, shall be approved for official travels.

**7.11** 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 Task Point of Contact (TPOC)**

TBD

TPOC Responsibilities:

- 8.1** The TPOC for the Task Order on the contract, as identified above. The TPOC 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 contractor Task Lead assigned to your task. Ensure the contractor 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 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 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:**

**1.1** Exploration Systems Development (ESD) Cross Program, Space Launch Systems (SLS), Multi-Purpose Crew Vehicle (MPCV), Ground Systems Development and Operations (GSDO) 2013-2015 Reviews and Standing Review Board (SRB).

(POP: 1/10/13 – 9/23/15, ORG: IPAO)

**2. Contractual References:**

**2.1 Statement of Work Reference:** This requirement is pursuant to the contract, between National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA) Langley Research Center (LaRC) and the contractor. 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 the contract), 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 the contract.

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

**3.1** NASA has been tasked by the Administration, with Congressional authorization, to develop the next generation capability to provide human access to space, with lift capability and crew accommodations to support missions beyond low Earth orbit (LEO). Responsibility to oversee this development activity is assigned to the Human Exploration and Operations Mission Directorate (HEOMD). Within HEOMD, the Exploration Systems Division (ESD) Division is charged with coordination and integration of three major programs that comprise this development initiative. The Space Launch Systems (SLS) Program, assigned to the Marshall Space Flight Center (MSFC), is responsible for developing a heavy-lift launch vehicle with sufficient capability to enable exploration beyond LEO. The Orion Multi-Purpose Crew Vehicle (MPCV) Program, assigned to the Johnson Space

Center (JSC), is responsible for developing a crew capsule that supports the long-range exploration needs of NASA. The Ground Systems Development and Operations (GSDO) Program, assigned to the Kennedy Space Center (KSC), is responsible to plan and outfit the ground capabilities in support of the necessary ground processing and launch operations for exploration and other missions.

SLS, MPCV, and GSDO have been classified as programs by the Agency, with management and resources provided to their respective centers. However, due to unique interdependencies among these programs, an integration function is assigned to the HEOMD, ESD Division, which will perform cross-program integration and execute reviews to assure that Agency technical, cost, and schedule commitments are being met. There will be a coordinated cross-program System Definition Review (SDR) at the ESD level assessing the confirmation of the design activities among the three programs that leads to a second Agency Key Decision Point (KDP). Preliminary Design Reviews and later Lifecycle Reviews (LCRs) including annual checkpoints to verify program design activities remain in alignment and compliance with HQ requirements will be conducted. Program-level life cycle events will be subject to independent review and KDP events at Agency Program Management Councils (APMCs).

**3.2** A Standing Review Board (SRB) is responsible for independently assessing the health of the three programs and the cross program at various life cycle gates and KDPs. Independent reviews of programs are conducted at defined lifecycle milestones and are used to objectively assess the program's progress against the program plan, its readiness to proceed to the next lifecycle phase, compliance with the latest versions of NPR 7120.5 and NPR 7123.1 requirements, and the integrated baseline.

**3.3** The purpose of this task is to obtain support for the ESD SRB, specifically for both a technical consultant and an S&T specialist SRB consultant to provide his/her expert opinion and counsel to the ESD SRB for these programs on program management for large developmental programs with fixed/flat budget from the private sector.

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

**4.1** The Contractor shall provide the following:

**4.1.1** The independent services of a consultant to the ESD SRB for technical and program management input to the ESD SRB as it relates to the ESD, SLS, MPCV, and GSDO technical and programmatic progress throughout its life cycle.

**4.2** The SRB Team Members are to serve on a non-consensus board. Specific duties of the Team Members shall include, but are not limited to:

**4.2.1** Review Formulation:

- 4.2.1.1 Coordinate with the SRB Chair on project risk areas.
- 4.2.1.2 Coordinate the Review Manager (RM) on review administration and logistics prior to meetings and throughout reviews.
- 4.2.1.3 Plan and prepare for review assignments.

**4.2.2** Review Execution:

- 4.2.2.1 Coordinate and perform assigned review activities for the programs reviews with the SRB Chair and the RM.
- 4.2.2.2 Assure availability to fully participate in each review and caucus/meeting.
- 4.2.2.3 Assure conduct of comprehensive program reviews in accordance with the latest versions of NPR 7120.5 and NPR 7123.1 in an integrated manner with the program technical approach and its corresponding programmatic performances.
- 4.2.2.4 Participate in team discussions of all relevant findings and recommendations on the program reviews and other 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.
- 4.2.2.6 Support reviews as a Subject Matter Expert in the areas of technical and program management.

**4.2.3** Review Reporting:

- 4.2.3.1 Assure results for each of the reviews are documented and provided to the SRB Chair and RM.
- 4.2.3.2 Each Individual Member Individual Reports (IMIRs) shall be submitted electronically using the IPAO template to the RM as a key task deliverable prior to the adjourning of the SRB caucus accompanies each review.
- 4.2.3.3 A draft may be submitted initially with all sections completed to the best judgment of the SRB consultant with a stipulation that a final version of the IMIR shall be submitted no later than 48 hours from the last caucus day.
- 4.2.3.4 In accordance with SRB Handbook guidance, the SRB consultant shall ensure that all identified issues, concerns, and observations are properly documented with appropriate background

information, specific associated risks, and explicit tractable realistic recommendations.

4.2.3.5 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.

4.2.3.6 The Contractor shall support the SRB Chair and RM for a verbal out-brief to the programs at the conclusion of each review if needed to clarify findings.

4.2.3.7 Support the SRB Chair and the RM for the preparation of a “snap shot” summary after each program review.

4.2.3.8 Support the SRB Chair and the RM for preparation of the SRB draft report and briefing package with direct inputs and detailed recommendations.

4.2.3.9 Upon request by the SRB Chair or the RM, support the Dry Run briefing for the IPAO, and a pre-briefing to the Director of Evaluation.

4.2.3.10 Upon request by the SRB Chair or the RM, provide support for the delivery of briefings to Center Management Councils (CMCs), the programs, the ESD Control Board (ECB), Human Exploration and Operations Mission Directorate Program Management Council (DPMC), and the Agency Program Management Council (APMC), respectively separated or combined.

**4.2.4** The SRB Contractor shall have overall responsibility for the full participation of the aforementioned reviews of this task, which includes analysis of the ESD Programs in the areas of management, technical, risk, schedule and cost from outside the advocacy chain of these programs.

**4.2.5** The SRB Contractor shall keep the SRB Chair and RM apprised of all correspondences and discussions that pertain to the conduct of the review or dissemination of results. (Note: All reports shall be reviewed and approved by the IPAO prior to release. Official correspondence shall be routed through the IPAO).

**4.3 Scientific and Technical Specialist support:** In addition to the Consultants, the S&T Specialist Consultant is requested to participate in the ESD/SLS/MPCV/GSDO SRB Reviews. Remote participation in the reviews is possible at times as dictated by the Review Chair; on-site participation in the SRB reviews is also expected but an exception may be granted by the Review Chair upon request. The Scientific and Technical Specialist may offer specific scientific, technical, and programmatic information only, when required by the SRB during open plenary-session or closed-session discussions. The Scientific and Technical Specialist shall not communicate to or appear before the SRB for any purpose other than to provide scientific and technical input to the SRB. The Scientific and Technical Specialist provided

under this task will not function as a full SRB member but will function as a technical consultant to the SRB to provide scientific and technical input related to the area of expertise identified below when required by the SRB and only in response to specific requests for such scientific and technical input. 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 other Consultants, the participating Scientific and Technical Specialist shall not provide an Individual Member Independent Report (IMIR) or any objective assessment or evaluation of the Program/project nor make a material contribution to developing such assessments or evaluations. Findings and recommendations intended to influence the Review Board, or the NASA Decision Authority, in association with NASA's decision-making process, shall not be solicited by the Review Board from the Scientific and Technical Specialist nor provided by the Scientific and Technical Specialist. The Scientific and Technical Specialist may submit RFAs to the Review Chair only for the purpose of requesting additional information that the 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 Review Board RFA sponsor as required. RFA forms can be used by other members of the review team to request additional information needed to complete an assessment, or to capture suggested approaches for resolving scientific, technical and/or programmatic challenges (while not offering a specific solution).

The technical specialists may offer, and/or Review Team members may request, specific scientific and technical and programmatic information only during open plenary-session or closed-session discussions. Requests for input must be limited to specific scientific and technical questions and not involve an expert in a particular discipline opining on all matters within that discipline that might arise during SRB activity. The scientific and technical consultant is limited to answering and providing input on specific, targeted scientific and technical questions.

#### Special Provisions Applicable to the S&T Specialist Consultant:

- Unlike technical advisors specifically hired to support the SRB (e.g. support service contractors), the participating scientific and technical specialist shall not provide an Individual Member Independent Report (IMIR) to the Review Chair or otherwise participate in general SRB discussions or caucuses.
- 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 Review Team, nor provided by the scientific and technical specialist.
- Similar to members of the audience, scientific and technical specialists

may submit RFAs to the Review Team Chair for the sole purpose of assisting with providing scientific and technical input. The Review Team Chair will assess their suitability and assign a review team sponsor as required.

- RFA forms can be used by the scientific and technical specialist solely to request additional information needed to provide scientific and technical input in response to a specific request for scientific and technical input, or to capture suggested approaches for resolving scientific and technical and/or programmatic challenges (while not offering a specific solution).

- The SRB Chair must make clear to all members that the scientific and technical consultant is limited to providing scientific and technical information in response to specific questions or requests for such input.

**4.4** The contractor shall prepare completion documents for task closeout purposes, as required.

**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 the contract 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 contract 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**

The contractor OCI task specific plan and technical approach dated 5/1/13 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.

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

**6.8** Applicable Documents, the latest versions of 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 [see **Optional Form (OF) 347 Block 15**]. Interim event dates may change based on direction of the TM. Changes to the completion date shall be approved by the Contracting Officer.

1. Current Schedule of Activities – activities currently scheduled for the SRB ESD programs reviews are listed below:
2. Number of people per trip 2.

<b>Description/Activity</b>	<b>Date (Number of meetings days) *</b>	<b>Location</b>
ESD SDR SRB pre-coordination telecom	1/9/13 (2 hrs)	Telecom
ESD SDR Kickoff/SRB Meetings	1/15-18/13 (3.5 days)	JSC/Houston
ESD SDR Tabletops/SRB Meetings	2/5-8/13 (3.5 days)	JSC/Houston
ESD SDR SRB Meetings	2/12-15/13 (3.5 days)	KSC/Cape Canaveral
ESD SDR SRB Meetings	2/26 – 3/1/13 (3.5 days)	JSC/Houston
ESD SDR Verbal Outbrief	3/5/13 (2 hrs)	Telecom
ESD SDR Snapshot	3/7/13 (.5 hrs)	Telecom
ESD SDR ECB Outbrief	3/15/13 (2 hrs)	Telecom
ESD SDR DPMC Outbrief	3/26/13 (2 hrs)	Telecom
ESD SDR APMC Outbrief	4/2/13 (2 hrs)	Telecom
ESD SDR Other Activities (document/products review, IMIR development, etc.) (60 hours)	January – March 2013	No travel
SLS PDR Readiness Assessment	4/2/13 (2 hrs)	Telecom
SLS PDR SRB Telecom	4/18/13 (2 hrs)	Telecom
SLS PDR SRB Telecom	5/2/13 (2 hrs)	Telecom
SLS PDR Kickoff/SRB Meetings	5/14-17/13 (3.5 days)	MSFC/Huntsville
SLS PDR Tabletops/SRB Meetings	6/4-7/13 (3.5 days)	MSFC/Huntsville
SLS PDR SRB Meetings	7/9-12/13 (3.5 days)	JSC/Houston
SLS PDR SRB Meetings	7/16-19/13 (3.5 days)	JSC/Houston
SLS PDR Verbal Outbrief	7/23/13 (2 hrs)	Telecom
SLS PDR Snapshot	7/25/13 (.5 hrs)	Telecom
SLS PDR CMC Outbrief	8/1/13 (2 hrs)	Telecom
SLS PDR DPMC Outbrief	8/8/13 (2 hrs)	Telecom
SLS PDR APMC Outbrief	8/15/13 (2 hrs)	Telecom
SLS PDR Other Activities (document/products review, IMIR development, etc.) (60 hours)	April – August 2013	No travel
ESD Annual Checkpoint SRB pre-coordination telecom	9/12/13 (2 hrs)	Telecom
ESD Annual Checkpoint Kickoff/SRB Meetings	10/1-4/13 (3.5 days)	JSC/Houston
ESD Annual Checkpoint Tabletops/SRB Meetings	10/15-18/13 (3.5 days)	JSC/Houston
ESD Annual Checkpoint SRB Meetings	11/28-31/13 (3.5 days)	KSC/Cape Canaveral
ESD Annual Checkpoint SRB Meetings	11/12-15/13 (3.5 days)	JSC/Houston
ESD Annual Checkpoint Verbal Outbrief	11/18/13 (2 hrs)	Telecom
ESD Annual Checkpoint ECB Outbrief	11/22/13 (2 hrs)	Telecom
ESD Annual Checkpoint DPMC Outbrief	11/27/13 (2 hrs)	Telecom
ESD Annual Checkpoint APMC Outbrief	12/4/13 (2 hrs)	Telecom
ESD Annual Checkpoint Other Activities (document/products review, IMIR development, etc.) (60 hours)	September - December 2013	No travel
GSDO PDR Readiness Assessment	12/6/13 (2 hrs)	Telecom
GSDO PDR SRB Telecom	12/12/13 (2 hrs)	Telecom

GSDO PDR SRB Telecom	1/9/14 (2 hrs)	Telecom
GSDO PDR Kickoff/SRB Meetings	1/14-17/14 (3.5 days)	KSC/Cape Canaveral
GSDO PDR Tabletops/SRB Meetings	1/28-31/14 (3.5 days)	KSC/Cape Canaveral
GSDO PDR SRB Meetings	2/11-14/14 (3.5 days)	JSC/Houston
GSDO PDR SRB Meetings	2/25-28/14 (3.5 days)	JSC/Houston
GSDO PDR Verbal Outbrief	3/4/14 (2 hrs)	Telecom
GSDO PDR Snapshot	3/7/14 (.5 hrs)	Telecom
GSDO PDR CMC Outbrief	3/14/14 (2 hrs)	Telecom
GSDO PDR DPMC Outbrief	3/18/14 (2 hrs)	Telecom
GSDO PDR APMC Outbrief	3/21/14 (2 hrs)	Telecom
GSDO PDR Other Activities (document/products review, IMIR development, etc.) (60 hours)	December 2013 - March 2014	No travel
MPCV PDR Readiness Assessment	5/1/14 (2 hrs)	Telecom
MPCV PDR SRB Telecom	5/8/14 (2 hrs)	Telecom
MPCV PDR SRB Telecom	5/15/14 (2 hrs)	Telecom
MPCV PDR Kickoff/SRB Meetings	5/27-30/14 (3.5 days)	MSFC/Huntsville
MPCV PDR Tabletops/SRB Meetings	6/10-13/14 (3.5 days)	MSFC/Huntsville
MPCV PDR SRB Meetings	6/24-27/14 (3.5 days)	JSC/Houston
MPCV PDR SRB Meetings	7/8-11/14 (3.5 days)	JSC/Houston
MPCV PDR Verbal Outbrief	7/15/14 (2 hrs)	Telecom
MPCV PDR Snapshot	7/17/14 (.5 hrs)	Telecom
MPCV PDR CMC Outbrief	7/22/14 (2 hrs)	Telecom
MPCV PDR DPMC Outbrief	7/29/14 (2 hrs)	Telecom
MPCV PDR APMC Outbrief	8/5/14 (2 hrs)	Telecom
MPCV PDR Other Activities (document/products review, IMIR development, etc.) (60 hours)	May 2014 - August 2014	No travel
ESD Annual Checkpoint SRB pre-coordination telecom	9/12/14 (2 hrs)	Telecom
ESD Annual Checkpoint Kickoff/SRB Meetings	10/1-4/14 (3.5 days)	JSC/Houston
ESD Annual Checkpoint Tabletops/SRB Meetings	10/15-18/14 (3.5 days)	JSC/Houston
ESD Annual Checkpoint SRB Meetings	11/28-31/14 (3.5 days)	KSC/Cape Canaveral
ESD Annual Checkpoint SRB Meetings	11/12-15/14 (3.5 days)	JSC/Houston
ESD Annual Checkpoint Verbal Outbrief	11/18/14 (2 hrs)	Telecom
ESD Annual Checkpoint ECB Outbrief	11/22/14 (2 hrs)	Telecom
ESD Annual Checkpoint DPMC Outbrief	11/27/14 (2 hrs)	Telecom
ESD Annual Checkpoint APMC Outbrief	12/4/14 (2 hrs)	Telecom
ESD Annual Checkpoint Other Activities (document/products review, IMIR development, etc.) (60 hours)	September - December 2014	No travel
SLS CDR SRB pre-coordination telecom	12/2/14 (2 hrs)	Telecom
SLS CDR Kickoff/SRB Meetings	12/9-12/15 (3.5 days)	MSFC/Huntsville
SLS CDR Tabletops/SRB Meetings	1/6-9/15 (3.5 days)	MSFC/Huntsville

SLS CDR SRB Meetings	1/20-23/15 (3.5 days)	KSC/Cape Canaveral
SLS CDR SRB Meetings	2/3– 6/15 (3.5 days)	JSC/Houston
SLS CDR Verbal Outbrief	2/9/15 (2 hrs)	Telecom
SLS CDR Snapshot	2/11/15 (.5 hrs)	Telecom
SLS CDR CMC Outbrief	2/16/15 (2 hrs)	Telecom
SLS CDR DPMC Outbrief	2/19/15 (2 hrs)	Telecom
SLS CDR APMC Outbrief	2/23/15 (2 hrs)	Telecom
SLS CDR Other Activities (document/products review, IMIR development, etc.) (60 hours)	December 2014 – February 2015	No travel
MPCV CDR SRB pre-coordination telecom	2/2/15 (2 hrs)	Telecom
MPCV CDR Kickoff/SRB Meetings	2/24-27/15 (3.5 days)	JSC/Houston
MPCV CDR Tabletops/SRB Meetings	3/10-13/15 (3.5 days)	JSC/Houston
MPCV CDR SRB Meetings	3/24-27/15 (3.5 days)	KSC/Cape Canaveral
MPCV CDR SRB Meetings	3/31– 4/3/15 (3.5 days)	JSC/Houston
MPCV CDR Verbal Outbrief	4/7/15 (2 hrs)	Telecom
MPCV CDR Snapshot	4/9/15 (.5 hrs)	Telecom
MPCV CDR CMC Outbrief	4/14/15 (2 hrs)	Telecom
MPCV CDR DPMC Outbrief	4/17/15 (2 hrs)	Telecom
MPCV CDR APMC Outbrief	4/20/15 (2 hrs)	Telecom
MPCV CDR Other Activities (document/products review, IMIR development, etc.) (60 hours)	February– April 2015	No travel
GSDO CDR SRB pre-coordination telecom	4/22/14 (2 hrs)	Telecom
GSDO CDR Kickoff/SRB Meetings	5/5-8/15 (3.5 days)	KSC/Cape Canaveral
GSDO CDR Tabletops/SRB Meetings	5/19-22/15 (3.5 days)	KSC/Cape Canaveral
GSDO CDR SRB Meetings	6/2-5/15 (3.5 days)	KSC/Cape Canaveral
GSDO CDR SRB Meetings	6/9-12/15 (3.5 days)	JSC/Houston
GSDO CDR Verbal Outbrief	6/15/15 (2 hrs)	Telecom
GSDO CDR Snapshot	6/17/15 (.5 hrs)	Telecom
GSDO CDR CMC Outbrief	6/19/15 (2 hrs)	Telecom
GSDO CDR DPMC Outbrief	6/24/15 (2 hrs)	Telecom
GSDO CDR APMC Outbrief	6/30/15 (2 hrs)	Telecom
GSDO CDR Other Activities (document/products review, IMIR development, etc.) (60 hours)	April – June 2015	No travel
ESD Annual Checkpoint SRB pre-coordination telecom	7/8/15 (2 hrs)	Telecom
ESD Annual Checkpoint Kickoff/SRB Meetings	7/14-17/15 (3.5 days)	JSC/Houston
ESD Annual Checkpoint Tabletops/SRB Meetings	7/21-24/15 (3.5 days)	JSC/Houston

ESD Annual Checkpoint SRB Meetings	8/4-7/15 (3.5 days)	KSC/Cape Canaveral
ESD Annual Checkpoint SRB Meetings	8/11-14/15 (3.5 days)	JSC/Houston
ESD Annual Checkpoint Verbal Outbrief	8/18/15 (2 hrs)	Telecom
ESD Annual Checkpoint ECB Outbrief	8/20/15 (2 hrs)	Telecom
ESD Annual Checkpoint DPMC Outbrief	8/27/15 (2 hrs)	Telecom
ESD Annual Checkpoint APMC Outbrief	9/3/15 (2 hrs)	Telecom
ESD Annual Checkpoint Other Activities (document/products review, IMIR development, etc.) (60 hours)	July - September 2015	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 airfares, if needed, shall be approved for official travels.

3. Changes to interim delivery dates shall be coordinated with and approved by the RM. 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 Point of Contact (TPOC):**  
TBD

Technical Point of Contact Responsibilities:

**8.1** The TPOCs 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 8.2 below. Please pay particular attention to the limitations/cautions listed in Paragraph 8.3 below.

- 8.2** The following authority and responsibilities are hereby assigned to the TPOC:
- a. Monitor task technical performance. Ensure that the Contractor complies with the Statement of Work or specifications included in the task. Notify the COR 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 the COR if the requirement exists to give technical direction. Only the COR can give technical direction.
  - c. Monitor the Contractor's expenditure of cost on the task. Review periodic reports received from the Contractor on Task Order progress and cost. Report any discrepancies, concerns, and questions to the COR.
  - d. Notify COR of any changes required to the Task Order/Delivery Order. Only the CO/COR can issue these changes.
  - e. Notify the CO/COR of any violation of the terms and conditions of the task/contract or any other Contractor action considered detrimental to the Government.

- f. Send an information copy to the COR of any correspondence exchanged with the Contractor regarding the Task Order/Delivery Order.
- g. For CPARs evaluation purposes, review and evaluate Contractor's performance and provide annual written reports to the COR for consideration in the evaluation of Contractor performance.
- h. Monitor Contractor computer usage on the task.
- i. Review the Task Order/Delivery Order deliverables and advise the COR on acceptability. Recommend to the COR closeout of the Task Order/Delivery Order when all requirements have been completed.
- j. Other duties as follows: Ensure all OCI/PCI adjudications are enforced.

**8.3** The duties delegated in this appointment 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. TPOCs primary interface will be with the contractor Task Lead assigned to your task. Ensure the contractor 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/Delivery Order or until rescinded in writing by the CO or COR on this contract.

**1. Task Order Title:**

**1.1** Gravity Recovery and Climate Experiment Follow On (GRACE FO) Project Standing Review Board (SRB) Support for Review Activities Through FY15. (POP: 4/17/13 – 9/30/14, ORG: IPAO)

**2. Contractual References:**

**2.1 Statement of Work Reference:** This requirement is pursuant to the contract between National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA) Langley Research Center (LaRC) and the contractor. 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 the contract), 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 the contract.

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

**3.1** GRACE FO is managed by the Jet Propulsion Laboratory (JPL), with participation by NASA Goddard Space Flight Center (GSFC) and the German space agency. GRACE FO is a follow on project to the ongoing GRACE mission and is currently scheduled for launch in 2017. GRACE FO will enable scientists to continue measuring variations in Earth's gravity field both spatially and temporally. GRACE FO is a project within the Earth Science Division of NASA's Science Mission Directorate. It is managed out of the Earth Systematic Missions Program Office at GSFC.

**3.2** A Standing Review Board (SRB) 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 purpose of this task is to obtain two SRB members through FY15 to provide SME evaluation in the primary areas of power systems and science in support of the SRB for the GRACE-FO CDR in February, 2015 and SIR in June, 2015.

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

**4.1** The Contractor shall provide the following:

**4.1.1** The independent services of two GRACE FO project SRB technical consultants for the GRACE FO project review activities through FY15.

**4.2** The technical consultants to serve on a non-consensus board with expert support. Specific duties of the Team Members shall include, but are not limited to:

**4.2.3** Review Formulation:

4.2.1.1 Coordinate with the SRB Chairman on project risk areas.

4.2.1.2 Coordinate with the Review Manager (RM) on review administration and logistics prior to meetings and throughout reviews.

4.2.1.3 Plan and prepare for review assignments.

**4.2.4** Review Execution:

4.2.1.1 Coordinate and perform assigned review activities for the design reviews with the Chairman and the RM.

4.2.1.2 Assure availability to fully participate in each review and caucus

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

4.2.1.4 Participate in team discussions of all relevant findings and recommendations resulting from the reviews.

4.2.1.5 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.

4.2.1.6 Support reviews as a Subject Matter Expert in the areas of 1) Power, Electrical and Avionics Systems, Laser Ranging Instrumentation, Systems Engineering and Project Management, 2) Geodesy Science.

#### **4.2.4** Review Reporting:

- 4.2.3.11 Assure results for each of the reviews are documented and provided to the SRB Chairman and RM.
  - 4.2.3.12 All Individual Member Individual Reports (IMIRs) shall be submitted electronically using the IPAO template to the RM as a key task deliverable prior to the adjourning of the SRB caucus that follows each site visit.
  - 4.2.3.13 A draft may be submitted initially with all sections completed to the best judgment of the SRB member with a stipulation that a final version of the IMIR shall be submitted no later than 48 hours from the last caucus day.
  - 4.2.3.14 In accordance with SRB Handbook guidance, the SRB members shall ensure that all identified issues, concerns, and observations are properly documented with appropriate background information, specific associated risks, and explicit tractable realistic recommendations.
  - 4.2.3.15 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.
  - 4.2.3.16 The SRB members shall support the SRB Chairman and RM for a verbal out-brief to program/project at the conclusion of the site review if needed to clarify findings.
  - 4.2.3.17 Support the SRB Chairman and the RM for the preparation of a “snap shot” summary after each life cycle review.
  - 4.2.3.18 Support the SRB Chairman and the RM for preparation of the SRB draft report and briefing package with direct inputs and detailed recommendations.
  - 4.2.3.19 Upon request by the SRB Chairman or the RM, support the Dry Run briefing for the IPAO, and a pre-briefing to the Director of Evaluation.
  - 4.2.3.20 Upon request by the SRB Chairman or the RM, provide support for the delivery of briefings to the JPL Center Management Council, the Earth Systematic Missions Program Office, the Earth Sciences Division, and the Science Mission Directorate Program Management Council PMC.
- 4.2.6** The SRB team members shall have overall responsibility for the full participation of the aforementioned reviews of this task, which includes analysis of the GRACE FO Project in the areas of management, technical, risk, schedule and cost from outside the advocacy chain of this project.
- 4.2.7** The SRB Team Members shall keep the SRB Chairman and IPAO RM apprised of all correspondences and discussions that pertain to the

conduct of the review or dissemination of results. (NOTE: All reports shall be reviewed and approved by the IPAO prior to release. Official correspondence shall be routed through the IPAO).

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

5.2. 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 the contract 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 contractor 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

The contractor OCI task specific plan and technical approach dated Rev C08-13-14F is hereby referenced and incorporated in its entirety into this task order.

**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.
- 6.9** The contractor shall plan for the following estimated travel. The contractor shall plan for the travel required in section 7, below.
- 6.10** Non-Disclosure Agreements. All contractor personnel shall have a signed non-disclosure agreement prior to commencement of work under this task order.
- 6.11** 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. Changes to the completion date shall be approved by the Contracting Officer.

- 4. Current Schedule of Activities –** There will be two reviews which require support in FY15 – the Project CDR and the Project SIR. There will be several meetings and activities associated with these reviews:

Description/Activity	Date (Number of meetings days) *	Location	Hours	People
Microwave Instrument (MWI) PDR	June, 2013 (2)	JPL	60	2
Accelerometer PDR	Sept., 2013 (2)	JPL	30	1
Laser Ranging Interferometer Tech Readiness Assessment	Nov., 2013 (2)	JPL	60	2
Fault Protection PDR	Nov, 2013(1)	JPL	16	1
PDR Kickoff	Dec., 2013	Telecon	16	2
GRACE FO Programmatic Assessment Review	Jan., 2014	Telecon	16	2
Document Review, Review Preparation, and Follow-up	Jan., 2014	Telecon	68	2
GRACE FO PDR	Jan., 2014 (5)	Cologne, Germany	80	2
MWI CDR	May, 2014	JPL	50	2
Accelerometer CDR	May, 2014	JPL	30	1
Laser Ranging Interferometer CDR	May, 2014	JPL	30	2
Mission Data System/Ground Data System PDR	July, 2014	Cologne, Germany	30	1

GRACE-FO CDR SRB Kickoff	Dec, 2014	Telecom	8	2
GRACE-FO CDR	Feb, 2015	Cologne, Germany	80	2
GRACE-FO CDR Document Review, Review Preparation and Follow Up	Feb, 2015	Telecom	68	2
GRACE-FO SIR SRB Kickoff	May, 2015	Telecom	8	2
GRACE-FO SIR	June, 2015	Cologne, Germany	80	2
GRACE-FO SIR Document Review, Review Preparation and Follow Up	June, 2015	Telecom	68	2

\*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.

5. Changes to interim delivery dates shall be coordinated with and approved by the TM. The Government has unlimited rights to all deliverables of this Order.

**8. NASA Technical Point of Contact (TPOC):**  
TBD

Technical Point of Contact Responsibilities:

**8.1.** The TPOC for the Task Order on the contract, as identified above. The TPOCs 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, and 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 contractor Task Lead assigned to your task. Ensure the contractor 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 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 InSight (Interior Exploration Using Seismic Investigations, Geodesy, and Heat Transport) Project Standing Review Board (SRB) Chair Support for Preliminary Design Review (PDR), Critical Design Review (CDR), System Integration Review (SIR)

(POP: 3/12/13 – 9/23/15, ORG: IPAO)

**2. Contractual References:**

2.1 **Statement of Work Reference:** This requirement is pursuant to the contract between National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA) Langley Research Center (LaRC) and the contractor. 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 the contract), 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 the contract.

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

3.1 The InSight mission is hosted by JPL and managed out of MSFC as part of the Discovery New Frontiers/Lunar Quest Program Office. InSight will investigate the interior structure and processes of Mars, relating these to the evolution of all rocky planets, and will determine its present level of tectonic activity and meteorite impact flux. The InSight mission will reveal the processes of formation and differentiation of the Martian core and crust, and illuminates the evolution of its interior by determining:

- The thickness and structure of the crust;
- The composition and structure of the mantle;
- The size, composition, and physical state of the core;
- The thermal state of the interior;
- The rate and distribution of internal seismic activity

- And the rate of meteorite impacts on the surface
- 3.2 A Standing Review Board is responsible for independently assessing the health of the Program. Independent reviews of Programs 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.
- 3.3 The purpose of this task is to obtain support for the InSight Project life cycle reviews, subsystem reviews, and associated activities.
4. **Description of the Work to be Performed:** The Contractor shall perform the following task requirements:
- a. The Contractor shall provide the following:
    - i. The independent services of SRB Chair for the InSight Project life cycle reviews, subsystem reviews, and associated activities.
  - b. The SRB Chair is to serve on a non-consensus board. Specific duties of the Chair shall include, but are not limited to:
    - i. Review Formulation:
 

Coordinate with Review Manager (RM), Science Mission Directorate (SMD)/ Program Executive (PE)/Project Manager (PM) or their designated point-of-contact (POC), to prepare the Terms of Reference (ToR) as applicable.

Coordinate with RM the identification of the required skill set needed on the SRB to conduct an integrated, holistic, assessment of the InSight project.

Coordinate with the PE, PM, and the RM on high risk areas and the review agenda.

Coordinate the review readiness assessment meetings for the life cycle reviews with the Project and the RM as specified in NPR 7120.5.

Coordinate with the RM, SMD/PE/PM or their designated POC, to appropriately structure the SRB for each review.

Coordinate with SRB members to assure appropriate team member participation.
    - ii. Review Execution:
 

Coordinate with RM and set schedule for SRB telecons and kickoff meetings. Conduct a readiness meeting with the project and provide the state of readiness to proceed notification with the review to the IPAO Director via email approximately 30 calendar days prior to the review

Assure conduct of comprehensive independent life cycle review (ILCR) for InSight in accordance with NPR 7120.5 and NPR 7123.1 in an integrated fashion encompassing the project technical approach and its corresponding programmatic performances. The SRB Chair shall be responsible for ensuring the SRB reviews all pertinent project, constituent subsystem, and

programmatic requirements, interface documentation, project control plans and maturity products as applicable for the review.

Lead SRB for all reviews, SRB caucus, and discussions to deliberate team findings and recommendations for all reviews, as applicable

Assure the capture of all SRB inputs including Request For Action (RFA) as well as Individual Member Input Reports (IMIR) from each SRB member

Monitor performance of SRB members on review assignments to ensure that they are complete and commensurate with the expected quality on the deliverable

Support reviews as a Subject Matter Expert in Program Management

Plan and prepare review assignments for the SRB.

iii. Review Reporting:

Conduct verbal out-brief to program/project at the conclusion of the applicable review site visit.

Within 48 hours (two work days) of the Project site review completion, prepare and coordinate with the project a “snap shot” summary briefing, and brief the Convening Authorities.

Within approximately one week after the site review prepare and coordinate with the RM an SRB draft report for the site review including the IMIRs.

The SRB Chair shall perform the following briefings for the site reviews:

No later than ten calendar days after the site review, present the SRB Dry Run briefing to the IPAO Director.

After the IPAO Dry Run, finalize the SRB briefing package.

After the IPAO Dry Run and within 20 calendar days after the site review one pager summary briefing, present briefings to the JPL Center Management Council (CMC), and the Program Office, respectively separated or combined.

One week before the SMD Program Management Council (PMC), submit the SRB report/briefing package and present a pre-briefing to the NASA SMD Associate Administrator.

The InSight Project SRB Chair shall participate in and lead the review reporting activities, provide expert advice, support the disposition of open actions or RFAs, and develop review findings during the preparation of a final report.

In accordance with SRB Handbook guidance, the SRB Chair shall coordinate with the SRB to ensure that all identified issues, concerns, and observations are properly and clearly stated with appropriate background information, specific associated risks, and explicit recommendations.

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.

The SRB Chair shall be responsible for providing to the RM, the executive summary, NPR 7120.5 and NPR 7123.1 stop-light assessment rating and explanatory text and conclusion sections of the SRB report.

The SRB Chair is required to review the final edited (for clarification) SRB report, coordinate and accept professional editorial changes, and sign it in a timely fashion.

The InSight SRB Chair shall have overall responsibility for leading the conduct of the site reviews which includes the analysis of the InSight project by an independent team composed of management, technical, risk, schedule and cost experts from outside the advocacy chain of this program. The key deliverables for all these reviews shall include the documenting and presenting the review findings in the associated management briefing charts and the SRB Chair Report. In addition, a Chair summary report shall be included as a key deliverable for participating on any project internal reviews. See section 8 for review execution and deliverable details.

The InSight SRB Chair shall keep the IPAO RM apprised of all correspondences and discussions that pertain to the conduct of the review or dissemination of results. (Note: All reports shall be reviewed and approved by the IPAO prior to release. Official correspondence shall be routed through the IPAO).

**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 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 contractor 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

The contractor OCI task specific plan and technical approach dated 2/11/13 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 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:** Interim event dates may change based on direction of the  
TM. Changes to the completion date shall be approved by the Contracting Officer.

7.1 Current Schedule of Activities – The next scheduled ILCR is the InSight Preliminary Design Review (PDR) in August 2013. Follow-on Life Cycle Reviews will be scheduled at later dates. Activities, and associated briefings for the PDR are listed below:

7.2 Within 5 days of each review, the ISS SRB Chair shall collect narrative input from all SRB members to develop, with the IPAO RM's assistance, briefing packages and a final written report.

7.3 At least 30 days prior to the site review, the ISS SRB Chair, in conjunction with the IPAO RM, will perform a readiness assessment of the materials and documents, and report the results of that assessment to the convening authorities.

7.4 Within 48 hours of the conclusion of the site review, the ISS SRB Chair will develop a snap shot quick look summary of the status of the project and potential findings to be vetted with the ISS Program and then provided to the Convening Authorities.

7.5 Within 5 days of each review, the ISS SRB Chair shall collect narrative input from all SRB members to develop, with the IPAO RM's assistance, briefing packages and a final written report.

7.6 Within 30 days of the review, or at a time agreed to by all parties, the ISS SRB Chair shall provide a status briefing to the Agency Program Management Council (APMC) detailing the technical findings of the SRB and addressing the adequacy of the cost and schedule resources.

7.7 Within 30 days of the review, and/or following the presentation to Mission Directorate Management, the chair, in conjunction with the review manager, shall provide a final written report for the record.

7.8 Current Schedule of Activities – The next scheduled ILCR is the Sustainment and Utilization Program Implementation Review in May 2013. Follow-on Program Implementation Reviews and the Decommissioning Review will be scheduled at later dates. Activities, and associated briefings for the Sustainment and Utilization Program Implementation Review are listed below:

Description/Activity	Date (Number of meetings days) *	Location
Coordinate with POCs to review and modify Terms-of-Reference (ToR) and plan for PIR	March, 2013 – April 2013 (Approximately 60 hours)	No Travel
SRB Kickoff	May, 2013 ( 2 days, 1 trip)	JPL
Subsystem Reviews	April-August, 2013 (Approximately 2 days each trip, 3 trips)	Denver, CO
PDR Readiness Assessment meeting	July, 2013 (Date TBD) 1 day	No Travel

Pre-review Site Visit	June 2013 (Date TBD) 2 days, 1 trip	JPL
SRB Site Review	August, 2013 (4 days, 1 trip)	Denver, CO
Snap Shot Briefing	August, 2013	Preparation, Coordination, and Briefing via Telecon (approx. 20 hrs.)
SRB Chair Draft Briefing Package for SRB Vetting	August, 2013	No Travel (approx. 20 hours)
IPAO/IPCE Dry Run	August, 2013	Telecon (Four Hours)
CMC Briefing	September 2013 (Date TBD, assume 1 day meeting)	JPL
Briefing to SMD PMC	September 2013 (Date TBD, assume 1 day meeting)	HQ
SRB Final Report due by Chair	September 2013	No Travel (10 hours)
Review Follow-up Activities for	September – October 2013 (Approximately 80 Hours)	No Travel
Period of Performance – End		9/23/15

\*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.

7.9 Changes to interim delivery dates shall be coordinated with and approved by the TM. The Government has unlimited rights to all deliverables of this Order.

**8. NASA Task Monitor**  
TBD

**1. Task Order Title:**

**1.1** The Joint Polar Satellite System (JPSS) Standing Review Boards (SRB)  
(POP: 1/4/13 – 9/23/15, ORG: IPA0)

**2. Contractual References:**

**2.1 Statement of Work Reference:** This requirement is pursuant to the contract between National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA) Langley Research Center (LaRC) and the contractor. 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 the contract), 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 the contract.

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

**3.1** The JPSS Program is a joint NOAA/NASA Program to develop space-flight instruments and ground systems for the Nation's next generation of polar-orbiting weather satellites. The program has content under development by both NOAA and NASA. Within NOAA, JPSS is managed by the JPSS Director. Within NASA, JPSS is a Program within the Joint Agency Satellite Division (JASD) of the Science Mission Directorate (SMD) of NASA. The JPSS Joint NOAA/NASA Program is being hosted at Goddard Space Flight Center (GSFC).

**3.2** A Standing Review Board is responsible for independently assessing the health of the Program and its flight missions. Independent reviews of Program and 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 7120.5E, NPR 7123.1, NASA Space Flight Program and Project Management Handbook requirements and the SRB Handbook.

**3.3** The purpose of this task is to obtain SRB support in conducting JPSS Program and its projects life-cycle reviews (LCR), prepare review documents & presentations, review activities for the JPSS, including the JPSS Program, JPSS-1 (J1), and JPSS-2 (J2) Flight Missions.

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

The Contractor shall perform the following task requirements in conducting reviews specified in Section 7.1:

- 4.1** The Contractor shall provide the independent services of a JPSS SRB Chair to conduct all the specified JPSS LCRs and associated activities.

For each review, specific duties of the SRB Chair shall include:

##### **4.1.1 Chair Review Formulation:**

- 4.2.2.1** Coordinate with Review Manager (RM), SMD/JASD Program Executive (PE), JPSS P/p Managers or designated point-of-contacts (POC), and GSFC Technical Authority (TA) or the Center representative to prepare the Terms of Reference (ToR), and participate in the review planning process as applicable.
- 4.2.2.2** Coordinate with the RM, SMD PE, and GSFC TA or equivalent, on high risk areas and the review agenda.
- 4.2.2.3** Coordinate the review readiness assessment meetings for the specified LCR's with the RM, and the respective P/p office as specified in NPR 7120.5.
- 4.2.2.4** Coordinate with the RM, SMD/JASD Director, and P/p leadership or designated POC, to appropriately structure the SRB for each review.
- 4.2.2.5** Coordinate with the RM and SRB members to assure appropriate team member participation.

##### **4.1.2 Chair Review Execution:**

- 4.2.2.1** For each specified LCR, after coordinating with the RM and the SRB Program Analysts on review documentation and requirements, perform a readiness review with the respective P/p, and provide the state of readiness to proceed notification to the IPAO Director via email at least 30 calendar days prior to each of the stated review.
- 4.2.2.2** For each specified review, assure conduct of comprehensive independent life cycle review (ILCR) in accordance with NPR 7123.1 and NPR 7120.5 in an integrated fashion encompassing the P/p technical approach and its corresponding programmatic performances. The SRB Chairman shall be responsible for ensuring the SRB reviews all pertinent project, constituent subsystem, and programmatic requirements, interface documentation, project control plans and maturity products as applicable for the respective LCR.

- 4.2.2.3** Lead SRB for all reviews, SRB caucus, and discussions to deliberate team findings and recommendations for all reviews, as applicable.
- 4.2.2.4** Assure the capture of all SRB inputs including Request for Actions (RFA) as well as Individual Member Input Reports (IMIR) from each SRB member.
- 4.2.2.5** Monitor performance of SRB members on review assignments to ensure that they are complete and commensurate with the expected quality on the deliverables.
- 4.2.2.6** Support other pertinent meetings as required.

#### **4.1.3 Chair Review Reporting:**

- 4.2.2.1** Conduct verbal out-brief to program/project at the conclusion of each applicable LCR site visit.
- 4.2.2.2** Within 48 hours (two work days) of each LCR site-review, and SRB caucus completion, prepare and coordinate with the project a “snap shot” summary briefing, and brief the Convening Authorities.
- 4.2.2.3** Within approximately one week after the LCR site-review, prepare and coordinate with the RM an SRB draft report including the IMIRs for each respective review to be vetted by both the SRB and the project.
- 4.2.2.4** For each specified review, the SRB Chair shall perform the following briefings for the site-review:
  - 4.1.3.4.1 No later than ten calendar days after the site review, present the SRB Dry Run briefing to the IPAO Director and the OE Director.
  - 4.1.3.4.2 After the IPAO Dry Run, finalize the SRB briefing package.
  - 4.1.3.4.3 After the IPAO Dry Run and within 30 calendar days post site-visit for each review, present briefings to GSFC Center Management Council (CMC), the JPSS Program Office, the JASD, the SMD Program Management Council (PMC), and the APMC, respectively.
  - 4.1.3.4.4 One week before the APMC, submit the SRB report/briefing package and present a pre-briefing to the NASA Associate Administrator.
- 4.2.2.5** The SRB Chair shall participate in and lead the review reporting activities, provide expert advice, support the disposition of open actions or RFAs, and develop review findings during the preparation of a final report.

4.1.3.5.1 In accordance with SRB Handbook guidance, the SRB Chair shall coordinate with the SRB to ensure that all identified issues, concerns, and observations are properly and clearly stated with appropriate background information, specific associated risks, and explicit recommendations.

4.1.3.5.2 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.

4.1.3.5.3 The SRB Chair shall be responsible for providing to the RM, the executive summary, NPR 7120.5 and NPR 7123.1 stop-light assessment rating and explanatory text and conclusion sections of the SRB report.

4.1.3.5.4 The SRB Chair is required to review the final edited (for clarification) SRB report, coordinate and accept professional editorial changes, and acknowledge the inclusion of the SRB IMIRs attachments that are non-consensus by the nature of the board composition, and sign it in a timely fashion.

**4.1.4** The SRB Chair shall have overall responsibility for leading the conduct of each specified LCR which includes the analysis of the JPSS P/p progress by an independent team composed of management, technical, risk, schedule and cost experts from outside the advocacy chain of this program. The key deliverables shall include the documenting and presenting the review findings in the associated management briefing charts and the SRB Chair Report. In addition, a Chair-person summary report shall be included as a key deliverable for participating on any project internal or sub-system reviews. See section 7 for review execution and deliverable details.

**4.1.5** The SRB Chair shall keep the RM apprised of all correspondences and discussions that pertain to the conduct of the review or dissemination of results. (Note: All reports shall be reviewed and approved by IPAO management prior to release. Official correspondence shall be routed through the IPAO.)

**4.2** The Contractor shall provide the independent services of SRB members (or consultants) for the specified LCRs. Each member shall be a Subject Matter Expert (SME) in one or more areas including but not limited to Program/project management, Systems Engineering, Risk Management, Spacecraft Systems, Launch Vehicle Management, Science Instrument Systems Development, Satellite Remote-sensing of Atmospheric Measurements & Interpretation, Weather and Atmospheric Science, Oceanography, Polar Orbit Weather Satellite Operations & Management, Complex System Integration and Testing, and Ground Systems Mission Operations for Satellite Weather Products. Together with the Chair, the members are to serve on the JPSS non-consensus board.

For each review, specific duties of the JPSS SRB Team members (consultants) shall include, but are not limited to:

#### **4.2.1 Member Review Formulation:**

- 4.2.2.1** Coordinate with the SRB Chair on project risk areas.
- 4.2.2.2** Coordinate with Review Manager (RM) on review logistics prior to the SRB Kick-Off meeting and throughout the review.
- 4.2.2.3** Plan and prepare for review assignments.

#### **4.2.2 Member Review Execution:**

- 4.2.2.1** Coordinate and perform assigned review activities for the respective review with the Chair and the RM.
- 4.2.2.2** Assure availability to fully participate in each review and caucus.
- 4.2.2.3** Assure conduct of comprehensive respective review 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 respective review and other review results.
- 4.2.2.5** As originator for RFA, issue/concern, support the detailed documentation (including explicit recommendations or appropriate rationales) and closure of such open items.
- 4.2.2.6** Support reviews as a SME in one or more areas of specialization as listed in Section 4.2.

#### **4.2.3 Member Review Reporting:**

- 4.2.2.1** Assure results for each of the reviews are documented and provided to the SRB Chair and RM. All IMIRs shall be submitted electronically using the IPAO template to the RM as a key task deliverable prior to the adjourning of the SRB caucus that follows each site visit.
  - 4.2.3.1.1** A draft may be submitted initially with all sections completed to the best judgment of the SRB member with a stipulation that a final version of the IMIR shall be submitted no later than 48 hours from the last caucus day.
  - 4.2.3.1.2** In accordance with SRB Handbook guidance, the SRB members shall ensure that all identified issues, concerns, and observations are properly documented with appropriate background information, specific associated risks, and explicit tractable realistic recommendations.
  - 4.2.3.1.3** 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.

- 4.2.2.2 The SRB members shall support the SRB Chair and RM for a verbal out-briefs to program/project at the conclusion of the site review if needed to clarify findings.
- 4.2.2.3 Support the SRB Chair and the RM for the preparation of a “snap shot” summary after each site-review.
- 4.2.2.4 Support the SRB Chair and the RM for preparation of the SRB draft report and briefing package with direct inputs and expert’s detailed recommendations.
- 4.2.2.5 Upon request by the SRB Chair or the RM, support the Dry Run briefing for the IPAO, and a pre-briefing to the Director of Evaluation.
- 4.2.2.6 Support the finalization of the SRB briefing package in a timely manner as requested by the SRB Chair or the RM.
- 4.2.2.7 Upon request by the SRB Chair or the RM, provide support for the delivery of briefings to the GSFC Center Management Council (CMC), the JPSS P/p Office, the SMD PMC, and the APMC, respectively.

4.2.4 The Contractor shall be responsible for executing the reviews on all pertinent P/p and constituent subsystem requirements, interface documentation, project control plans and maturity products for the aforementioned reviews of this task.

4.2.5 The Contractor shall participate in the review planning activities, provide expert advice, support the disposition of open actions, and develop report findings during the preparation of a final report. Additionally, the team members/consultants shall attend other pertinent meetings as required and shall provide meeting/trip summary in written report format to the SRB Chair and the RM of the JPSS P/p SRB.

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

4.2.7 The Contractor shall keep the SRB Chairman and IPAO RM apprised of all correspondences and discussions that pertain to the conduct of the review or dissemination of results. (Note: All reports shall be reviewed and approved by the IPAO prior to release. Official correspondence shall be routed through the IPAO).

4.3 The Contractor shall prepare completion documents for task closeout purposes.

**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 the Contract 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 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 contractor 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 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, 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.

### 6.1.3 Cost

The contractor shall utilize pre-negotiated 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 will be conducted unless adequately justified in accordance with FAR Parts 6 and 44.

## 6.2 Organizational Conflict of Interest

The contractor OCI task plan and technical approach dated 5/29/13 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 7.2 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/>.

**6.8** All contractor personnel (Chair and SRB members) under this task shall be required to complete the necessary NASA IT-procedural processes to successfully obtain a NASA AUID, and an account on NASA Safety Center Knowledge Now (NSCKN) server to access JPSS community of practice data repository in support of the specified JPSS reviews.

**7. Period of Performance/Deliverables/Schedule:**

**7.1** The table below specifies major LCR’s planned for the JPSS Program and the J1 Mission. For Mod #2, Program/PIR

<b>Program/Project</b>	<b>Life-Cycle Review</b>	<b>Tentative Date</b>
JPSS Program	Program/SDR (existing)*	May 2013
	Program/PIR <sup>1</sup>	May 2015
J1 Flight Mission	Mission/PDR (existing)*	Feb* & May* 2013
	Mission/CDR <sup>1</sup>	Feb 2014
	Mission/SIR <sup>1</sup>	Aug 2014

\*Note: In Section 7.7 (“Schedule of Activities”) detailed in the initial JPSS SRB Task award (Order date 1/4/2013), the items and respective dates were for a 1-step J1 Mission/PDR LCR. Due to P/p readiness, the 1-step review was adjusted and adopted a 2-step review with step-2 limited to programmatic assessment. Items 1 thru 6 were completed by 3/5/2013, and planning for step-2 continued. To economize and minimize schedule delay, step-2 for M/PDR will be executed during the Program/SDR week in May 2013; and items (6 thru 11) will be completed jointly for both reviews.

**7.2** Period of performance shall be from the date of task-order issuance through 09/23/15. Review and interim event dates may change based on direction of the Technical Point of Contact (TPOC) to accommodate P/p readiness. At least 30 days prior to a LCR, the TPOC will notify the Contractor to confirm or adjust the planned review date. Change to the task completion date shall be approved by the Contracting Officer.

**7.3** For each of the specified LCR’s in Section 7.1, SRB activities, and associated briefings are listed but not limited to items identified in the table below. Management briefings maybe virtual (i.e. telephone/WebEx, and videos), or in-person. Whenever travel is required for in-person briefing, RM will notify the Contractor and authorize as necessary to proceed.

#	Description of Activity	Duration (# days)*	Location	Required	
				Chair	Member
1	Subsystem Reviews, 2 ea. per member	3	Colorado, GSFC	Y	Y
2	SRB Discussion/Telecon (Total 6 for 1 hour ea.)	---	Telecon/WebEx	Y	Y
3	Readiness to Proceed Assessment & Notification to IPAO Director	1	GSFC	Y	---
4	Kick-off Meeting	1	GSFC	Y	Y
5	LCR – Site-Review & Caucus	5	GSFC	Y	Y
6	LCR Snap-shot Briefing	1	Telecon	Y	---
7	OE/IPAO Dry-run Briefing	1	Telecon/WebEx	Y	---
8	CMC Out-Brief	1	GSFC	Y	---
9	<del>SMD Division Briefing by PE</del> (Removed)	<del>4</del>	<del>NASA HQ</del>	<del>If asked</del>	<del>---</del>
10	NESDIS/SMD PMC Out-Brief (& KDP memo as needed)	1	NASA HQ	Y	---
11	NOAA/NASA APMC Out-Brief, SRB Final Report & respective KDP memo	1	NASA HQ	Y	---
12	Review follow-up & close-out activities (2 hour per member)	---	Online	Y	Y

\*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 Deliverables:** (identified but not limited to items in table below)

**7.4.1** SRB members/consultants will provide written reports to the SRB Chair and RM of documents reviewed (as assigned by the SRB Chair) and meetings/reviews attended as requested.

**7.4.2** Within 3 days of each subsystem review or ILCR, the SRB Chair and/or SRB members/consultants shall submit a written report in the Individual Members Independent Report (IMIR) format that will be provided by the RM.

**7.4.3** The SRB Chair and SRB members/consultants will prepare Requests for Actions (RFAs) during the ILCR and work with JPSS, SRB Chair, and RM in the review of recommended closures.

**7.4.4** Within 48 hours of the conclusion of the site review, the SRB Chair will develop a snap shot quick look summary of the status of the project and potential findings to be vetted with the JPSS and then provided to the Convening Authorities.

**7.4.5** Within 5 days of each ILCR, the SRB Chair shall collect narrative input from all SRB members and develop, with the RM’s assistance, a briefing package, that, when completed with annotations, will also serve as the final written report.

**7.4.6** The assessment final report / briefing shall be presented by the SRB Chair to the CMC, DPMC, and APMC in standard IPAO MS PowerPoint formats. Where possible, the SRB Chair shall complete and submit the final documentation a minimum of 10 calendar days before the scheduled briefing date or according to the schedule events in the next section. The SRB members/consultants will support the SRB Chair and/or the RM as requested in the review of the briefings.

#	Description of Product	Due Date <sup>^</sup> (# days)	Required	
			Chair	Member
1	Subsystem Review Report	3*	Y	Y
2	Individual Members Independent Report (IMIR)	3*	Y	Y
3	RFA & Closure	TBD	Y	---
4	Snap-Shot Report (AKA. “One-Pager”)	2**	Y	---
5	Narrative Report post LCR’s (expanded IMIR)	5**	Y	Y
6	SRB Briefing Charts for IPAO Dry-Run, CMC & DPMC	5**	Y	---
7	SRB Final Briefing with Annotated Notes before GPMC (APMC or can be DPMC) -	10**	Y	---
8	Chair/RM Signed Final Annotated Briefing post GPMC	1**	Y	---
9	Review follow-up & close-out activities	TBD	Y	Y

<sup>^</sup> Except when there is written communication from RM to Contractor, “Due Date” as specified in the table take precedent in cases where conflicting value is noted elsewhere in the SOW.

\*Due Date is the number of work-days post review activity completion

\*\*Due Date is the number of days prior to the identified briefing (or activity).

1. **Task Order Title:**

1.1 James Webb Space Telescope (JWST) Standing Review Board (SRB) Chair and Member Support  
(POP: 5/21/13 – 9/23/15, ORG: IPAO)

2. **Contractual References:**

2.1 **Statement of Work Reference:** This requirement is pursuant to the contract between National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA) Langley Research Center (LaRC) and the contractor. 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 the contract), 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 the contract.

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

3.1. The JWST Program is developing a very large deployable infrared observatory whose 6.5-meter aperture mirror and instruments will allow it to detect light from what are believed to be the earliest stars in the universe. The 6.5 meter primary mirror consists of 18 segments that must be deployed and aligned. To accomplish this objective, the observatory will be placed in orbit at the earth-sun L-2 point and the telescope and instrument complement will operate at approximately 45 degrees Kelvin (-378 degrees Fahrenheit). The SRB will be responsible for independently assessing the health of the project at various life cycle gates and Key Decision Points (KDPs).

3.2. A Standing Review Board (SRB) 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 purpose of this task is to obtain support for the JWST independent reviews and associated activities.

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

- 4.1** The contractor shall provide the independent consultant services of the JWST SRB Chair, who shall work with the Independent Program Assessment Office (IPAO) Review Manager (RM) 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.
- 4.2** Specific duties of JWST SRB Chair include, but are not limited to:
  - 4.2.5 The JWST SRB Chair shall organize and lead the SRB for all review activities. The Chair shall review pertinent program documentation prior to field reviews, attend and provided leadership for all review activities, provide expert advice, support the disposition of open actions and develop report findings in the preparation of a final report.
  - 4.2.6 The JWST SRB Chair shall keep the IPAO RM apprised of all correspondences and discussions that pertain to the conduct of reviews or the dissemination of results. All reports shall be reviewed and approved by the IPAO prior to release. Official correspondence shall be routed through the IPAO.
  - 4.2.7 The JWST SRB Chair shall lead discussion sessions at the end of each day during any site reviews to identify major findings and considerations of the proceedings and prepare for follow-on activities.
  - 4.2.8 The Chair shall support teleconferences as required.
  - 4.2.9 The JWST SRB Chair shall, with the active support of the IPAO RM, coordinate all reports, briefings, and briefing schedules concerning JWST assessments.
  - 4.2.10 The JWST SRB Chair shall provide independent analysis and assessment of the JWST project's technical and programmatic progress throughout its life cycle. The results of these assessments shall be reported to senior NASA management.
- 4.3** Specific duties of JWST SRB Members include, but are not limited to:
  - 4.3.1 Review relevant project milestone documentation, as requested, prior to attending review meetings.
  - 4.3.2 Assess the presented material and maturity of gate products, and identify any findings, comments and/or Requests For Action (RFAs).

- 4.3.3 Evaluate project progress using the review success criteria for each review, as defined in the GSFC Project Review Plan, to judge whether or not the review objectives have been satisfied.
- 4.3.4 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.
- 4.3.5 Provide inputs to cost and schedule risk assessments and analyses.
- 4.3.6 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".
- 4.3.7 Write the individual member independent report (IMIR) (strengths, issues and concerns, including recommendations, and observations).
- 4.3.8 Participate in post-review discussions.
- 4.3.9 Prepare and submit inputs to the SRB report based on guidance from the SRB Chair.
- 4.3.10 Raise concern to the SRB Chair if the RFA originator disagrees with the project's disposition of the RFA.
- 4.3.11 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.
- 4.3.12 Support reviews as a Subject Matter Expert in Project Management and Launch Vehicle.

**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 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 contractor 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**

The contractor OCI task specific plan and technical approach dated Rev F 07-07-14F 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.

**6.12** The contractor shall plan for the following estimated travel. The contractor shall plan for the travel required in section 7, below.

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

**6.14** 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 TM. Changes to the completion date shall be approved by the Contracting Officer.

7.1 Current Schedule of Activities – The next scheduled event is the JWST LV TIM in September 2014. Activities are listed below:

Description/Activity	Date (Number of meetings days) *	Location/Duration	Participants
----------------------	----------------------------------	-------------------	--------------

1. JWST Focused Assessment and Associated Activities	June 2013	NASA JSC (2 Days), NASA HQ (2 Days)	Chair +2 Members
2. Program Quarterly Management Review	Aug-13, Oct- 13, Jan-14, April -14	NASA HQ (1 Day)	Chair +2 Members
3. NIRCAM PSR	June-13	NASA GSFC (3 Days)	Chair
4.S/C Structures & Mechanisms CDR	June-13	NGST, Redondo Beach, CA (3 Days)	Chair
5. ISIM Cryovac1 RRTR	Jul-13	NASA GSFC (3 Days)	Chair
6. Spacecraft CDR	Dec -13	NGST, Redondo Beach, CA (3 Days)	Chair
7. ISIM Flight Model Pre-Environmental	March – 14	NASA GSFC (2 Days)	Chair
9. Observatory I&T review	April – 14	NGAS (3 days)	Chair
10. SLR coordination tag up with review team	May 6	Telecom	Chair
11. ISIM Flight Model Pre-Environmental	May 7-9	GSFC (2 days)	Chair
12. Spaceraft Lien Status and Look Back Review	May 12 – 15	GSFC 4 days)	Chair, Launch Vehicle Expert
13. ISIM Cryo #2 TRR	June 12-13	GSFC (2days)	Project Management Expert (1)
14. LV TIM	Sept 2014	Evry, France (1 Day)	Launch Vehicle Expert (1)
15. OTE Deployment Review 1 (ADIR)	Jan 2015	NGST, Redondo Beach, CA (1 Day)	Project Management Expert (1)
16. OTIS Delta Design Review	March 2015	NASA GSFC (1 Day)	Project Management Expert (1)
17. Observatory Deployment Review – 1	March 2015	NGST, Redondo Beach, CA (1 Day)	Project Management Expert (1)
18. OTE Deployment Review 2 (SMSS & PBMA Mech & DTA)	June 2015	NGST, Redondo Beach, CA (1 Day)	Project Management Expert (1)

19. ISIM Cryo 3 Test Readiness	August 2015	NASA GSFC (1 Day)	Project Management Expert (1)
20. LV TIM	Sept 2015	Evry, France (1 Day)	Launch Vehicle Expert (1)
20. SRB Member Support (includes Document and Risk Reviews, SRB telecons, and RFA processing)	July 2014 - Sept 2015 (100 hrs)	N/A	Project Management Expert (1) and Launch Vehicle Expert (1)
21. SRB Member Pending Reviews	July 2014 – Sept 2015 (2 trips each member)	TBD (3 days)	Project Management Expert (1) and Launch Vehicle Expert (1)

\* 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 TM. Changes to the completion date must be approved by the Contracting Officer. The Government has unlimited rights to all deliverables of this Order.

**1. Task Order Title:**

**1.1 Mars 2020 (M2020) Standing Review Boards (SRB).**  
(POP: 4/29/14 – 9/30/14, ORG: IPAO)

**2. Contractual References:**

**2.1 Statement of Work Reference:** This requirement is pursuant to the contract, between NASA Langley Research Center and Science Applications International Corporation. Refer to Paragraphs 4.0 Assessments.

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

- **Unequal Access to Information:** Situations in which a firm has access to non-public information as part of its performance of a government contract which may provide a competitive advantage in a later competition.

As described in NASA Clause 1852.209-71 (Clause H.3, Limitation of Future Contracting, contained in the contract), 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 the contract.

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

- 3.4.** The Mars 2020 Project is an assigned mission within the Mars Exploration Program of NASA's Science Mission Directorate (SMD). The Mars 2020 Project is managed for NASA by Jet Propulsion Laboratory (JPL). The Mars 2020 Project primary mission goals are:
- a.** To characterize the geologic context and history of a landing site and, using the acquired geologic information, determine the habitability of an ancient environment, assess the biosignature preservation potential within that environment, and seek signs of ancient Martian life within the geologic record.
  - b.** And/or address the exploration technology objectives to assess in situ resources, identify hazards, and characterize the environment.
  - c.** Enable future Mars exploration by identifying and rigorously selecting a suite of samples for placement into a cache for potential future return to Earth.

The Mars 2020 mission will use the proven design and technology developed for the Mars Science Laboratory (MSL) mission and rover (Curiosity) that arrived at Mars in August 2012. The mission will fly a near-duplicate of the MSL rover outfitted with new scientific instruments to meet the above

objectives. The mission will be designed to seek signs of past life on Mars, and collect and store a compelling set of soil and rock samples that could possibly be returned to Earth in the future by a different mission. The Mars 2020 mission may include payloads to test new technology to benefit future robotic and human exploration of Mars.

- 3.5. A Standing Review Board (SRB) 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 7120.5E, NPR 7123.B1, NASA Space Flight Program and Project Management Handbook requirements and the SRB Handbook.
- 3.6. The purpose of this task is to obtain support for the M2020 life cycle reviews starting with the SRR through ORR. This includes subsystem reviews and associated activities.

4. **Description of the Work to be Performed:** The contractor shall provide for the services of the M2020 SRB Chair and SRB members/consultants as follows. Initially, this task will provide Chair services. A modification to the task will be submitted when member task details are developed after the Chair is selected.

4.1 The contractor shall provide the independent services of a M2020 SRB Chair for the M2020 ILCRs. Specific duties of the SRB Chair shall include:

4.1.1 Review Formulation:

- 4.2.1.1 Coordinate with Review Manager (RM), Science Mission Directorate (SMD) Program Executive (PE), P/p Managers or designated point-of-contacts (POC), and JPL Technical Authority (TA) or the Center representative to prepare the Terms of Reference (ToR) as applicable
- 4.2.1.2 Coordinate with RM the identification of the required skill set needed on the SRB to conduct an integrated, holistic, assessment of the M2020 project.
- 4.2.1.3 Coordinate with the SMD PE, JPL TA or equivalent, and the RM on high risk areas and the review agenda
- 4.2.1.4 Coordinate the review readiness assessment meetings for all the Independent Life Cycle Reviews (ILCR) with the respective P/p office and the RM as specified in the NASA NPR 7120.5E.
- 4.2.1.5 Chair shall coordinate with the RM, SMD/PE/PM or their designated POC, to appropriately structure the SRB for each review.
- 4.2.1.6 Coordinate with SRB members to assure appropriate team member participation

#### **4.2.2 Review Execution:**

- 4.2.2.1** After coordinating with the RM and the SRB Program Analysts on review documentation and requirements, perform a readiness review as stated in 3.2.1.3 with the respective P/p and provide the state of readiness to proceed with the LCR notification to the IPAO Director via email approximately 60 calendar days prior to each of the stated review.
- 4.2.2.2** Assure conduct of comprehensive ILCRs in accordance with NPR 7123.1B, and the NPR 7120.5E in an integrated fashion encompassing the P/p technical approach and its corresponding programmatic performances. The M2020 P/p SRB Chairman shall be responsible for ensuring the SRB reviews all pertinent project, constituent subsystem, and programmatic requirements, interface documentation, project control plans and maturity products as applicable for each ILCR.
- 4.2.2.3** Lead SRB for all reviews, SRB caucus, and discussions to deliberate team findings and recommendations for all reviews
- 4.2.2.4** Assure the capture of all SRB inputs including Request For Actions (RFA) as well as Individual Member Input Reports (IMIR) from each SRB member
- 4.2.2.5** Monitor performance of SRB members on review assignments to ensure that they are complete and commensurate with the expected quality on the deliverables
- 4.2.2.6** Support other pertinent meetings as required

#### **4.2.3 Review Reporting:**

For the following activities, see section 4 for more details regarding the format and duration of the briefings

- 4.2.3.1** Conduct verbal out-brief to program/project at the conclusion of each of the ILCR site visit. If a conflict for the stated time frame is found between this section, 3, and the schedule section, 4; then the schedule section or section 4 will prevail.
- 4.2.3.2** Within 48 hours (two work days) of the ILCR SRB caucus, prepare and coordinate with the project a “one pager” summary briefing, and brief the Convening Authorities
- 4.2.3.3** Within approximately one week after the ILCR site visit, prepare and coordinate with the RM an SRB draft report including the IMIRs for each of these reviews to be vetted by both the SRB and the project
- 4.2.3.4** For these reviews, the SRB Chairman shall perform the following briefings for these reviews:

- 4.2.3.4.1** No later than five calendar days after site visit, present the SRB Dry Run briefing to the IPAO Director and the Associate Administrator (AA) of the Office of Evaluation (OoE).
  - 4.2.3.4.2** After the IPAO Dry Run, finalize the SRB briefing package
  - 4.2.3.4.3** After the IPAO Dry Run and within 30 calendar days after the site visit present briefings to the Center Management Council (CMC), the M2020 Program Office, the SMD Program Management Council (PMC), and the APMC, respectively.
  - 4.2.3.4.4** One week before the APMC, submit the SRB report/briefing package and present a pre-briefing to the NASA Associate Administrator
- 4.2.3.5** The M2020 SRB Chairman shall participate in and lead the review reporting activities, provide expert advice, support the disposition of open actions or RFAs, and develop review findings during the preparation of a final report.
- 4.2.3.5.1** In accordance with SRB Handbook guidance, the SRB Chairman shall coordinate with the SRB to ensure that all identified issues, concerns, and observations are properly and clearly stated with appropriate background information, specific associated risks, and explicit recommendations.
  - 4.2.3.5.2** 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.
  - 4.2.3.5.3** The SRB Chairman shall be responsible for providing to the RM, the executive summary, NPR 7120.5E and NPR 7123.1B stop-light assessment rating and explanatory text and conclusion sections of the SRB report
  - 4.2.3.5.4** The SRB Chairman is required to review the final edited (for clarification) SRB report, coordinate and accept professional editorial changes, and acknowledge the inclusion of the SRB IMIRs attachments that are non-consensus by the nature of the board composition, and sign it in a timely fashion.
- 4.2.4** The M2020 SRB Chairman shall have overall responsibility for leading the conduct of the ILCR which includes the analysis of the M2020 project by an independent team composed of management,

technical, risk, schedule and cost experts from outside the advocacy chain of this project. The key deliverables shall include the documenting and presenting the review findings in the associated management briefing charts and the SRB Chairman Report. In addition, a Chairman summary report shall be included as a key deliverable for participating on any project internal or sub-system reviews. See section 4 for review execution and deliverable details.

- 4.2.5** The M2020 SRB Chairman shall keep the IPAO RM apprised of all correspondences and discussions that pertain to the conduct of the review or dissemination of results. (Note: All reports shall be reviewed and approved by the IPAO prior to release. Official correspondence shall be routed through the IPAO.)

**4.2** The contractor shall provide the independent services of the M2020 SRB members/consultants for the M2020 ILCRs. Specific duties of the M2020 SRB Team members/consultants shall include the following.

i. Review Formulation:

**4.2.1.1** Members shall review project documents and provide comments and suggested areas of concern, risks, and agenda topics for the ILCR

**4.2.1.2** Members shall attend subsystem reviews as the subject matter expert as assigned by the Chair and RM

**4.2.1.3** Coordinate with Review Manager (RM) on review logistics prior to the SRB Kick-Off meeting and throughout each review

**4.2.1.4** Plan and prepare for review assignments

**4.2.2** Review Execution:

**4.2.2.4** Coordinate and perform assigned review activities for each of the ILCR with the Chairman and the RM

**4.2.2.5** Assure availability to fully participate in each review and caucus

**4.2.2.6** Assure conduct of comprehensive assessment for the ILCR in accordance with NPR 7123.1B and NPR 7120.5E in an integrated manner with the project technical approach and its corresponding programmatic performances

**4.2.2.7** Coordinate with the SRB Chair on project risk areas

**4.2.3** Review Reporting:

**4.2.3.4** Assure results for each of the reviews are documented and provided to the SRB Chair and RM. All IMIRs shall be submitted electronically using the IPAO template to the

RM as a key task deliverable prior to the adjourning of the SRB caucus that follows each site visit.

- 4.2.3.4.1** A draft could be submitted initially with all sections completed to the best judgment of the SRB member with a stipulation that a final version of the IMIR shall be submitted no later than 48 hours (3 days from the completion of the ILCR) from the last caucus day.
  - 4.2.3.4.2** In accordance with SRB Handbook guidance, the SRB members shall ensure that all identified issues, concerns, and observations are properly documented with appropriate background information, specific associated risks, and explicit tractable realistic recommendations.
  - 4.2.3.4.3** 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.
  - 4.2.3.5** Members shall provide, as requested by the Chair and RM, cost and schedule inputs to the SRB program analysts for a cost estimation and schedule analysis to be performed
  - 4.2.3.6** As originator for RFA, Issue/Concern, support the detailed documentation (including explicit recommendations or appropriate rationales) and closure of such open items  
The SRB members shall support the SRB Chair and RM for a verbal out-brief to program/project at the conclusion of the site review if needed to clarify findings
  - 4.2.3.7** Members shall participate in team discussions involving relevant findings and recommendations
  - 4.2.3.8** Support the SRB Chair and the RM for the preparation of a “snap shot” summary after each independent life-cycle review
  - 4.2.3.9** Support the SRB Chair and the RM for preparation of the SRB draft report with direct inputs and expert’s detail recommendations
  - 4.2.3.10** Upon request by the SRB Chair or the RM, support the Dry Run briefing for the IPAO, and a pre-briefing to the AA of the OoE.
  - 4.2.3.11** Support the finalization of the SRB briefing package in a timely manner as requested by the SRB Chair or the RM
  - 4.2.3.12** Upon request by the SRB Chair or the RM, provide support for the delivery of briefings to the Center Management Council (CMC), the Mars 2020 P/p Office, the SMD PMC, and the APMC, respectively.
- 4.2.4** The M2020 SRB members/consultants shall be responsible for executing the reviews on all pertinent P/p and constituent subsystem requirements, interface documentation, project control plans and maturity products for the aforementioned reviews of this task.

- 4.2.5** The M2020 SRB members/consultants shall participate in the review planning activities, provide expert advice, support the disposition of open actions, and develop report findings during the preparation of a final report. Additionally, the team members/consultants shall attend other pertinent meetings as required and shall provide meeting/trip summary as stated in section 3.3.3.1.2 to the SRB Chair and the RM.
- 4.2.6** The SRB team members/consultants shall have overall responsibility for the full participation of the aforementioned reviews of this task, which includes analysis of the M2020 project in the areas of management, technical, risk, schedule and cost from outside the advocacy chain of this program.
- 4.2.7** The SRB team members/consultants shall keep the SRB Chair and the RM apprised of all correspondences and discussions that pertain to the conduct of the review or dissemination of results. (Note: All reports shall be reviewed and approved by the IPAO prior to release. Official correspondence shall be routed through the IPAO.)

**4.3** The Contractor shall prepare completion documents for task closeout purposes

**5. Government Furnished Items:**

5.1. The Contractor will have access to technical documents, some 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 the contract and the OCI Avoidance Plan contained therein.

**6. Other Information Needed for Task Performance:** Requirements in addition to those of paragraph 4.2 above may be specified in Section 5.0 Special/Additional Requirements, Success Criteria and Assessment Products of the ToR(s) executed in the conduct of M2020 life cycle reviews.

**7. Performance Objectives:**

**7.1 Quality**

This Task will 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 will 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 contractor CEO.

## **7.2 Timeliness**

The contractor Task Leader will 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 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, 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.

## **7.3 Cost**

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

Hours (but no ODC charges) will 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 will be available to the NASA Review Manager within 10 days following each contractor pay period (twice monthly).

#### **7.4 Other**

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

#### **7.5 Organizational Conflict of Interest**

The contractor Technical Approach and OCI Plan dated Rev B 07-03-14F is hereby referenced and incorporated in its entirety into this task order.

#### **8. Deliverables/Period of Performance/Schedule: The SRB Chair and SRB members/consultants shall provide the following deliverables:**

- 8.1** SRB members/consultants shall provide reports to the SRB Chair and RM of documents reviewed (as assigned by the SRB Chair) and meetings/reviews attended as requested.
- 8.2** Within 3 days of each subsystem review or ILCR, the SRB Chair and/or SRB members/consultants shall submit a written report in the Individual Members Independent Report (IMIR) format that will be provided by the RM.
- 8.3** The SRB Chair and SRB members/consultants will prepare Requests for Actions (RFAs) during the ILCR and work with the project, SRB Chair, and RM in the review of recommended closures.
- 8.4** Within 48 hours of the conclusion of the site review, the SRB Chair will develop a snap shot quick look summary of the status of the project and potential findings to be vetted with the project and then provided to the Convening Authorities.
- 8.5** Within 5 days of each ILCR, the SRB Chair shall collect narrative input from all SRB members and develop, with the RM's assistance, a briefing package, that, when completed with annotations, will also serve as the final written report
- 8.6** The assessment final report / briefing shall be presented by the SRB Chair to the CMC, DPMC, and APMC in standard IPAO MS PowerPoint formats. Where possible, the SRB Chair shall complete and submit the final documentation a minimum of 10 calendar days before the scheduled briefing date or according to the schedule events in the next section. The SRB members/consultants will support the SRB Chair and/or the RM as requested in the review of the briefings.

**8.7** Period of performance is through signature date of this order through 9/23/15. Current Schedule of Activities – SRR and associated briefings are listed below:

Review	Notional Date	Location	Meeting Hours (Chair)	Meeting Hours (Member)	Chair Trips	SRB Member Trips
FS Baseline Workshop	April 30, 2014	JPL	20	0	Yes	No
Telecon discussions	July – Oct 2014	Telecon	20	100	No	No
Planning Meeting	May 2014	JPL	10	50	Yes	No
Landing Site Workshop	May, 2014	JPL	30	0	Yes	No
Payload Selection Meeting	June 2014	JPL	20	0	Yes	No
Program Requirements Review	June 2014	JPL	20		Yes	No
EDL Review	June 2014	JPL	10	0	Yes	No
Kickoff Meeting	Aug 2014	JPL	40	200	Yes	Yes (5)
Cost Briefings	August 2014	JPL	20	0	Yes	No
Surface Operability Review	August 2014	JPL	10	50	Yes	Yes (5)
Sampling System	August 2014	JPL	10	50	Yes	Yes (5)
SRR/MDR	Oct 2014	JPL	50	250	Yes	Yes (5)
SRB Briefing Package Prep.	Nov 2014	None	40	20	No	No
IPAO Dry Run	Nov 2014	LaRC	8	0	Yes	No
CMC Briefing	Nov 2014	JPL	4	0	Yes	No
Mars Program Office Briefing	Nov 2014	HQ	4	0	Yes	No
DPMC	Dec 2014	HQ	4	0	Yes	No
APMC	Dec 2014	HQ	4	0	Yes	No

\*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.

**8.8** Changes to delivery dates shall be coordinated with the TM and approved by the Contracting Officer. The Government has unlimited rights to all deliverables of this Order.

**9.** NASA Technical Point of Contact (TPOC)  
TBD

Technical Point of Contact 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, and 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. The TPOC is not authorized to direct or supervise Contractor employees in the accomplishment of work assignments. Your primary interface shall be with the contractor Task Lead assigned to your task. Ensure contractor Task lead remains abreast of significant information communicated

between Task Manager (NASA) and other Contractor/Subcontractor/Consultant employees.

b. TPOC's 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:**

Magnetospheric Multiscale (MMS) Project Standing Review Board (SRB) and MMS SRB Chair Support for Program Implementation Reviews (PIRs) and associated activities.

(POP: 3/6/13 – 9/23/15, ORG: IPAO)

**2. Contractual References:**

**2.1 Statement of Work Reference:** This requirement is pursuant to the contract between National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA) Langley Research Center (LaRC) and the contractor. 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 the contract), 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 the contract.

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

**3.1 Purpose:** 3.1 The MMS mission will explore the physics responsible for the transfer of energy from the solar wind to Earth's magnetosphere. Four identically instrumented spacecraft orbiting the Earth in a tetrahedral configuration will be used to conduct definitive investigations of magnetic reconnection in key boundary regions of the Earth's magnetosphere. The satellites will provide three-dimensional, high-time resolution in situ measurement of plasma and electric and magnetic fields. The instrument suite was selected by Announcement of Opportunity (AO). The MMS project is assigned to Goddard Space Flight Center (GSFC); the spacecraft bus will be developed in-house by GSFC. Launch is scheduled in 2015.

**3.2** A Standing Review Board is responsible for independently assessing the health of the Program. Independent reviews of Programs 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.

**3.3** The purpose of this task is to obtain support for the MMS Project PIRs and associated activities.

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

**4.1** The Contractor shall provide the following:

**4.1.1** The independent services of SRB Chair and SRB Members for the MMS PIRs and associated activities.

**4.2** The SRB Team Members are to serve on a non-consensus board. Specific duties of the Team Members shall include, but are not limited to:

**4.2.1** Chair Review Formulation:

4.2.1.1 Coordinate with Review Manager (RM), Science Mission Directorate (SMD) / Space Technology Portfolio (STP) Division Director, and Program Manager (PM) or designated point-of-contact (POC), to prepare the Terms of Reference (ToR) as applicable.

4.2.1.2 Coordinate with the STP Division Director, PM and the RM on high risk areas and the review agenda.

4.2.1.3 Coordinate the review readiness assessment meetings for the PIRs with the Program and the RM as specified in NPR 7120.5.

4.2.1.4 Coordinate with RM, Space Mission Directorate (SMD) / MMS HQ Division Director, and PM or designated POC, to appropriately structure the SRB for each review.

4.2.1.5 Coordinate with SRB members to assure appropriate team member participation.

**4.2.2** Board Review Formulation:

4.2.2.1 Coordinate with the SRB Chairman on project risk areas.

4.2.2.2 Coordinate the RM on review administration and logistics prior to meetings and throughout reviews.

4.2.2.3 Plan and prepare for review assignments.

**4.2.3** Chair Review Execution:

4.2.3.1 After coordinating with the RM and the SRB Program Analysts on review documentation and requirements, perform a readiness review with the project and provide the state of readiness to proceed notification with the review to the IPAO Director via email approximately 30 calendar days prior to the review

4.2.3.2 Assure conduct of comprehensive independent life cycle review (ILCR) for the MMS reviews in accordance with NPR 7123.1 and NPR 7120.5 in an integrated fashion encompassing the project technical approach and its corresponding programmatic performances. The MSS Program SRB Chair shall be responsible for ensuring the SRB reviews all pertinent project, constituent subsystem, and programmatic requirements, interface documentation, project control plans and maturity products as applicable for the review.

4.2.3.3 Lead SRB for all reviews, SRB caucus, and discussions to deliberate team findings and recommendations for all reviews, as applicable

4.2.3.4 Assure the capture of all SRB inputs including Request For Actions (RFA) as well as Individual Member Input Reports (IMIR) from each SRB member

- 4.2.3.5 Monitor performance of SRB members on review assignments to ensure that they are complete and commensurate with the expected quality on the deliverables
- 4.2.3.6 Support reviews as a Subject Matter Expert in Program Management.
- 4.2.4 Member Review Execution:**
  - 4.2.4.1 Coordinate and perform assigned review activities for the PIRs with the Chairman and the RM.
  - 4.2.4.2 Assure availability to fully participate in each review and caucus.
  - 4.2.4.3 Assure conduct of comprehensive PIRs in accordance with NPR 7120.5 and NPR 7123.1 in an integrated manner with the project technical approach and its corresponding programmatic performances.
  - 4.2.4.4 Participate in team discussions of all relevant findings and recommendations on the PIRs and other review results.
  - 4.2.4.5 As originator for RFA, issue/concern, support the detailed documentation (including explicit recommendations or appropriate rationale) and closure of such open items.
  - 4.2.4.6 Support reviews as a Subject Matter Expert in Electrical/Avionics, Ground Systems, and Payload Systems.
- 4.2.5 Chair Review Reporting:**
  - 4.2.5.1 Conduct verbal out-brief to program/project at the conclusion of the applicable review site visit.
  - 4.2.5.2 Within 48 hours (two work days) of the Project site review completion, prepare and coordinate with the project a “snap shot” summary briefing, and brief the Convening Authorities.
  - 4.2.5.3 Within approximately one week after the site review prepare and coordinate with the RM an SRB draft report for the site review including the IMIRs.
  - 4.2.5.4 The SRB Chair shall perform the following briefings for the site reviews:
    - 4.2.5.4.1 No later than ten calendar days after the site review, present the SRB Dry Run briefing to the IPAO Director.
    - 4.2.5.4.2 After the IPAO Dry Run, finalize the SRB briefing package.
    - 4.2.5.4.3 After the IPAO Dry Run and within 20 calendar days after the site review one pager summary briefing, present briefings to the GSFC Center Management Council (CMC), the SMD Program Management Council (PMC), and the APMC, respectively separated or combined.
    - 4.2.5.4.4 One week before the APMC, submit the SRB report/briefing package and present a pre-briefing to the NASA Associate Administrator.
    - 4.2.5.5 The MMS Project SRB Chair shall participate in and lead the review reporting activities, provide expert advice, support the disposition of open actions or RFAs, and develop review findings during the preparation of a final report.

4.2.5.5.1 In accordance with SRB Handbook guidance, the SRB Chair shall coordinate with the SRB to ensure that all identified issues, concerns, and observations are properly and clearly stated with appropriate background information, specific associated risks, and explicit recommendations.

4.2.5.5.2 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.

4.2.5.5.3 The SRB Chair shall be responsible for providing to the RM, the executive summary, NPR 7120.5 and NPR 7123.1 stop-light assessment rating and explanatory text and conclusion sections of the SRB report.

4.2.5.5.4 The SRB Chair is required to review the final edited (for clarification) SRB report, coordinate and accept professional editorial changes, and sign it in a timely fashion.

#### **4.2.6 Board Review Reporting:**

4.2.6.1 Assure results for each of the reviews are documented and provided to the SRB Chairman and RM.

4.2.6.2 All IMIRs shall be submitted electronically using the IPAO template to the RM as a key task deliverable prior to the adjourning of the SRB caucus that follows each site visit.

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

4.2.6.4 In accordance with SRB Handbook guidance, the SRB members shall ensure that all identified issues, concerns, and observations are properly documented with appropriate background information, specific associated risks, and explicit tractable realistic recommendations.

4.2.6.5 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.

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

4.2.6.7 Support the SRB Chairman and the RM for the preparation of a “snap shot” summary after each PIR.

4.2.6.8 Support the SRB Chairman and the RM for preparation of the SRB draft report and briefing package with direct inputs and detailed recommendations.

4.2.6.9 Upon request by the SRB Chairman or the RM, support the Dry Run briefing for the IPAO, and a pre-briefing to the Director of Evaluation.

4.2.6.10 Upon request by the SRB Chairman or the RM, provide support for the delivery of briefings to the GSFC Center Management Council, the SMD Program Management Council (PMC), and the APMC, respectively separated or combined.

#### **4.2.7 Chair Overall Responsibilities:**

The MSS SRB Chair shall have overall responsibility for leading the conduct of the site reviews which includes the analysis of the MSS Program by an independent team composed of management, technical, risk, schedule and cost experts from outside the advocacy chain of this program. The key deliverables for all these reviews shall include the documenting and presenting the review findings in the associated management briefing charts and the SRB Chair Report. In addition, a Chair summary report shall be included as a key deliverable for participating on any project internal reviews. See section 8 for review execution and deliverable details.

**4.2.8** The MSS SRB Chair shall keep the IPAO RM apprised of all correspondences and discussions that pertain to the conduct of the review or dissemination of results. (Note: All reports shall be reviewed and approved by the IPAO prior to release. Official correspondence shall be routed through the IPAO).

#### **4.2.9 Board Overall Responsibilities:**

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

**4.2.10** The SRB Team Members shall keep the SRB Chairman and IPAO RM apprised of all correspondences and discussions that pertain to the conduct of the review or dissemination of results. (Note: All reports shall be reviewed and approved by the IPAO prior to release. Official correspondence shall be routed through the IPAO).

### **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 the contract 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 contractor 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**

The contractor OCI task specific plan and technical approach dated 2/11/13 is hereby referenced and incorporated in its entirety into this task order.

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

**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 8, below.

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

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

**6.9** All contractor personnel under this task shall be required to obtain a NASA AUID, “eAuthentication” (login verification via Launchpad) to access the NASA Safety Center Knowledge Now (NSCKN) TDRS community of practice data repository.

**7. 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 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 ILCR is the MMS Operational Readiness Review (ORR) in June 2014. Follow-on Program Implementation Reviews will be scheduled at later dates. Activities, and associated briefings for the ORR are listed below:

7.2 Number of people per trip 4 unless otherwise noted below.

<b>Description/Activity</b>	<b>Date (Number of meetings days)</b>	<b>Location</b>
1. Telecons (8, 1 hour each)	May 2013 – Sep 2015	Telecon
2. Program Quarterly Management Reviews (10, 8 hours each)	2 in 2013, 4 in 2014, 4 in 2015	WebEx/Telecon
3. Review and modify Terms-of-Reference (ToR) (Chair only)	October 2013 – February 2014 (Approximately 40 hours)	No Travel
4. SRB Kickoff	May 2014	WebEx/Telecon, (3 Hours)
5. Internal Program Reviews (6, 1 Board Member)	May 2013 - Sep 2015 (Approximately 2 Days)	GSFC
6. Readiness Assessment meeting	May 2014	WebEx/Telecon, (1 Hour)
7. SRB Site Review	June 2014, 5 days	GSFC
8. Snap Shot Briefing (with Chair only)	July 2104	Preparation, Coordination, and Briefing via Telecon (approx. 16 hrs.)
9. IPAO/IPCE Dry Run (with Chair only)	July 2014	Telecon (2 Hours)
10. CMC Briefing (Chair only)	August (1 day meeting)	GSFC
11. Briefing to SMD PMC (Chair only)	September 2014 (1 day meeting)	HQ
12. Briefing to APMC/HQ (Chair only)	September 2014 (1 day meeting)	HQ
13. SRB Final Report due by Chair (Chair only)	October 2014	No Travel, (40 Hours)
14. Review Follow-up Activities	October 2014 – August 2015 (Approximately 20 Hours)	No Travel

8. **NASA Technical Point of Contact:**  
TBD

**1. Task Order Title:**

**1.1** NASA-ISRO Synthetic Aperture Radar Mission (NI-SAR) Project Standing Review Board (SRB) Support for all review activities for the Lifecycle Reviews (LCR) including the Mission Definition Review (MDR), System Definition Review (SDR) and Preliminary Non-Advocate Review (PNAR). (POP: 7/8/14 – 9/23/15, ORG: IPAO)

**2. Contractual References:**

**2.1 Statement of Work Reference:** This requirement is pursuant to the contract between National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA) Langley Research Center (LaRC) and the contractor. 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 the contract), 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 the contract.

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

**3.1** The objective of the NI-SAR mission is to understand: the response of ice sheets to climate change and the interaction of sea ice and climate; the dynamics of carbon storage and uptake in wooded, agricultural, wetland, and permafrost systems; and the likelihood of earthquakes, volcanic eruptions, and landslides. NI-SAR is a Directed mission to be implemented by the Jet Propulsion Laboratory (JPL) in partnership with the Indian Space Research Organization (ISRO). It is planned to be launched, using a Geosynchronous Satellite Launch Vehicle (GSLV Mark-II), provided by ISRO, from a launch-site in India. Primary mission operation is planned for 3 years. NI-SAR is a Category 2 project (NPR 7120.5E) & instrument risk class C (NPR8705.4).

**3.2** The SRB is responsible for independently assessing the health of the Program. Independent reviews of Programs 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 7120.5E and NPR 7123.1A requirements.

**3.3.** The purpose of this task is to obtain the SRB Chair and SRB members to perform a lifecycle review for the NI-SAR LCRs, MDR/SDR/PNAR.

**4. Description of the Work to be Performed:** The Contractor shall provide for the services of the NI-SAR SRB Chair and SRB members/consultants as follows:

**4.1** The Contractor shall provide the independent services of a NI-SAR SRB Chair for the NI-SAR LCRs. Specific duties of the SRB Chair shall include:

**4.1.1 Review Formulation:**

**4.2.5.1** Coordinate with Review Manager (RM), Science Mission Directorate (SMD) / Planetary Science Division (PSD) Program Executive (PE), P/p Managers or designated point-of-contacts (POC), and JPL Technical Authority (TA) or the Center representative to prepare the Terms of Reference (ToR) as applicable

**4.2.5.2** Coordinate with the SMD PE, JPL TA or equivalent, and the RM on high risk areas and the review agenda

**4.2.5.3** Coordinate the review readiness assessment meetings for the Critical Design Review (CDR) with the respective P/p office and the RM as specified in the NASA Interim Directive (NID) for the NPR 7120.5E, and the SRB Handbook.

**4.2.5.4** Coordinate with SRB members to assure appropriate team member participation

**4.2.6 Review Execution:**

**4.2.6.1** After coordinating with the RM and the SRB Program Analysts on review documentation and requirements, perform a readiness review as stated in 4.1.1.3 with the respective P/p and provide the state of readiness to proceed with the CDR notification to the IPAO Director via email approximately 60 calendar days prior to each of the stated review.

**4.2.6.2** Assure conduct of comprehensive independent life cycle review (ILCR) for the CDR in accordance with NPR 7123.1A, and NPR 7120.5E in an integrated fashion encompassing the P/p technical approach and its corresponding programmatic performances. The NiSAR P/p SRB Chairman shall be responsible for ensuring the SRB

reviews all pertinent project, constituent subsystem, and programmatic requirements, interface documentation, project control plans and maturity products as applicable for the CDR.

- 4.2.6.3** Lead SRB for all reviews, SRB caucus, and discussions to deliberate team findings and recommendations for all reviews
- 4.2.6.4** Assure the capture of all SRB inputs including Request For Actions (RFA) as well as Individual Member Input Reports (IMIR) from each SRB member
- 4.2.6.5** Monitor performance of SRB members on review assignments to ensure that they are complete and commensurate with the expected quality on the deliverables
- 4.2.6.6** Support other pertinent meetings as required

#### **4.2.7** Review Reporting:

For the following activities, see section 4 for more details regarding the format and duration of the briefings

- 4.2.7.1** Conduct verbal out-brief to program/project at the conclusion of each of the CDR site visit. If a conflict for the stated time frame is found between this section, and the schedule section 7.1; then the schedule section or section 7.1 will prevail.
- 4.2.7.2** Within 48 hours (two work days) of the CDR SRB caucus, prepare and coordinate with the project a “one pager” summary briefing, and brief the Convening Authorities
- 4.2.7.3** Within approximately one week after the CDR site visit, prepare and coordinate with the RM an SRB draft report including the IMIRs for each of these reviews to be vetted by both the SRB and the project
- 4.2.7.4** For these reviews, the SRB Chairman shall perform the following briefings for these reviews. All briefings should be reviewed by the IPAO:
  - 4.2.7.4.1** No later than five calendar days after site visit, present a one page/snapshot telecom briefing to the APMC.
  - 4.2.7.4.2** After the briefing to the APMC, begin work to finalize the SRB briefing package.
  - 4.2.7.4.3** Present briefings as required to the JPL Center Management Council (CMC), the NI-SAR Program Office, the NI-SAR Project, the SMD Program Management Council (PMC), and the APMC.
  - 4.2.7.4.4** No later than five calendar days after the Integrated Independent Assessment Review (IAR), present a one page/snapshot telecom briefing to the APMC.

**4.2.7.4.5** Present the final SRB briefing package within 30 calendar days after the IAR.

**4.2.7.5** The NI-SAR SRB Chairman shall participate in and lead the review reporting activities, provide expert advice, support the disposition of open actions or RFAs, and develop review findings during the preparation of a final report.

**4.2.7.5.1** In accordance with SRB Handbook guidance, the SRB Chairman shall coordinate with the SRB to ensure that all identified issues, concerns, and observations are properly and clearly stated with appropriate background information, specific associated risks, and explicit recommendations.

**4.2.7.5.2** 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.

**4.2.7.5.3** The SRB Chairman shall be responsible for providing to the RM, the executive summary, NPR 7120.5E and NPR 7123.1A stop-light assessment rating and explanatory text and conclusion sections of the SRB report

**4.2.7.5.4** The SRB Chairman is required to review the final edited (for clarification) SRB report, coordinate and accept professional editorial changes, and acknowledge the inclusion of the SRB IMIRs attachments that are non-consensus by the nature of the board composition, and sign it in a timely fashion.

**4.2.8** The NI-SAR SRB Chairman shall have overall responsibility for leading the conduct of the CDR which includes the analysis of the NI-SAR by an independent team composed of management, technical, risk, schedule and cost experts from outside the advocacy chain of this program. The key deliverables shall include the documenting and presenting the review findings in the associated management briefing charts and the SRB Chairman Report. In addition, a Chairman summary report shall be included as a key deliverable for participating on any project internal or sub-system reviews. See section 4.2.2 and 4.2.3 for review execution and reporting details.

**4.2.9** The NI-SAR SRB Chairman shall keep the IPAO RM apprised of all correspondences and discussions that pertain to the conduct of the review or dissemination of results. (Note: All reports shall be reviewed and approved by the IPAO prior to release. Official

correspondence shall be routed through the IPAO.)

- 4.3** The SRB Team Members are to serve on a non-consensus board. Specific duties of the Team Members shall include, but are not limited to:

**4.2.11** Review Formulation:

- 4.2.1.1 Coordinate with the SRB Chairman on project risk areas.
- 4.2.1.2 Coordinate the Review Manager (RM) on review administration and logistics prior to meetings and throughout reviews.
- 4.2.1.3 Plan and prepare for review assignments.

**4.2.12** Review Execution:

- 4.2.1.1 Coordinate and perform assigned review activities for the ILCR with the Chairman and the RM.
- 4.2.1.2 Assure availability to fully participate in each review and caucus
- 4.2.1.3 Assure conduct of comprehensive PIRs in accordance with NPR 7120.5E and NPR 7123.1A in an integrated manner with the project technical approach and its corresponding programmatic performances.
- 4.2.1.4 Participate in team discussions of all relevant findings and recommendations on the PIRs and other review results
- 4.2.1.5 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.
- 4.2.1.6 Support reviews as a Subject Matter Expert in the areas of Program Management, Project Management, Systems Engineering, Risk Management, Safety & Mission Assurance, Spacecraft Flight Systems, Flight Mission, Flight Ops & Software, Electrical/Avionics, Synthetic Aperture Radar, Mechanical/Mechanisms, Verification & Validation, Integration & Testing, Ground Systems, Solid Earth, Cryosphere, Ecosystem.

**4.2.5** Review Reporting:

- 4.2.3.21 Assure results for each of the reviews are documented and provided to the SRB Chairman and RM.
- 4.2.3.22 All Individual Member Individual Reports (IMIRs) shall be submitted electronically using the IPAO template to the RM as a key task deliverable prior to the adjourning of the SRB caucus that follows each site visit.

- 4.2.3.23 A draft may be submitted initially with all sections completed to the best judgment of the SRB member with a stipulation that a final version of the IMIR shall be submitted no later than 48 hours from the last caucus day.
- 4.2.3.24 In accordance with SRB Handbook guidance, the SRB members shall ensure that all identified issues, concerns, and observations are properly documented with appropriate background information, specific associated risks, and explicit tractable realistic recommendations.
- 4.2.3.25 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.
- 4.2.3.26 The SRB members shall support the SRB Chairman and RM for a verbal out-brief to program/project at the conclusion of the site review if needed to clarify findings.
- 4.2.3.27 Support the SRB Chairman and the RM for the preparation of a “snap shot” summary after each PIR.
- 4.2.3.28 Support the SRB Chairman and the RM for preparation of the SRB draft report and briefing package with direct inputs and detailed recommendations.
- 4.2.3.29 Upon request by the SRB Chairman or the RM, support the Dry Run briefing for the IPAO, and a pre-briefing to the Director of Evaluation.
- 4.2.3.30 Upon request by the SRB Chairman or the RM, provide support for the delivery of briefings to the JPL Center Management Council, the NI-SAR Program Office, the Science Mission Directorate Program Management Council PMC, and the Agency Program Management Council, respectively separated or combined.

**4.2.8** The SRB team members shall have overall responsibility for the full participation of the aforementioned reviews of this task, which includes analysis of the NI-SAR Project in the areas of management, technical, risk, schedule and cost from outside the advocacy chain of this program.

**4.2.9** The SRB Team Members shall keep the SRB Chairman and IPAO RM apprised of all correspondences and discussions that pertain to the conduct of the review or dissemination of results. (NOTE: All reports shall be reviewed and approved by the IPAO prior to release. Official correspondence shall be routed through the IPAO).

**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 the contract 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 contractor 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

The contractor OCI plan and technical approach dated Rev B 8-26-14F 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.

**6.15** The contractor shall plan for the following estimated travel. The contractor shall plan for the travel required in section 7 below.

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

**6.17** 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 2015. Interim event dates may change based on direction of the TM. Changes to the completion date shall be approved by the Contracting Officer.

**7.1** Current Schedule of Activities

Description/Activity	Date (Number of meetings days) *	Location	Required Attendance
Coordinate with POCs to review and modify Terms-of-Reference (ToR)	July, 2014 – August 2014 (Approximately 60 hours)	No Travel	Chair
Pre-Planning Meeting	July 2014 (1 day)	JPL	Chair
SRB Kickoff	August 2014 (2 days)	JPL	Chair 6 Members
TRB and PCB meetings	September - October, 2014 (main support via telecom; 2 2 day trips)	JPL	Chair 6 Members
eKDP1 Readiness Assessment meeting	November 2014 1 day	No Travel	Chair 6 Members
SRB Site Review	January 2015 (5 days)	JPL	Chair 6 Members
Snap Shot Briefing	February 2015	Preparation, Coordination, and Briefing via Telecon (approx. 20 hrs.)	Chair

SRB Chair Draft Briefing Package for SRB Vetting	March 2015	No Travel (approx. 20 hours)	Chair
IPAO/IPCE Dry Run	March 2015	Telecon (Four Hours)	Chair
CMC Briefing	March 2015 (Date TBD, assume 1 day meeting)	JPL	Chair
Briefing to SMD PMC	March 2015 (Date TBD, assume 1 day meeting)	HQ	Chair
Briefing to APMC	March 2015 (Date TBD, assume 1 day meeting)	HQ	Chair
SRB Final Report due by Chair	April 2015 (Date TBD, assume 1 day meeting)	No Travel (10 hours)	Chair
Review Follow-up Activities	March – April 2015 (Approximately 80 Hours)	No Travel	Chair

\*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.

7.2 Changes to interim delivery dates shall be coordinated with and approved by the TM. The Government has unlimited rights to all deliverables of this Order.

**8. NASA Technical Point of Contact (TPOC):**  
TBD

Technical Point of Contact Responsibilities:

**8.1.** The TPOC for the Task Order on the contract, as identified above. The TPOCs 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, and 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 contractor Task Lead assigned to your task. Ensure the contractor 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** Space Network Ground Segment Sustainment (SGSS) Project Standing Review Board (SRB) Chair and Technical Expert Support for all SRB independent review activities concerning the life cycle of the SGSS Project: (Critical Design Review (CDR); System Integration Review (SIR); and Operational Readiness Review (ORR)).  
(POP: 1/30/13 – 9/23/15, ORG: IPAO)

**2. Contractual References:**

**2.1 Statement of Work Reference:** This requirement is pursuant to the contract between National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA) Langley Research Center (LaRC) and the contractor. 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 the contract), 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 the contract.

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

**3.7.** The SGSS project is hosted for NASA at the Goddard Space Flight Center (GSFC). The SGSS project is charged with implementing a flexible and extensible ground system for the Space Network (SN) to replace the current system while maintaining the current high level of service, accommodating new users and capabilities, and reducing the effort required to operate and maintain the system. The SGSS will modify three existing ground stations and implement one new ground station. This activity is particularly challenging because the system being replaced is operational and heavily used, and ultimate testing deployment and transition activities must be performed while maintaining uninterrupted operational service for SN customers. This requires judicious sharing of operational resources including operations staff, operational spacecraft, antennae, and simulators.

- 3.8. A Standing Review Board (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 lifecycle phase, compliance with NPR 7120.5 and NPR 7123.1 requirements, and the Integrated Baseline.
- 3.9. The purpose of this task is to obtain support for the SGSS project reviews from CDR 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:

4.1.1 The independent services of an SGSS SRB Chair and one technical expert SRB member for the SGSS project reviews.

4.2 Specific duties of the SGSS SRB Chair shall include:

4.2.13 Review Formulation:

4.2.1.1 Coordinate with Review Manager (RM), Human Exploration and Operations Mission Directorate (HEOMD) / Space Communications and Navigation (SCaN) Director, and Project Manager (PM) or designated point-of-contact (POC), to coordinate independent review activities.

4.2.1.2 Coordinate with the SCaN team, SGSS team and the RM on high-risk areas and the review agenda.

4.2.1.3 Coordinate the review readiness assessment meetings for the reviews with the SGSS project, SCaN, the GSFC technical representative and the RM as specified in NPR 7120.5.

4.2.1.4 Coordinate with SRB members to assure appropriate team member participation.

4.2.14 Review Execution:

4.2.1.1 After coordinating with the RM and the SRB Program Analysts on review documentation and requirements, perform a readiness review with the project and provide the state of readiness to proceed notification with the review to the IPAO Director via email approximately 30 calendar days prior to the review

4.2.2.1 Assure conduct of comprehensive independent life cycle review (ILCR) for the SGSS reviews in accordance with

NPR 7123.1 and NPR 7120.5 in an integrated fashion encompassing the project technical approach and its corresponding programmatic performances. The SGSS SRB Chair shall be responsible for ensuring the SRB reviews all pertinent project, constituent subsystem, and programmatic requirements, interface documentation, project control plans and maturity products as applicable for the review.

- 4.2.2.2** Lead SRB for all reviews, SRB caucus, and discussions to deliberate team findings and recommendations for all reviews, as applicable
- 4.2.2.3** Assure the capture of all SRB inputs including Request For Actions (RFA) as well as Individual Member Input Reports (IMIR) from each SRB member
- 4.2.2.4** Monitor performance of SRB members on review assignments to ensure that they are complete and commensurate with the expected quality on the deliverables.
- 4.2.2.5** Support reviews as a Subject Matter Expert in Program Management.

#### **4.2.6** Review Reporting:

- 4.2.3.31** Conduct verbal out-brief to the SGSS project at the conclusion of the of the applicable review site visit.
- 4.2.3.32** Within 48 hours (two work days) of the Project site review completion, prepare and coordinate with the project a “snap shot” summary briefing, and brief the Convening Authorities: Associate Administrator for HEOMD, Chief Engineer, GSFC Center Director, Director, Office of Evaluation.
- 4.2.3.33** Within approximately one week after the site review prepare and coordinate with the RM an SRB draft report for the site review including the IMIRs.
- 4.2.3.34** The SRB Chair shall perform the following briefings for the site reviews:
  - 4.2.3.4.1** No later than ten calendar days after the site review, present the SRB Dry Run briefing to the IPAO Director.
  - 4.2.3.4.2** After the IPAO Dry Run, finalize the SRB briefing package.
  - 4.2.3.4.3** After the IPAO Dry Run and within 20 calendar days after the site review one pager summary briefing, present briefings to the Center Management Council (CMC), the HEOMD Program Management Council (PMC), and the Agency Program Management Council (APMC) as necessary, respectively separated or combined.

- 4.2.3.4.4 One week before the APMC if conducted, submit the SRB report/briefing package and present a pre-briefing to the NASA Associate Administrator.
  - 4.2.3.5** The SGSS SRB Chair shall participate in and lead the review reporting activities, provide expert advice, support the disposition of open actions or RFAs, and develop review findings during the preparation of a final report.
    - 4.2.3.5.1 In accordance with SRB Handbook guidance, the SRB Chair shall coordinate with the SRB to ensure that all identified issues, concerns, and observations are properly and clearly stated with appropriate background information, specific associated risks, and explicit recommendations.
    - 4.2.3.5.2 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.
    - 4.2.3.5.3 The SRB Chair shall be responsible for providing to the RM, the executive summary, NPR 7120.5E and NPR 7123.1 stop-light assessment rating and explanatory text and conclusion sections of the SRB report.
    - 4.2.3.5.4 The SRB Chair is required to review the final edited (for clarification) SRB report, coordinate and accept professional editorial changes, and sign it in a timely fashion.
  - 4.2.10** The SGSS Chair shall have overall responsibility for leading the conduct of the site reviews which includes the analysis of the SGSS project by an independent team composed of management, technical, risk, schedule and cost experts from outside the advocacy chain of this program. The key deliverables for all these reviews shall include the documenting and presenting the review findings in the associated management briefing charts and the SRB Chair Report. In addition, a Chair summary report shall be included as a key deliverable for participating on any project internal reviews. See section 7 for review execution and deliverable details.
  - 4.2.11** The SGSS SRB Chair shall keep the IPAO RM apprised of all correspondences and discussions that pertain to the conduct of the review or dissemination of results. (Note: All reports shall be reviewed and approved by the IPAO prior to release. Official correspondence shall be routed through the IPAO).
- 4.3** Specific duties of the SGSS technical expert SRB member shall include:

#### **4.3.1 Review Formulation:**

4.3.1.1 The SGSS technical expert SRB member (hereafter “team member”) shall participate in pre- and post-review activities by face-to-face meetings, electronic media and/or teleconferences. The team members 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 team members via the IPAO established NASA Safety Center Knowledge Now (NSCKN) website or e-mail. Part of the pre-review activities will include a kick-off meeting conducted by the RM that is intended to insure that team members have a complete and clear understanding of the SRB roles, responsibilities, duties and expectations.

4.3.1.2 The team member shall attend and actively participate in a pre-review meeting/telecon that will occur before each major review. The team members shall have a complete and clear understanding of the SRB roles, responsibilities, duties and expectations at the conclusion of these meetings.

#### **4.3.2 Review Execution:**

4.3.2.1 The team member shall review pertinent program documentation prior to the site reviews, attend and actively participate in the site review activities, provide expert advice, support the disposition of open actions and develop the final report and briefing and other activities as required. At a minimum, the team members shall assess the project in accordance with the review criteria as defined in the current versions of NPR 7120.5”E” and NPR 7123.1.

4.3.2.2 The team member shall prepare for, attend, and participate in post-site review meetings that will occur following each major review. The team members shall support the disposition of open actions, develop and deliver within five calendar days their Individual Members Independent Report (IMIR) in their area of expertise and other areas as assigned, and assist with the development and review of the final report and the Chairman’s briefing package for errors and inaccuracies.

4.3.2.3 The team member shall keep the IPAO Review Manager (RM) and SRB Chair apprised of all correspondences and discussions that pertain to the conduct of the review or dissemination of results. All reports shall be reviewed and approved by the RM prior to release. Official correspondence shall be routed through the RM for submittal by the IPAO.

#### **4.3.3 Review Reporting:**

- 4.3.3.1 The team member shall support the Chair and RM in the preparation of briefings to NASA Senior Management and/or preparation of responses to action items arising from these briefings, as required.
- 4.3.3.2 The team member shall support the Cost Analyst and Schedule Analyst by providing inputs, review, and comments as requested. The team members shall participate in teleconferences as required. The teleconferences typically to last 1 to 2 hours and occur approximately weekly (when there is not an active review) during the CDR season.

#### **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 the contract 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 contractor 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**

The contractor OCI task specific plan dated 12/07/12 and technical approach dated 1/09/13 as amended by 6/27/13 is hereby referenced and incorporated in its entirety into this task order.

## **6.3 IPAO Specific Information**

- 6.3.1 The SGSS team members shall use the following criteria for conducting assessments based on NPR 7120.5.
- 6.3.2 Alignment with and contributing to Agency needs, goals, and objectives, and the adequacy of requirements flow-down from those.
- 6.3.3 Adequacy of technical approach, as defined by NPR 7123.1 entrance and success criteria.
- 6.3.4 Adequacy of schedule.
- 6.3.5 Adequacy of estimated costs (total and by fiscal year), including Independent Cost Analyses (ICAs) and Independent Cost Estimates (ICEs), against approved budget resources.
- 6.3.6 Adequacy/availability of resources other than budget.
- 6.3.7 Adequacy of risk management approach and risk identification/mitigation.
- 6.3.8 Adequacy of management approach.

**6.4** 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.

**6.5** 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.

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

**6.8** 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 [See Optional Form (OF) 347 Block 15] Interim event dates may change based on direction of the Technical Point of Contact. Changes to the completion date shall be approved by the Contracting Officer.

7.1 Within 5 days of each review, the SGSS SRB Chair shall collect narrative input from all SRB members to develop, with the IPAO RM's assistance, briefing packages and a final written report.

7.2 At least 30 days prior to the site review, the SRB Chair, in conjunction with the IPAO RM, will perform a readiness assessment of the materials and documents, and report the results of that assessment to the convening authorities.

7.3 Within 48 hours of the conclusion of the site review, the SRB Chair will develop a snap shot quick look summary of the status of the project and potential findings to be vetted with the SGSS project and SCan and then provided to the Convening Authorities.

Description/Activity	Date	Personnel	Location/Hours/Travel	
Coordinate with POCs to prepare for review and attend Element CDRs	Jan-May 2013	Chair/SME	Approximate total of 50 hours (30 each)	Done
SRB Kickoff	5/6/13	Chair/SME	4 hours total	Done
SGSS CDR Readiness to Proceed	5/6/13	Chair	2 hours total	Done
Documentation Review	April-May 2013	Chair/SME	40 hours total	Covered
CDR Review @ GD begins	6/24/13	All	Chair and SME (5 days + travel to Scottsdale, AZ)	Covered
CDR Review Phase 1 @ GD ends	6/28/13	All		
Snapshot Telecom (plus prep)	7/2/13	Chair	Telecom @ Chair only (6 hours)	Covered
Post Phase 1 Planning	7/3/13	Chair	Chair @ 2 hours	Added
Checkpoint Meeting with SGSS Project + Preparation	8/15/13	Chair/SME	Preparation (8 hours each for 6 hours total)	Added
Checkpoint Meeting with SCan (Program) + Preparation	9/15/13	Chair/SME	2 Days each + Preparation (20 hours each for 40 hours total)	Added
Readiness to Proceed for Phase 2	9/20/13	Chair	3 hours (telecom)	Added
Programmatic Site Review Start	10/16/13	Chair/SME	2 Days each + Preparation (20 hours each for 40 hours total)	Added
Programmatic Site Review End	10/17/13	Chair/SME		Added
Snapshot Telecom (plus prep)	10/21/13	Chair	Telecom @ Chair only (6 hours)	Added
Start Development of Briefing and Draft Report	10/24/13	Chair	10 hours	Added
Briefing: IPAO/OE (Dry Run)	11/6/13	Chair	5 hours	Added
Briefing: Program/CMC	11/16/13	Chair	5 hours	Added
Briefing: DPMC (Final Brief)	11/26/13	Chair	5 hours	Added
Briefing: APMC/NA	N/A			
Report Complete Draft Report	11/26/13	Chair/RM	12 hours	Added

7.4 Within 30 days of the review, or at a time agreed to by all parties, the SRB Chair shall provide a status briefing to the Governing Program Management Council (GPMC) detailing the technical findings of the SRB and addressing the adequacy of the cost and schedule resources.

7.5 Within 30 days of the review, and/or following the presentation to Mission Directorate Management, the chair, in conjunction with the review manager, shall provide a final written report for the record.

7.6 Current Schedule of Activities – The next scheduled ILCR is the June 1, 2013

\*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.

7.7 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.

**1. Task Order Title:**

**1.1** Surface Water Ocean Topography (SWOT) Standing Review Boards (SRB)  
(POP:8/20/13 – 9/23/15, ORG: IPAO)

**2. Contractual References:**

**2.1 Statement of Work Reference:** This requirement is pursuant to the contract between National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA) Langley Research Center (LaRC) and the contractor. 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 the contract), 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 the contract.

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

**3.1** SWOT is a NASA/international partner's science mission designed to provide ocean topography measurements for determining ocean circulation, sea-level rise and climate change. It is designated as a Category 2 space-flight project. International partners include Centre National d'Etudes Spatiales (CNES) and Canadian Space Agency (CSA). Within NASA, SWOT is a mission within the Earth Science Division (ESD) of the Science Mission Directorate (SMD) of NASA. The flight mission is being hosted at Jet Propulsion Laboratory (JPL).

**3.2** A Standing Review Board is responsible for independently assessing the health of the flight project/mission. Independent reviews of the project 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 7120.5E, NPR 7123.1, NASA Space Flight Program and Project Management Handbook requirements and the SRB Handbook.

**3.3** The purpose of this task is to obtain SRB support in conducting SWOT life-cycle reviews (LCR), prepare review documents & presentations, and complete all requested management out-briefs.

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

The Contractor shall perform the following task requirements in conducting reviews specified in Section 7.1:

- 4.1** The Contractor shall provide the independent services of a SWOT SRB Chair to conduct all the specified SWOT LCRs and associated activities.

For each review, specific duties of the SRB Chair shall include:

##### **4.1.1 Chair Review Formulation:**

- 4.2.2.1** Coordinate with Review Manager (RM), SMD/ESD Program Executive (PE), SWOT Project Managers or designated point-of-contacts (POC), and JPL Technical Authority (TA) or the Center representative to prepare the Terms of Reference (ToR), and participate in the review planning process as applicable.
- 4.2.2.2** Coordinate with the RM, SMD PE, and JPL TA or equivalent, on high risk areas and the review agenda.
- 4.2.2.3** Coordinate the review readiness assessment meetings for the specified LCR's with the RM, and SWOT Project Office as specified in NPR 7120.5.
- 4.2.2.4** Coordinate with the RM, SMD/ESD Director, and Project leadership or designated POC, to appropriately structure the SRB for each review.
- 4.2.2.5** Coordinate with the RM and SRB members to assure appropriate team member participation.

##### **4.1.2 Chair Review Execution:**

- 4.2.2.1** For each specified LCR, after coordinating with the RM and the SRB Program Analysts on review documentation and requirements, perform a readiness review with the project, and provide the state of readiness to proceed notification to the IPAO Director via email at least 30 calendar days prior to each of the stated review.
- 4.2.2.2** For each specified review, assure conduct of comprehensive independent life cycle review (ILCR) in accordance with NPR 7123.1 and NPR 7120.5 in an integrated fashion encompassing the Project technical approach and its corresponding programmatic performances. The SRB Chairman shall be responsible for ensuring the SRB reviews all pertinent project, constituent subsystem, and programmatic requirements, interface documentation, project control plans and maturity products as applicable for the respective LCR.

- 4.2.2.3** Lead SRB for all reviews, SRB caucus, and discussions to deliberate team findings and recommendations for all reviews, as applicable.
- 4.2.2.4** Assure the capture of all SRB inputs including Request for Actions (RFA) as well as Individual Member Input Reports (IMIR) from each SRB member.
- 4.2.2.5** Monitor performance of SRB members on review assignments to ensure that they are complete and commensurate with the expected quality on the deliverables.
- 4.2.2.6** Support other pertinent meetings as required.

#### **4.1.3 Chair Review Reporting:**

- 4.2.2.1** Conduct verbal out-brief to project at the conclusion of each applicable LCR site visit.
- 4.2.2.2** Within 48 hours (two work days) of each LCR site-review, and SRB caucus completion, prepare and coordinate with the project a “snap shot” summary briefing, and brief the Convening Authorities.
- 4.2.2.3** Within approximately one week after the LCR site-review, prepare and coordinate with the RM an SRB draft report including the IMIRs for each respective review to be vetted by both the SRB and the project.
- 4.2.2.4** For each specified review, the SRB Chair shall perform the following briefings for the site-review:
  - 4.1.3.4.1 No later than ten calendar days after the site review, present the SRB Dry Run briefing to the IPAO Director and the OE Director.
  - 4.1.3.4.2 After the IPAO Dry Run, finalize the SRB briefing package.
  - 4.1.3.4.3 After the IPAO Dry Run and within 30 calendar days post site-visit for each review, present briefings to JPL Center Management Council (CMC), and the SMD Program Management Council (PMC) respectively.
- 4.2.2.5** The SRB Chair shall participate in and lead the review reporting activities, provide expert advice, support the disposition of open actions or RFAs, and develop review findings during the preparation of a final report.
- 4.1.3.5.1 In accordance with SRB Handbook guidance, the SRB Chair shall coordinate with the SRB to ensure that all identified issues, concerns, and observations are properly and clearly stated with appropriate background information, specific associated risks, and explicit recommendations.

4.1.3.5.2 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.

4.1.3.5.3 The SRB Chair shall be responsible for providing to the RM, the executive summary, NPR 7120.5 and NPR 7123.1 stop-light assessment rating and explanatory text and conclusion sections of the SRB report.

4.1.3.5.4 The SRB Chair is required to review the final edited (for clarification) SRB report, coordinate and accept professional editorial changes, and acknowledge the inclusion of the SRB IMIRs attachments that are non-consensus by the nature of the board composition, and sign it in a timely fashion.

**4.1.4** The SRB Chair shall have overall responsibility for leading the conduct of each specified LCR which includes the analysis of the SWOT Project progress by an independent team composed of management, technical, risk, schedule and cost experts from outside the advocacy chain of this project. The key deliverables shall include the documenting and presenting the review findings in the associated management briefing charts and the SRB Chair Report. In addition, a Chair-person summary report shall be included as a key deliverable for participating on any project internal or sub-system reviews. See Section 7 for review execution and deliverable details.

**4.1.5** The SRB Chair shall keep the RM apprised of all correspondences and discussions that pertain to the conduct of the review or dissemination of results. (Note: All reports shall be reviewed and approved by IPAO management prior to release. Official correspondence shall be routed through the IPAO.)

**4.2** The Contractor shall provide the independent services of up to 5 SRB members for the specified LCRs. Each member shall be a Subject Matter Expert (SME) in one or more areas including but not limited to Program/project management, Systems Engineering, Risk Management, Spacecraft Systems, Launch Vehicle Management, Science Instrument Systems Development, Satellite Remote-sensing of Atmospheric Measurements & Interpretation, Weather and Atmospheric Science, Oceanography, Satellite Operations & Management, Complex System Integration and Testing, and Ground Systems Mission Operations for Satellite Remote Sensing and Products. Together with the Chair, the members are to serve on the SWOT non-consensus board.

For each review, specific duties of the SWOT SRB members shall include, but are not limited to:

**4.2.1** Member Review Formulation:

**4.2.2.1** Coordinate with the SRB Chair on project risk areas.

**4.2.2.2** Coordinate with Review Manager (RM) on review logistics prior to the SRB Kick-Off meeting and throughout the review.

**4.2.2.3** Plan and prepare for review assignments.

**4.2.2** Member Review Execution:

- 4.2.2.1** Coordinate and perform assigned review activities for the respective review with the Chair and the RM.
- 4.2.2.2** Assure availability to fully participate in each review and caucus.
- 4.2.2.3** Assure conduct of comprehensive respective review 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 respective review and other review results.
- 4.2.2.5** As originator for RFA, issue/concern, support the detailed documentation (including explicit recommendations or appropriate rationales) and closure of such open items.
- 4.2.2.6** Support reviews as a SME in one or more areas of specialization as listed in Section 4.2.

**4.2.3** Member Review Reporting:

- 4.2.2.1** Assure results for each of the reviews are documented and provided to the SRB Chair and RM. All IMIRs shall be submitted electronically using the IPAO template to the RM as a key task deliverable prior to the adjourning of the SRB caucus that follows each site visit.
  - 4.2.3.1.1** A draft may be submitted initially with all sections completed to the best judgment of the SRB member with a stipulation that a final version of the IMIR shall be submitted no later than 48 hours from the last caucus day.
  - 4.2.3.1.2** In accordance with SRB Handbook guidance, the SRB members shall ensure that all identified issues, concerns, and observations are properly documented with appropriate background information, specific associated risks, and explicit tractable realistic recommendations.
  - 4.2.3.1.3** 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.
- 4.2.2.2** The SRB members shall support the SRB Chair and RM for a verbal out-briefs to project at the conclusion of the site review if needed to clarify findings.
- 4.2.2.3** Support the SRB Chair and the RM for the preparation of a “snap shot” summary after each site-review.

- 4.2.2.4 Support the SRB Chair and the RM for preparation of the SRB draft report and briefing package with direct inputs and expert's detailed recommendations.
- 4.2.2.5 Upon request by the SRB Chair or the RM, support the Dry Run briefing for the IPAO, and a pre-briefing to the Director of Evaluation.
- 4.2.2.6 Support the finalization of the SRB briefing package in a timely manner as requested by the SRB Chair or the RM.
- 4.2.2.7 Upon request by the SRB Chair or the RM, provide support for the delivery of briefings to the SWOT Project Office, the JPL Center Management Council (CMC), and the SMD PMC respectively.

4.2.4 The SWOT SRB members shall be responsible for executing the reviews on all pertinent Project and constituent subsystem requirements, interface documentation, project control plans and maturity products for the aforementioned reviews of this task.

4.2.5 The SWOT SRB members shall participate in the review planning activities, provide expert advice, support the disposition of open actions, and develop report findings during the preparation of a final report. Additionally, the SRB members shall attend other pertinent meetings as required and shall provide meeting/trip summary in written report format to the SRB Chair and the RM of the SWOT SRB.

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

4.2.7 The SRB Members shall keep the SRB Chairman and RM apprised of all correspondences and discussions that pertain to the conduct of the review or dissemination of results. (Note: All reports shall be reviewed and approved by the IPAO prior to release. Official correspondence shall be routed through the IPAO).

4.3 The Contractor shall prepare completion documents for task closeout purposes.

**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 the contract 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 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 CONTRACTOR 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 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, 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.

### 6.1.3 Cost

The contractor shall utilize pre-negotiated CONTRACTOR 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 will be conducted unless adequately justified in accordance with FAR Parts 6 and 44.

## 6.2 Organizational Conflict of Interest

THE CONTRACTOR OCI plan and technical approach dated 7/17/13 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 7.2 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/>.

**6.8** All contractor personnel (Chair and SRB members) under this task shall be required to complete the necessary NASA IT-procedural processes to successfully obtain a NASA AUID, and an account on NASA Safety Center Knowledge Now (NSCKN) server to access SWOT community of practice data repository in support of the specified SWOT reviews.

**7. Period of Performance/Deliverables/Schedule:**

**7.1** The table below specifies major LCR’s planned for SWOT.

<b>ID #</b>	<b>Life-Cycle Review</b>	<b>Tentative Date</b>
1	System Requirements Review	October 2013
2	Mission Definition Review	March 2014

**7.2** **Period of performance** shall be from the date of task-order issuance through **09/23/15**. Review and interim event dates may change based on direction of the TPOC to accommodate Project readiness. At least 30 days prior to a LCR, the TPOC will notify the Contractor to confirm or adjust the planned review date. Change to the task completion date shall be approved by the Contracting Officer.

**7.3** For each of the specified LCR’s in Section 7.1, SRB activities, and associated briefings are listed but not limited to items identified in the table below. Management briefings maybe virtual (i.e. telephone/WebEx, and videos), or in-person. Whenever travel is required for in-person briefing, RM will notify the Contractor and authorize as necessary to proceed.

<b>#</b>	<b>Description of Activity</b>	<b>Duration (# days)*</b>	<b>Location</b>	<b>Required</b>	
				<b>Chair</b>	<b>Member</b>
1	Subsystem Reviews, 2 ea. per member	3	California	Y	Y
2	SRB Discussion/Telecon (Total 6 for 1 hour ea.)	---	Telecon/WebEx	Y	Y
3	Readiness to Proceed Assessment & Notification to IPAO Director	1	JPL	Y	---
4	Kick-off Meeting	1	JPL	Y	Y
5	LCR – Site-Review & Caucus	5	JPL	Y	Y
6	LCR Snap-shot Briefing	1	Telecon	Y	---
7	OE/IPAO Dry-run Briefing	1	Telecon/WebEx	Y	---

8	CMC Out-Brief	1	JPL	Y	---
9	SMD PMC Out-Brief (& KDP memo as needed)	1	NASA HQ	Y	---
10	Review follow-up & close-out activities (2 hour per member)	---	Online	Y	Y

\*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 Deliverables:** (identified but not limited to items in table below)

- 7.4.1** SRB members will provide written reports to the SRB Chair and RM of documents reviewed (as assigned by the SRB Chair) and meetings/reviews attended as requested.
- 7.4.2** Within 3 days of each subsystem review or ILCR, the SRB Chair and/or SRB members shall submit a written report in the Individual Members Independent Report (IMIR) format that will be provided by the RM.
- 7.4.3** The SRB Chair and SRB members will prepare Requests for Actions (RFAs) during the ILCR and work with SWOT, SRB Chair, and RM in the review of recommended closures.
- 7.4.4** Within 48 hours of the conclusion of the site review, the SRB Chair will develop a snap shot quick look summary of the status of the project and potential findings to be vetted with the SWOT and then provided to the Convening Authorities.
- 7.4.5** Within 5 days of each ILCR, the SRB Chair shall collect narrative input from all SRB members and develop, with the RM's assistance, a briefing package, that, when completed with annotations, will also serve as the final written report.
- 7.4.6** The assessment final report / briefing shall be presented by the SRB Chair to the CMC, and DPMC in standard IPAO MS PowerPoint formats. Where possible, the SRB Chair shall complete and submit the final documentation a minimum of 10 calendar days before the scheduled briefing date or according to the schedule events in the next section. The SRB members will support the SRB Chair and/or the RM as requested in the review of the briefings.

#	Description of Product	Due Date <sup>^</sup> (# days)	Required	
			Chair	Member
1	Subsystem Review Report	3*	Y	Y

2	Individual Members Independent Report (IMIR)	3*	Y	Y
3	RFA & Closure	TBD	Y	---
4	Snap-Shot Report (AKA. "One-Pager")	2**	Y	---
5	Narrative Report post LCR's (expanded IMIR)	5**	Y	Y
6	SRB Briefing Charts for IPAO Dry-Run, CMC & DPMC	5**	Y	---
7	SRB Final Briefing with Annotated Notes before GPMC at SMD level	10**	Y	---
8	Chair/RM Signed Final Annotated Briefing post GPMC	1**	Y	---
9	Review follow-up & close-out activities	TBD	Y	Y

^ Except when there is written communication from RM to Contractor, "Due Date" as specified in the table take precedent in cases where conflicting value is noted elsewhere in the SOW.

\*Due Date is the number of work-days post review activity completion

\*\*Due Date is the number of days prior to the identified briefing (or activity).

## **8. NASA Technical Point of Contact (TPOC)**

Technical Point of Contact 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 TM:

- a. Monitor task technical performance. Ensure that the Contractor complies with the Statement of Work or specifications included in the task. Notify the COR 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 the COR if the requirement exists to give technical direction. Only the COR can give technical direction.

c. Monitor the Contractor's expenditure of cost on the task. Review periodic reports received from the Contractor on Task Order progress and cost. Report any discrepancies, concerns, and questions to the COR.

d. Notify COR of any changes required to the Task Order/Delivery Order. Only the CO/COR can issue these changes.

e. Notify the CO/COR of any violation of the terms and conditions of the task/contract or any other Contractor action considered detrimental to the Government.

f. Send an information copy to the COR of any correspondence exchanged with the Contractor regarding the Task Order/Delivery Order.

g. For CPARS evaluation purposes, review and evaluate Contractor's performance and provide annual written reports to the COTR for consideration in the evaluation of Contractor performance.

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, and notify CO immediately of OCI situations.

(4) All actions to be coordinated through the SOMA COR.

(5) See Task Order paragraph 2.2 – 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. TM is not authorized to direct or supervise Contractor employees in the accomplishment of work assignments. Your primary interface will be with the CONTRACTOR Task Lead assigned to your task. Ensure THE CONTRACTOR 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/Delivery Order or until rescinded in writing by the CO or COR on this contract.