

Question and Answers (4)

This is a continuation of Questions and Answers (3), issued on January 23, 2015.

These questions and answers are in response to the Final RFP

Question 8:

Will the government please clarify the Software Systems Engineer rates provided in Enclosure 3? The rates, shown below, have a senior rate that is higher than both the Senior Principal and Principal rates.

- Software Systems Engineer (Chief) \$77.41
- Software Systems Engineer (Senior Principal) \$58.22
- Software Systems Engineer (Principal) \$54.40
- Software Systems Engineer (Senior) \$62.99
- Software Systems Engineer (Mid-Level) \$33.17

Answer 8:

There was an error in the rates provided which will be corrected via an amendment. The correct rates are:

Software Systems Engineer (Chief)	\$77.41
Software Systems Engineer (Senior Principal)	\$62.99
Software Systems Engineer (Principal)	\$58.22
Software Systems Engineer (Senior)	\$54.40
Software Systems Engineer (Mid- Level)	\$33.17

Question 9:

Will the government clarify if the Ground Software System Developer (Principal) rate (\$71.27) given in Enclosure 3 is for the Principal or Senior Principal level?

Answer 9:

The rate (\$71.27) in Enclosure #3 is for the Ground Software System Developer Principal level.

Question 10:

Will the government consider extending the proposal submission date from February 25th to March 12th? With the release of the final RFP, two new evaluated requirements were added: 1. Safety and Health Plan; and 2. Basis of Estimate for the Sample Problem. These new requirements represent a significant difference from the draft RFP, requiring additional time to adequately respond to them.

Answer 10:

The Government will not extend the proposal due date.

Question 11:

Reference, Exhibit 6, Prime GPM: Exhibit 6 (GPM), all years, have fractional hours in the On-Site portion. The fractional hours are in the following labor categories: Administrative Analyst (Senior) .80; Configuration Manager (Mid-Level) .50; Flight Software System Developer (Senior Principal) .60; Ground Software System Developer (Chief) .20; and Software Developer (Principal) .20. The fractional amounts total 2.3 hours. Are these fractional hours correct?

Answer 11:

Yes, the fractional hours are correct.

Question 12:

Reference, L.22(a)(4), Proposal Format and Organization: After enumerating specific requirements for the CD-ROM label information, the final paragraph on this page instructs "The Offeror shall provide written documentation that describes the contents of each CD-ROM and each file." Will the government confirm that this "written documentation" is a level of detail regarding the CD-ROM contents? That it may be imprinted on the CD-ROM label or included as a printed insert to the CD ROM case? And that it is not part of any specific proposal volume nor subject to any page limitation? Will the government confirm that it is essentially a table of contents for the CD-ROMs submitted with the offer?

Answer 12:

Yes, this is essentially a table of contents for the CD-ROM.

Question 13:

In Section L.28.1 under Proposal Marking and Delivery, on Page 106, it still has the old RFP # being referenced. Which RFP # should be used?

Answer 13:

The correct Solicitation Number is: NNG15498942R. The RFP will be amended to correct this error.

Question 14:

Reference, Cost Exhibits 13-20B Exhibits That Pertain to the Entire Contract, Please confirm subcontractors who are considered significant in CORE or GPM, in addition to completing the CORE required and GPM required cost exhibits, are also required to complete all of the exhibits listed under "Exhibits That Pertain to the Entire Contract" (Costs Exhibits 13-20B)?

Answer 14:

Yes the significant subcontractor should complete Cost Exhibits 13-20B Exhibits That Pertain to the Entire Contract.

Question 15:

Reference, Enclosure 3, SES Incumbent Rates: Exhibit 6 (GPM) includes the labor category "Administrative Analyst (Principle) onsite, and the labor category Database Administrator (Principle) offsite, but these labor categories are not included in Enclosure 3 (SES incumbent rates). The Draft RFP

specified a DL rate of \$30.13 for the Administrative Analyst (Principle). Will the government please include Administrative Analyst (Principle) and the Database Administrator (Principle) in Enclosure 3?

Answer 15:

Both Administrative Analyst (Principle) onsite and Database Administrator (Principle) offsite have been removed from Exhibit 6, Exhibit 9 and Enclosure 3. After careful analysis it was noted that those 2 labor categories were bid at the beginning of the SES contract, however, hours for those 2 labor categories have not been posted in quite some time. Revised Exhibits and Enclosure will be uploaded.

Question 16:

The Room Number in L.28.1 (Room 050) differs from the Room Number shown in the Past Performance Questionnaire (shown as 50A). What room number should be used?

Answer 16:

050 is a suite of offices. 50A is an office within that suite, both address are acceptable.

Question 17:

Section L.22 (b)(1), Table, p.81. Please confirm the page counted portion of the Mission Suitability volume is 85 pages and 15 pages for the Basis of Estimate Sample Problem totaling 100 pages for the page counted material required for the Mission Suitability volume.

Answer 17:

That is correct.

Question 18:

Section L.22 (b)(1), Table, p.81 & Section L.24(3), p.87 "...shall comply with the BOE page limitations set forth in PROPOSAL PREPARATIONS—GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS." If the Offeror does not require all 15 pages allocated to BOEs in order to be responsive to the RFP instructions, would the Government consider allowing the remaining pages to be used for responding to Mission Suitability requirements?

Answer 18:

No, Offerors shall follow the page limitations as stipulated in the RFP.

Question 19:

In the answer to Question 6 of the first set of draft RFP Question and Answers, it was stated that "The Quality Plan is now due 30 days after contract effective date and the Staffing Plan has been removed from the page count for the final RFP." The Staffing Plan was not removed from the page count of the final RFP. Is the Staffing Plan excluded from the Mission Suitability Volume's total page count?

Answer 19:

This was an oversight. The RFP will be amended to exclude the staffing plan from the page count.

Question 20:

In the answer to Question 97 of the first set of draft RFP Question and Answers, it was stated that "SES II SOW Section 3 is a consolidation of pieces of several IT services on SES and other contracts within AETD." Are these other contracts ending at the same time as the current SES contract? Would the government be willing to indicate how many of these or what percentage are not on the current SES contract?

Answer 20:

All services outlined in Section 3 of the SOW are anticipated to start on the first day of the new contract.

Question 21:

In the GPM, an explicit break down for onsite/offsite for non-management hours is provided in the spreadsheet. The Core spreadsheet also provides for an onsite/offsite break down. We would assume that for core requirements, non-management work would be done onsite and that similar to the GPM for consistency, management hours should be considered offsite. Can the government confirm that this is what is intended?

Answer 21:

That is correct.

Question 22:

The RFP says (page 81): "(5) The format for each proposal volume shall parallel, to the greatest extent possible, the format of the evaluation factors and subfactors contained in Section L of this solicitation."

Evaluation factors are located in section M, not in section L. What was the intended phrasing of this requirement?

Was the intended phrasing: "(5) The format for each proposal volume shall parallel, to the greatest extent possible, the format of the evaluation factors and subfactors contained in Section M of this solicitation."

Answer 22

Sections L and M mirror each other. The RFP language is correct.

Question 23:

The final RFP Section M evaluation factors do not require a response to SOW 4.x. Did the Government intend to require a technical response to SOW 4.x requirements?

Answer 23

No.

Question 24:

The RFP says (page 109): "The Government will evaluate the technical approach, skill mix (labor categories and projected hours), Government interface"

Would the Government clarify "Government interface?" For example, will the "government interface" include Government-to-Government, Government-to-third party, and Government-to-Contractor interfaces?

Answer 24:

The interface is Government-to-Contractor.

Question 25:

Cover Letter: The Cover Letter's Subject Line indicates that the new Solicitation Number is: NNG15498942R. Page 2 of the Cover Letter indicates that the Solicitation Number is NNG1549842R. The Solicitation document and FBO list the Solicitation Number as NNG15498942R. Please confirm that the correct Solicitation Number is: NNG15498942R.

Answer 25:

The correct Solicitation Number is: NNG15498942R.

Question 26:

RFP Reference: Section I, Topic: Service Contract Act: Will the Service Contract Act apply and if so which WD(s) and location(s) should contractors use for pricing purposes? Alternatively, if the Service Contract Act will not apply, please so indicate.

Answer 26:

The contract is subject to the requirements of 52.204-15 – Service Contract Reporting Requirements for Indefinite-Delivery Contracts. The contract is not subject to the Service Contract Labor Standards (formerly known as the Service Contract Act of 1965).

Question 27:

Also in L.18 on Page 79, it shows Lisa Mullen at Mail Code as 210.3, while the PPQ shows it as 210.M. Which one should be used?

Answer 27:

Either will work, however 210.3 is the specific mail code.

Question 28:

L.25.1 of the RFP states: ... All proposed significant subcontractors shall complete and submit exhibits 9, 10 and 11 and provide the supporting information that is requested from the Prime Offeror.

It is our interpretation of Exhibit 9 that this should be filled out by the Prime only as it is similar to Exhibit 6. Please confirm that significant subcontractors do not need to submit exhibit 9?

Answer 28:

The RFP has been amended to state that only Prime Offeror need fill out exhibit 9.

Question 29:

Reference L.25.1, Should offerors use the hours in Exhibit 6 to estimate Percent of Effort or can the Government provide estimated hours for Contract Year 6 to aide in developing composite rates?

Answer 29:

The hours in Exhibit 6 are not necessary for completing Exhibit 9.

Question 30:

Reference L.25.1, Will the Government update Exhibit 9 to include a column for Percent of Effort for Prime and Subcontractor Loaded Rates.

Answer 30:

Exhibit 9 has been updated to include percent of effort and the revised version will be uploaded to NAIS.

Question 31:

Section B.8 states:

(a) The total estimated cost of this contract includes the following estimated costs:

Cost Element	Estimated Cost
Materials	\$591,000.00
Travel	\$130,385.00

These costs are the Government's best estimate of what the actuals will be. There will be no adjustment in the fee(s) of the contract should the actuals be different than these estimates, unless additional effort is added to the contract or there is a change to the contract under the Changes clause of this contract which impacts these estimates.

These numbers appear to be material and travel costs for the Core in Exhibit 1. If this is correct, will the government confirm which numbers are correct for Travel because Section B.8 states \$130,385.00 and Exhibit 1 states \$130,685.00?

Are these Section B numbers **in addition** to the dollar amounts for the GPM in Exhibit 7?

Answer 31:

Exhibit 1 is correct the travel amount should be \$130,685. The RFP will be revised to correct this error to Section B.8.

The material and travel costs in Section B.8 are in addition to costs in Exhibit 7.