

Question: Please confirm that only SOW paragraphs 2.4, 3.3, and 3.7 are required to be addressed in the Mission Suitability volume? If so, how do we satisfy the requirement to identify all SOW paragraphs in the SOW Compliance Matrix (L10.5), successfully complete the requirements specified in the SOW (L.10), and use the SOW/WBS to structure the Mission Suitability Volume. It appears offerors are required to address all SOW requirements in order to submit a compliant response however, the 80-page limit and other proposal instructions contradict. Please clarify how the SOW/WBS is to be used to structure the Mission Suitability volume.

Reference: Section L.10 and L.13

Answer: This section has been reworded for clarity. The SOW Compliance Matrix is not required and will be deleted. The RFP Compliance Matrix is still required in L.10 (5) Please see the below language:

“The proposal shall include a matrix showing where the evaluation criteria of this RFP are satisfied.”

“The offeror's technical approach should demonstrate an understanding of the principal requirements of the Statement of Work (SOW) and provide the techniques and procedures that will be used to satisfy these principal requirements in an efficient and effective manner. The principal requirements are identified as WBS 2.4 (inclusive of all sub-levels), 3.3, and 3.7 (inclusive of all sub-levels).

The offeror shall also identify the most significant potential risks under this contract, as a whole, and also describe the risk management techniques that will be used to manage identified risks during contract performance. Risk factors may be those inherent in the work, unique to the offeror's chosen approach. General areas of possible risk that are of concern to NASA are technical, schedule, cost, security (including personnel, information technology), export control and environmental risks. The identification of risks is the responsibility of the offeror. The offeror's discussion of a risk factor should provide the offeror's approach to managing the risk--the probability of the risk, impact and severity, time frame and risk acceptance or mitigation.”

Question: Please clarify if a Program Management Plan is required – DRFP page 115 alludes to a plan in the proposal instructions. If a Program Management Plan is not required, please specify where the items in the first three paragraphs on D-RFP page 115 are to be provided in our proposal response. Also, please clarify if the Program Management Plan is included in the 80-page limitation.

Reference: Section L.13

Answer: A Program Management Plan is not required. The items should be addressed within the Mission Suitability Volume and are included within the 80 page limitation.

Question: The referenced paragraphs conflict regarding the definition of a “Significant Contractor”. L.10 states any subcontractor likely to exceed \$20,000,000 is defined as a Significant Subcontractor and L.14 states any subcontractor likely to exceed \$5,000,000 is defined as a Significant Subcontractor. Please Clarify.

Reference: Section L.10 and L.14

Answer: These two locations should coincide. The number should be \$20,000,000 and will be updated for the RFP.

Question: In Section L.10 GSFC 52.215-201 Proposal Preparation- General Instructions, (b) Proposal Content and Page Limitations, Cost Exhibits in the proposal matrix are annotated as being required for only the Prime Offeror individually and Significant Subcontractor individually. However, Section L.14 indicates Exhibits 2A, 2B (if applicable), 10A and 10B are required from ALL subcontractors. Please clarify the specific Exhibits required from subcontractors falling below the threshold for Significant Subcontractors.

Reference: Section L.10 and Section L.14

Answer: Exhibit 2A is required of all subcontractors. Exhibit 2B is required if applicable. 10A and 10B are required of all service subcontractors as they are defined in NFS 1852.231-71.

Question: Please confirm whether Section L.14 GSFC 52.215-223 COST VOLUME INSTRUCTIONS (JUN 2015) – Page 123, 2. (a) Direct and Indirect Rate Substantiation, only applies to the Prime.

Section L.14

Answer: L.14 (1) *“A proposed significant subcontractor shall complete and submit Exhibits 2A, 2B, and 4 through 11B and provide the same supporting information that is requested from the Prime Offeror.”*

Question: Section L.14 GSFC 52.215-223 Cost Volume Instructions (JUN 2015) – Page 126, 2,(c) Government Pricing Model (GPM) states, - ***For evaluation purposes, all Management Costs shall be assumed Onsite and All Administrative costs shall be assumed offsite. Section L.14 GSFC 52.215-223 Cost Volume Instructions (JUN 2015) – Page 127, 2. (e) Offeror Management and Administrative Labor states- ***For Exhibit 2B, Offerors will note that all Management and Administrative labor categories shall be proposed using Offsite rates.*** It is stated all Management Costs shall be assumed On-Site for evaluation purposes, but it’s also stated all Management and Administrative labor categories shall be proposed using Off-Site rates. *It seems hours should be priced against the Management and Admin rates for the site applicable for each company.* The intent of evaluation on on-site rates for Management Costs is unclear. Please clarify.

Reference: Section L.14

Answer: This will be made consistent. Both Management and Administrative Labor categories shall be proposed using Offsite Rates.

Question: Please confirm that subcontractors below the significant subcontractor threshold need to complete exhibits 10A and 10B, even though only proposing entity options on the Exhibit itself states Prime or Significant Subcontractor.

Reference: Section L.14

Answer:

Exhibits 10A and 10B will be revised to reference “Prime Offeror” or “Subcontractor”. Subcontractors below the significant subcontractor threshold will complete exhibits 10A and 10B if they meet the criteria in the RFP.

Please reference the below excerpts from L.13 and L.14.

L.13 “In accordance with the Exhibits 10A and 10B "Fringe Benefit Chart", the offeror and all service subcontractors (as defined in paragraph (d) of NFS provision 1852.231-71) shall provide a detailed list of their fringe benefits and company estimated cost per hour, along with an itemization of the benefits that require employee contributions and the amount of that contribution as a percentage of the total cost of the benefit. Two exhibits shall be submitted, one containing the average of fringe benefit information for all the exempt labor categories and one containing the average of fringe benefit information for all the non-exempt labor categories. (The Mission Suitability Volume must not include Exhibits 10A and 10B but should reference where the information appears in the Cost Volume.)”

L.14 (n) “As addressed in the Mission Suitability Volume Instructions provision *Subfactor B*, the Offeror and all service subcontractors (as defined in paragraph (d) of NFS provision 1852.231-71) shall provide a detailed list of their fringe benefits and company estimated cost per hour, along with an itemization of the benefits that require employee contributions and the amount of that contribution as a percentage of the total cost of the benefits. Two exhibits shall be submitted, in Exhibits 10A containing the average of fringe benefit information for all the exempt labor categories, and Exhibit 10B containing the average of fringe benefit information for all the non-exempt labor categories. These exhibits fulfill the Total Compensation Plan requirement under FAR 52.222-46 for non-Significant Subcontractors.”

Question: Please consider removing the referenced clause. This is a much more detailed version of a Limitation of Funds clause, in that detailed proposals are required when there is an anticipation of an overrun, and/or a significant underrun. Unfortunately, this is a fluid requirement, as the projections of overruns and underruns vary month to month, as costs are incurred and reviewed, and variance are determined and explained. These proposals are very costly and time consuming to prepare.

Reference: Section B.6 GSFC 52.232-94 Estimated Cost Increases (DEC 2005)

Answer: This is a GSFC required clause and therefore cannot be removed from the solicitation.

Question: The referenced section specifies two non-exempt employees listed on page 62, section I.10 and defines how to access salary tables for GS rates. Will these two skills have to follow the GS rate schedule or the AWD provided? Section L reads like it is up to the offerors to determine the direct labor rates (if we are not proposing to use the incumbent workforce), and provide rationale, specifically callout salary survey data. There does not appear to be any clear requirement that states offerors are to propose GS rates or AWD rates. Please clarify why an AWD is provided?

Reference: Section I.10

Answer: The two non-exempt labor categories must adhere to the current Wage Determination. The GS rate equivalents are meant as informational only.

Question: : In review of the entire RFP and attachments, it appears as though the contract may require additional labor categories other than that provided in Attachment EE. Please confirm that the bidder may provide additional labor categories as needed to fulfill requirements.

Reference: Enclosure EE: Labor Skill Category

Answer: Bidders may provide additional labor categories, however, they must be mapped to existing labor categories in the GPM provided in Enclosure EE.

Question: Although it is not listed, is the List of Acronyms within the Mission Suitability Volume excluded from page limitations?

Reference: L.10 (b)(1) Proposal Content and Page Limitations

Answer: The List of Acronyms has been added to the excluded pages of the Mission Suitability Volume.

Question: : A limit of 75 pages per WBS Level 3 is allocated for the Basis of Estimates yet the Cost Volume instructions only ask for “estimating the Program Management and Administrative Support and subcontracting.” Additionally there is no second and third level WBS for SOW 1. Are additional requirements missing from the Cost Volume instructions?

Reference: Section L.14 2(g) and Section L.10 (b) (1)

Answer: WBS Level 3 reference has been eliminated. There are no additional requirements missing from the Cost Volume.

Question: There seems to be a discrepancy in the dollar value used to define a significant subcontractor in Section L. L.10(a)(2) defines any subcontract which is expected to exceed \$20M as a Significant Subcontractor while L.14(1)Paragraph 7 defines a Significant Subcontractor as a subcontractor expected to exceed \$5M or more of the GPM total estimated value.

Reference: Section L. 10(a)(2) & Section L14(1) Para 4

Answer: These should be consistent with each other. The value is \$20,000,000 and will be updated in the RFP.

Question: There seems to be a disconnect related to the location of Management and Administrative personnel for proposal purposes. Section L.14(2) Bullet 8 states “For evaluation purposes, all Management Costs shall be assumed Onsite and all Administration costs shall be assumed Offsite” while L.14(2)(e) states “For Exhibit 2B, Offerors will note that all Management and Administrative labor categories shall be proposed using Offsite rates.”

Reference: L.14(2)(c) Bullet 8 & L.14(2)(e)

Answer: These should be consistent. L.14 (2) (c) should state, “For evaluation purposes, all Management and Administration costs shall be assumed Offsite.” This will be updated in the RFP.

Question: Will the government allow Contractor to modify Exhibit 3 pricing model and separately list FRINGE and OVERHEAD cost?

Reference: Exhibit 3

Answer: Yes, this should match your company’s accounting practice.

Question: Can the Government please confirm that for large corporations with multiple business units, subsidiaries, etc., only past performance for the business unit proposed to execute the work will be considered? If past performance from another business unit is utilized, is that business unit then required to provide their relevant metrics (e.g. safety and health ISRs, attrition, etc.)? Is it also required to show how this business unit and its capabilities are relevant to GSMMO-2 performance?

Reference: L.15 Past Performance Volume

Answer: For large businesses with affiliated companies or subsidiaries, offerors may provide past performance information on such affiliated companies where the firm’s proposal demonstrates that the resources of the affiliate will affect the performance of the offeror. The offeror is required to “demonstrate that the resources of the...affiliate...company (its workforce, management, facilities or other resources) shall be provided or relied upon for contract performance such that the...affiliate...will have a meaningful involvement in contract performance.” In such circumstances, the offeror shall provide the information listed in L.15(a), which includes data on safety performance and contract personnel turnover, among other required data.

Question: Would the Government allow delivery of the past performance questionnaires by email, for the convenience of the references?

Reference: L.15 (b)

Answer: Yes. E-mail address has been added.

Question: Would the Government provide the Past Performance Questionnaire in MS Word format with the final RFP, for the convenience of the references?

Reference: Past Performance Questionnaire

Answer: The Government will provide a PDF that can be converted to MS word.

Question: Given that BOEs are only required for Program Management and Administrative Support and subcontracting, please clarify the statement “75 pages per WBS Level 3 for BOEs.”

Reference: L.10(b)(1)

Answer: The reference to “WBS Level 3” has been deleted.

Question: There is a discrepancy in the Draft RFP in the definition of significant subcontractor with regard to the cost volume. Section L.10, item a (2) states that significant subcontractor for the Cost Volume proposal is defined as any subcontract likely to exceed \$20M. Section L.14 item 1 states that significant subcontractor for the Cost Volume is any subcontractor expected to exceed \$5M or more of the GPM total estimated cost value. Please clarify what constitutes a significant subcontractor for the Cost Volume.

Reference: L.14 GSFC 52.215-223

Answer: These sections should be consistent. The value is \$20,000,000. This will be updated in the RFP.

Question: Would the Government consider excluding the past performance consent letters from the page count of Volume IV?

Reference: L.15(b)

Answer: Past Performance Consent Letters will be excluded from the page count.

Question: To be consistent with the previous GSMO RFP and other recent GSFC RFPs (such as GITISS and SEAS), would the Government consider lowering the Past Performance average annual cost/fee for the significant subcontractors (e.g. \$10,000,000)?

Reference: L.15 Past Performance Volume

Answer: Upon further analysis of contracts similar in scope and value, this amount will be \$12,000,000.

Question: If Company X is providing past performance references for a contract where they were a sub to Company Y, can Company X provide their Past Performance Questionnaire directly to their Government customer rather than to their Prime (Company Y)? The concern is that Company Y may unfairly evaluate Company X if Company Y is priming and Company X is on a competing team: but must use their contract with Company Y for past performance.

Reference: L.15 Past Performance Volume (b) Prior Customer Evaluations

Answer: Yes, company X may provide a questionnaire to any entity that has direct knowledge of their performance on the contract, which may be the Government Agency in some subcontracting situations.