Intelligent Systems Research and Development Support – 3 (ISRDS-3)
Solicitation 80ARC018R0012

Final Request for Proposal (FRFP) QUESTIONS and ANSWERS SET 4

28. Question: Per the Section L.16, Section (b), Offerors are instructed to the limitation of a text size not smaller than 14 point, and diagrams, charts, tables, and photographs to a text size not smaller than 12 point. By limiting offerors to 12 point font for all diagrams, charts, tables, and photographs, the government runs the risk of complicating oral presentation slides conveyance and making them more difficult to evaluate. (As currently required, for example, extensive milestone schedules, etc. will need to be broken across many more slides, and much less detail.) Will the government allow diagrams, charts, tables, and photographs to contain Arial font text in a size no smaller than 10 point?

Reference: FRFP dated 7/10/2018, Section L.16(b)

Answer: The Government has reviewed your request, and decided to keep the limitation of the Arial font text size not smaller than 14 point, and diagrams, charts, tables, and photographs to Arial font text size not smaller than 12 point, as stated in Section L.16(b) of the final RFP.

29. Question: The RFP states: "The Offeror shall provide evidence of an adequate accounting system for accumulating and reporting incurred costs, as determined by the cognizant Government Administrative Contracting Officer (ACO) or Government Audit Agency (GAA). Offerors shall provide a copy of the most recent Accounting System audit report."

This language states a copy of the audit report needs to be submitted versus the actual approval letter from DCMA. DCAA does not always provide the full audit report to a company upon completion of an audit - they provide the final accounting approval letter from DCMA. Is it acceptable to submit this approval letter received from the ACO to fulfill this requirement?

Reference: FRFP dated 7/10/2018, Section L.14(a)(10)

Answer: The most recent Accounting System approval letter from the Defense Contract Management Agency (DCMA) is acceptable. This information will be clarified in the RFP Amendment P00002.

30. Question: The government states that “All JV member company Cost/Price Template Workbooks will then roll up into the costs to administer and manage the JV will be proposed in the Cost/Price Template Workbook for the unpopulated JV
entity”. A full roll up may not have full detail, as the members of the JV will be sending only sanitized information to the manager of the JV’s proposal. How would the government like to see this detail?

Reference: FRFP dated 7/10/2018, Questions and Answers Set 3, posted 7/24/2018

Answer: If the Offeror is an unpopulated Joint Venture (JV), each JV member company shall submit its own Cost/Price Volume as instructed in Section L, via FBO.gov, representing the effort that the JV member company is anticipated to perform on the contract. If the JV member company subcontracts out its work to another company and the amount of that subcontract meets the definition of a Major Subcontractor in the solicitation, then that subcontractor needs to submit its own proposal to be incorporated into the JV member company’s Cost/Price Template Workbook. All JV member company Cost/Price Template Workbooks will then roll up into a separate Cost/Price Template Workbook for the unpopulated JV entity. Any JV related costs to administer and manage the JV will be proposed in the Cost/Price Template Workbook for the unpopulated JV entity.

This information will be clarified in the RFP Amendment P00002.

31. Question: As Standard Labor Categories (SLC) rates will most likely differ between the JV members, single SLC rates cannot result in an accurate overall cost, as those rates will vary depending on each JV member. Exhibits 2, 3, 4, 5, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11 and 12 would all be affected. How does the government want these rates displayed? As an average?

Reference: FRFP dated 7/10/2018, Section L.17(c), and Attachment Jb1

Answer: Each JV member company shall submit its own Cost/Price Template Workbook containing its own Standard Labor Categories rates applied to the portion of the direct labor hours provided in the RFP that the JV member company is anticipated to perform on the contract. Therefore, the sum of the hours from all JV members must be equal to the hours provided in the Cost/Price Template Workbook (Attachment Jb1). As such, the separate Cost/Price Template Workbook for the JV entity should show the final cost calculated from each JV member’s proposed rates multiplied by its respective assigned hours and also include any indirect costs for the unpopulated JV entity.

This information will be clarified in the RFP Amendment P00002.
32. Question: Since the dollar thresholds for past performance references were removed, will the Government consider allowing references where performance has been less than one year?

Reference: FRFP dated 7/10/2018, Section L.17(b)(I)
Answer: The Government has reviewed your request, and decided to keep the requirement as stated in the final RFP, Section L.17(b)(I)(1).

33. Question: Key personnel position descriptions are required in both oral and written portions of key personnel sections. Will the Government consider this be required for the written section only?

Reference: FRFP dated 7/10/2018, Section L.17(b)(I)
Answer: The Government has reviewed your request, and decided to keep the requirement as stated in the final RFP, Section L.17(a)(A)(II) and (III).

34. Question: Please clarify the period of performance for pricing purposes. Should Offeror’s assume a contract start date of 04/01/19 for the base period, with the phase in period running from 02/01/19-03/31/19?

Reference: FRFP dated 7/10/2018, Section L.17(c)(III), Exhibit 15
Answer: As stated in Section L.17(c)(III), Exhibit 15, “For proposal purposes only, assume the start date of the Phase-In Period to be January 31, 2019.”

35. Question: The number of labor hours in the Government Cost Model increases significantly over contract period of performance, essentially doubling. In order to prepare a more responsive proposal, can the Government please explain the drivers and anticipated work areas, projects, and/or technologies that will drive the increase?

Reference: FRFP dated 7/10/2018, Section L.17(c)(III), Exhibits 3 and 4
Answer: The labor hours provided in the RFP are based on the historical information on the technical requirements, and the reason for the increase is a straight 10% from previous years.

For Core Technical: If requirements under the Core Technical decrease or increase, the Government reserves the right to re-negotiate the CPFF value.

For IDIQ: There is a minimum quantity of work of $1,000,000 during the two-year Base period. The total maximum contract value of all IDIQ CLINs, if all options
36. Question: Will the government please clarify the sealed package requirements for subcontractors performing under a FFP/T&M subcontract agreement? The Government Pricing Template appears to be designed for CPFF subcontract based on the detailed cost buildup which is appropriate for CPFF contracts. However, subcontractors are not usually requiring to provide such detailed cost buildup for T&M/FFP subcontracts.

Reference: FRFP dated 7/10/2018, Section L.17(c)(III), Exhibit 16

Answer: The instruction for Exhibit 16 allows the Prime Offeror to propose the type(s) of subcontract(s) (i.e., firm-fixed price, cost-plus-fixed-fee, labor hour, etc.). The Subcontractor may provide its fully detailed Cost/Price Volume (electronic copy) via FBO.gov and also provide a "sanitized" version to the Prime Offeror showing only a summary of proposed direct labor hours, proposed total estimated cost and proposed fee, but not the data leading to the development thereof. It is acceptable for the Prime to display only the total proposed amount for the Subcontractor in Exhibit 16, with the footnote that "The Government will receive the Subcontractor’s detailed breakdown of cost and fee in the Subcontractor’s separate submission”.

37. Question: Attachment Jb7 includes updated education and experience requirements, however several of the requirements appear to overlap among the skill levels within a labor category. This results in little or no progression between skill levels for each labor category. For example, the Systems Analyst III and Senior Systems Analyst IV both require a Bachelor’s of Science and 5 years of work experience. Typically, higher skill levels would require additional years of experience with a corresponding increase in salary. Additionally, many direct labor sources (e.g. salary surveys) do not differentiate salaries based on education, therefore one of the key factors in estimating salaries is the years of experience. Will the government reevaluate the labor category requirements to ensure there is a logical progression in skill level for each labor category? (Per our review, the following labor categories have overlapping requirements: Systems Analyst III & Senior Systems Analyst IV; the entire Systems Integrator and Senior Systems Integrator category; Senior System Engineer IV & V; Senior Research Engineer IV & V; and Senior Software Engineer IV & V).

In Attachment Jb7, Standard Labor Categories Descriptions and Qualifications, based on a review of the labor category requirements, it appears that the highest skill levels only require a minimum of 8 years of experience. Does this accurately
reflect the Government’s intent or should some labor categories require more experience to reflect the desired workforce?

Reference: FRFP dated 7/10/2018, Attachment Jb7

Answer: The requirements stated in Attachment Jb7, Standard Labor Categories Descriptions and Qualifications, are minimum requirements for a certain labor category. The Government has reviewed your request, and decided to keep the requirement as stated in Attachment Jb7, dated 7/10/2018.

38. Question: The Statement of Work is broad and encompasses a myriad of tasks and technologies. Release of this type of information will enable a more insightful proposal through an understanding of the type and amount of work actually being performed, and mitigate the natural incumbent advantage to establish a more competitive environment. In order for non-incumbent bidders to have better insight into the actual work being performed, will the government release the current Technical Directives and IDIQ Task Orders?

Reference: FRFP dated 7/10/2018, Attachment Ja1

Answer: The Offeror may request for the current contract information through FOIA at: hq-foia@nasa.gov

39. Question: L.14 Item (a) Cover Letter – The RFP specifies bidders provide a complete description and documentation for teaming or other such business arrangements. Can the government elaborate on the intent for requesting this information and more specifically what is desired in the “description” and “documentation” requirements?

Reference: FRFP dated 7/10/2018, Section L.14(a)

Answer: The Government would like to be informed of the teaming mechanism (i.e. a partnership or a joint venture) of the Offeror, as well as the responsibilities of the parties. Description shall include teaming mechanism (i.e. a partnership or a joint venture), points of contact for each party, business size of each Major Subcontractor or joint venture member. Documentation shall include teaming/joint venture agreements with details on roles and responsibilities of each party. If the Offeror is a small business joint venture or an 8(a) joint venture, the Offeror shall comply with all of the applicable small business or 8(a) program by the Small Business Administration.

This information will be clarified in the RFP Amendment P00002.
40. Question: RFP Attachment Jb2 ISRDS-3 Cost Price Template Workbook contains several named ranges with references to "DynCorp Cost Forms", "prod.nais.nasa.gov", "JSC FSS ver 04" and "NPS ADD TO Rates" some of which are returning #REF errors. May Offerors delete these named ranges?

**Reference: FRFP dated 7/10/2018, Attachment Jb1**

Answer: Yes, the Offeror may delete all named ranges (except Print_Area and Print_Titles).

[End of FRFP Questions and Answers Set 4]