

Highlights of the NASA Ames Research Center
Aerospace Testing and Facilities Operations and Maintenance (ATOM)
Request for Proposal
DRAFT NNA08220778R - AMA

Introduction

This document highlights significant aspects of the attached Aerospace Testing and Facilities Operations and Maintenance DRAFT Request for Proposal (DRFP). Included in this overview is a brief discussion of some of the issues related to the contract scope and intent, incentives, selection criteria, and other issues of significance to this acquisition. The discussion also provides some insight into the reasoning that went into the formulation of the DRFP. These highlights also provide a section-by-section account of important information regarding the RFP. However, these highlights should not be a substitute for a thorough and comprehensive review of the RFP.

The Government's intent is to enter into a single award, indefinite delivery/indefinite quantity contractual arrangement, which will allow the Ames Research Center to perform successfully meet its mission of providing high quality testing services in its aerospace facilities in a safe manner and at a competitive price.

Current Contract Information:

The proposed acquisition is a follow-on to the current contract, NNA04BA85C, that is presently being performed by Jacobs Technology Inc. (JTI) Contract NNA04BA85C provides operation, maintenance, repair, and support of test, calibration, and support facilities at ARC over a five-year performance period with a current staff of approximately 100, at a current estimated value of \$124M. Contract NNA04BA85C is a performance-based, hybrid cost-plus-incentive-fee/award-fee (CPIF/AF) contract that was awarded on a competitive basis to JTI in 2004, and is scheduled to expire on July 31, 2009.

The Statement of Work (SOW) is Performance-Based, written in terms of functional requirements implemented by Contract Task Orders (CTOs). The contractor works jointly with NASA to operate and maintain the Center's aerospace test facilities. The current contract includes an organizational conflict of interest clause.

The current contract is incentivized using Incentive Fee for Cost performance and Award Fee for Quality, Safety, and Timeliness. By splitting Cost Performance out of the Award Fee, the Government was able to focus on making cost reduction improvements.

Information Specifically Related to this Acquisition:

This acquisition will be issued for Full and Open competition for a period of five (5) years with a two-year base period and three one-year options.

The NAICS code and Size Standard is 561210 – Facility Support Services with a size standard of \$35.5M.

The contract awarded from this solicitation will also be Performance-Based. The SOW is formatted such that the Contractor should have a clear understanding of the required outcomes rather than the expected effort. This is intended to allow the Contractor autonomy and responsibility to manage its resources and to encourage the partnership between NASA and the Contractor.

However, this contract will not have an Award Fee component. The contract is anticipated to be Cost-Plus-Incentive-Fee with **both** Cost and Performance Incentives. Please refer to solicitation attachment J.1(a)12, Surveillance and Incentive Fee Plan, for more information.

The primary mission of the aerospace test facilities and the Ames operating organizations remains constant. The Government expects that nearly all activities will be accomplished through teams consisting of NASA and Contractor personnel. The number of tests and projects, and the customer base served under this contract continue to change. These factors, as well as other potential changes and the desired improvements the Government intends to achieve, require a significant amount of flexibility for the NASA/Contractor teams to function.

Contract Task Orders (CTOs) will continue to be a critical tool used for this contract since the Government cannot precisely predict the magnitude of services that will be required during the life of this contract. The Government intends to issue a relatively small number of CTOs, typically at six month intervals during the life of the contract, which will allow the Contractor to address changes in requirements. Target Costs will be used to establish both the cost and performance incentives to reward the Contractor for meeting performance metrics.

All of the issues discussed above were factors in the development of the selection criteria to be used for evaluating the proposals received as a result of the Final RFP. The evaluation factors: Mission Suitability, Past Performance, and Cost, have been developed and prioritized to allow the Government the ability to choose a Contractor which it believes will best meet the objectives of this contract. All evaluation factors, Mission Suitability, Past Performance, and Cost, are essentially equal to each other. Mission Suitability and Past Performance factors, when combined, are significantly more important than the Cost factor.

Past Performance will be evaluated based on the corporate entities and subcontracting arrangements that are being proposed. The Past Performance of these performing entities along with the quantity of relevant experience will be of importance in determining a rating. Past Performance Questionnaires will be utilized to determine which offerors have a demonstrated ability to succeed in meeting similar contract requirements.

Specific Highlights by Section

The information presented below, by section, is used to delineate significant aspects of the RFP that the offeror should be aware of.

1. SECTION B - SUPPLIES OR SERVICES AND PRICE/COSTS

NOTE: PLEASE READ THIS SECTION OF THE DRAFT SOLICITATION CAREFULLY. As stated above, this contract is anticipated to be Cost-Plus-Incentive-Fee with both Cost and Performance Incentives.

- The minimum amount of supplies or services that shall be ordered during the effective period of this contract is \$300,000. The maximum amount of supplies or services that may be ordered for the potential 5 year period of the contract is \$200,000,000.00. **Task Orders for Other Direct Costs (Line Item 03) will be issued on a cost only basis.**

- During the performance of the resulting contract, the Government plans to issue task orders with clearly defined objectives, thus avoiding open-ended requirements. This approach will allow the Government to more accurately define the risk and costs associated with each task assignment.
- The Government envisions that a small number of task orders may be authorized within the first 90 days of the contract; however, the number of task orders could increase or decrease based on the Government requirements. Task orders under this contract are expected to vary in complexity, risk, and duration.
- Note that 2 clauses, B.1, *Supplies/Services to be Provided*, and B.6, *Estimated Cost and Fees*, contain a fill-in for an offeror to complete. In B.1, the offeror will complete the Phase-In Costs proposed. For B.6, the offeror will complete the target and maximum incentive fees.
- Note that Clause B.4, *Limitation Of Indirect Costs*, limits the indirect costs in excess of the ceiling rates set forth in Attachment J.1(a) 5, *Direct Labor Rates, Fringe Rates, Indirect Rates, Incentive Fee, and Ceiling Rate Matrices*.
- **NOTE:** The Government is seeking comments regarding the completed sharing ratios shown in clause B.6, *Estimated Cost and Fees*.

2. SECTION C - DESCRIPTION/SPECIFICATION/WORK STATEMENT

- The Statement of Work (SOW) describes the requirements for the work to be performed under this contract. The SOW is intentionally written describing the overall scope of ATOM requirement to be accomplished.
- Task orders will clearly state the objectives of each task order with applicable costs, and cost and performance incentives. This approach will enable the Government to monitor performance, and the Contractor to meet the Government's requirements in a cost effective and timely manner.

3. SECTION D – PACKAGING AND MARKING

No significant features or issues in this section.

4. SECTION E – INSPECTION AND ACCEPTANCE

No significant features or issues in this section.

5. SECTION F – DELIVERIES OR PERFORMANCE

- Contract level reports and other deliverables are included in Section J as Attachment J.1 (a) 2, *Contract Data Requirements List (CDRL)*.
- Contract Task Orders will include a schedule for specific task deliverables that are not included in the CDRL.

6. SECTION G – CONTRACT ADMINISTRATION DATA

- Clause G.10 *Incentive Fee Process* provides the process, in conjunction with the Surveillance and Incentive Fee Plan, for evaluation of the Contractor's performance.
- The Government has developed a Draft Surveillance and Incentive Fee Plan, Attachment J.1(a)12, for the Incentive Fee portion of this contract. NOTE – We are very interested in your comments and questions on improving this plan.

7. SECTION H – SPECIAL CONTRACT REQUIREMENTS

- Clause H.2, *Organizational Conflicts Of Interest, And Limitation Of Future Contracting*, includes information regarding potential conflicts of interest for this acquisition.
- **NOTE:** the nature and restriction specified in the Organizational Conflict of Interest clause is not identical to the current contract. **For this acquisition, the offeror will be required to submit a Organizational Conflict of Interest (OCI) Avoidance Plan with its proposal. In addition, an OCI Avoidance Plan may be required in response to individual task orders.**
- In accordance with clause H.4, NFS 1852.216-80, *Task Order Procedure*, and as part of the task order negotiations process, the Contracting Officer and the Contracting Officer's Technical Representative (COTR) will assess the direct labor and indirect rates proposed for the individual task orders, and compare them against the successful offeror's original proposal.
- Note that clause H.12, *Incorporation of the Contractor's Proposal (Offeror Fill In)* requires that the Mission Suitability proposal be incorporated in the contract.
-
- Please review closely the requirements of clause H.13 *Small Disadvantaged Business Participation – Contract Targets* which will require completion in the Offeror's proposal.
- Please review closely clause H.14, *Small Disadvantaged Business Participation – Contract Targets (Offeror Fill In)* as this is a fairly new requirement.

8. SECTION I – CONTRACT CLAUSES

- Personal Identity Verification of Contractor Personnel clause (See Paragraph I.2) addresses the contractor's compliance agency personal identity verification procedures identified in the contract that implement Homeland Security Presidential Directive-12 (HSPD-12), Office of Management and Budget (OMB) guidance M-05-24, and Federal Information Processing Standards Publication (FIPS PUB) Number 201.
- FAR Clauses 52.203-13 *Contractor Code of Business Ethics and Conduct*; and 52.244-6 *Subcontracts for Commercial Items* are dated December 2008 to reflect FAC 2005-28 which will become effective December 12, 2008.
- **NOTE:** The following FAR clauses 52.219-4 *Notice Of Price Evaluation Preference For Hubzone Small Business Concerns*; 52.219-23 *Notice Of Price Evaluation Adjustment For*

Small Disadvantaged Business Concerns; and 52.227-23, *Rights to Proposal Data (Technical)* are included by reference yet have areas requiring the Offeror to complete.

- 52.219-28, *Post-Award Small Business Program Rerepresentation (June 2007)*, has been included by reference.

9. SECTION J – LIST OF ATTACHMENTS

NOTE – ALL ATTACHMENTS ARE DRAFTS – THE FINAL VERSIONS WILL BE POSTED WITH THE FINAL SOLICITATION

Significant Attachments included in this Draft Solicitation:

- J.1(a)1 – Wage Determinations
- J.1(a)2 – Contract Data Requirements List
- J.1(a)10 – DoD Contract Security Classification Specification (DD254)
- J.1(a)12 – Surveillance and Incentive Fee Plan
- J.1(b)1 – As noted above, the current contractor has a staff of approximately 100 work-year-equivalents. The DRAFT Government Labor Estimate is included; however, it may be revised before the final RFP is issued. Position descriptions are not included at this time. The Government Labor Estimates are not intended to represent a binding requirement since the exact skill mix and work distribution are dependent on task orders issued after the contract is awarded. The offeror will be required to use the Government estimates for proposal purposes.
- J.1(b)3 – Pricing Attachment

10. SECTION K - REPRESENTATIONS, CERTIFICATIONS, AND OTHER STATEMENTS OF OFFERORS

No significant features or issues in this section.

11. SECTION L - INSTRUCTIONS, CONDITIONS, AND NOTICES TO OFFERORS

OFFERORS ARE ADVISED TO REVIEW THIS SECTION CAREFULLY.

- FAR 52.215-1, *Instructions to Offerors-Competitive Acquisition*, ensures that offerors are aware that the Government intends to evaluate proposals and award a contract without discussions with offerors (except clarifications as described in FAR 15.306(a)), unless the Contracting Officer determines that discussions are necessary. Therefore, the offeror's initial proposal should contain the offeror's best terms from a cost or price and technical standpoint. The Government reserves the right to conduct discussions if the Contracting Officer later determines them to be necessary. The Government seeks to maximize the quality of the offeror's initial proposal, improve the efficiency of the selection process, and reduce lead-time.
- For purposes of proposal submission, an Other Direct Costs (ODCs) estimate is provided for use in the offeror's cost model response and represents the Government's current best estimate of the contract requirements.

- Offeror's should closely read the instructions carefully and ensure that: page counts are not exceeded; that the information submitted is relevant to the oral proposal and written proposal volumes and sections; is formatted as requested; and is complete and accurate. Please note that for this acquisition, a Major Subcontract is defined as a subcontract valued at or over \$500,000.00 for the life of this contract, including options.
- An e-Library link will be provided in the final solicitation for documents listed in provision L.2 *AVAILABILITY OF SPECIFICATIONS NOT LISTED IN THE GSA INDEX OF FEDERAL SPECIFICATIONS, STANDARDS AND COMMERCIAL ITEM DESCRIPTIONS*.
- A Pre-Solicitation Conference is planned to be held on Tuesday, December 9, 2008, from 9-12 with a facility tour from 1-3. As stated in the Draft RFP, the conference will begin in Building 245 Auditorium. After the conference, the presentation charts and the list of attendees will be posted.
- The Mission Suitability (Volume I) consists of an Oral Presentation (see FAR 15.102 and solicitation provision L.8, *Instructions For Mission Suitability Oral Presentations*). The format of the Mission Suitability subfactors can be found at paragraph L.9, *Proposal Preparation—Specific Instructions*.
- Subfactor 4 under the Mission Suitability factor is Small Business Utilization providing for a separate and distinct evaluation of Small Business Utilization. Although Small Businesses are not required to submit Small Business subcontracting plans, this provision requires small businesses to provide subcontracting information in their proposal.

12. SECTION M – EVALUATION FACTORS AND AWARD

The evaluation approach is outlined in paragraph M.2, Evaluation Approach.

OFFERORS ARE ADVISED TO REVIEW THIS SECTION CAREFULLY.

End of Specific Highlights by Section

Industry Comments/Questions

Industry is requested to submit comments and questions on improving the solicitation. The Government will publish all questions and comments with the Government's response. Where appropriate, the Government will modify the relevant sections of the RFP in order to reflect suggestions from industry, or to address issues of consistency, ambiguity, or vagueness.

Again, NASA seeks comments on **all** aspects of the Draft Request for Proposal. Comments will be most valuable if they are accompanied by section, clause, and paragraph references, and include suggestions on specific changes to NASA's approach. All comments will be reviewed and responses will be developed by NASA and will be posted (on a non-attribution basis) on the Ames Business Opportunities Home Page. Comments are also welcome on areas that the interested party believes should be addressed, but are not currently covered in the Draft Request for Proposal.

Conclusion

This concludes the Highlights for the Draft RFP. Potential Offerors are encouraged to attend the Pre-Proposal Conference and Tour. All questions and comments are to be submitted by email to Ronnee.R.Gonzalez@nasa.gov and to Jill.Willard-1@nasa.gov.

As a final note, the information provided in these highlights is not intended to be construed differently from the information in the RFP. Should an apparent conflict in interpretation exist, the information in the RFP should be considered to take precedence.