

**International Space Station (ISS) Program Integration and Control (PI&C) Follow-on
Final Request for Proposal - NNJ09ZBG001R**

NUMBER	QUESTIONS	ANSWERS
15	<p>Section L, Part II, Section 1.0 (Page L-19): The table in Section 1.0 requests that “Offerors shall also submit three (3) original executed model contracts, Sections A-J, with all fill-ins completed (those fill-ins required to be completed by the Offeror).” In the Final RFP, there are many fields marked “TBD,” but it is unclear whether these are to be completed by the Offeror or by the Government. We have identified the below clauses as being potential fill-ins required to be completed by the Offeror; could the Government please confirm which clauses should be completed by the Offeror?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. B.3 b. B.5 c. F.4, Option 1, A (“\$XX M”) d. F.4, Option 2, A (“\$XX M”) e. H.5 f. H.6 g. I.14 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. To be completed by the Offeror b. To be completed by the Government at contract award. c. To be completed by the Government at contract award. d. To be completed by the Government at contract award. e. To be completed by the Offeror f. To be completed by the Offeror g. To be completed by the Government at contract award
16	<p>Section C, Section 1.3.1.2.2.(d) (Page C-16): This section states that the Contractor shall “Identify any issues or concerns derived from work transfer or deferral and presented to the ISS Program Manager.” Does the Government intend for the Contractor to present to the ISS Program Manager the “issues or concerns derived from work transfer or deferral” or does the Government want the Contractor to only identify those issues or concerns, derived from work</p>	<p>The Contractor would identify any issues or concerns; provide those issues/concerns to NASA Configuration Management (CM) and NASA CM would elevate/present to the Program Manager. Statement of Work Section, 1.3.1.2.2 (d) has been modified to reflect these as follows:</p> <p>FROM:</p> <p>Identify any issues or concerns derived</p>

**International Space Station (ISS) Program Integration and Control (PI&C) Follow-on
Final Request for Proposal - NNJ09ZBG001R**

	transfer or deferral, that have been presented to the ISS Program Manager (in essence, should the word be “present” or “presented”)?	from work transfer or deferral and presented to the ISS Program Manager. TO: Identify any issues or concerns derived from work transfer or deferral and provide to NASA CM.
17	Section C, 1.4 (Page C-24): The second paragraph states that “Institutional desktop and workstation support for on-site personnel will be provided by NASA... in accordance with NFS 1852.245-77 and Mission Focus Review (MFR) 137.” Contractor off-site facilities are not mentioned; should the Offeror provide desktop and workstation support for off-site personnel?	It is the Government’s intent to provide ODIN desktops for those persons located on-site only. Those personnel that are located off-site requiring desktops and workstation support shall be provided by the offeror. Details of Offerors plan shall be documented in the response to Section C, 1.4 and its associated cost in Section B, Clause B.4.
18	Section C, Section 3.1.1.11, Systems Engineering and Test and Verification (T&V) Support (Page C-58): This section notes that the contractor is responsible for performing OMRSD functions including maintenance of the OMRS database, change processing for requirements in the OMRS document, and requirements tracking and change paper closure. Understanding that the OMRSD is a repository for all KSC-related Operations and Maintenance requirements for numerous programs (e.g., Shuttle, ELV, Station, etc.) six questions arise: 1) Is the PI&C contractor responsible only for the management of ALL THE REQUIREMENTS in the database, only for the management of STATION-RELATED REQUIREMENTS in the database, management of the entire OMRS DATABASE ITSELF (essentially the IT function including user account administration and training - regardless of what program-specific requirements are in the database) or any/all of the above?	When Shuttle retires, the PI&C Contractor will be responsible for the OMRS database functions and maintenance, including user account administration and training. Regarding requirements, the Contractor is responsible for all ISS hardware and payload requirements.

**International Space Station (ISS) Program Integration and Control (PI&C) Follow-on
Final Request for Proposal - NNJ09ZBG001R**

	<p>2) If we are responsible for database administration: Will any other entity be administering any part of the OMRS database or will all administration responsibilities be shifted to the PI&C contractor?</p> <p>3) We anticipate that the government will provide software and system information on the OMRSD data base (the system referred to in SOW 3.1.1.11.(a) in Appendices 3 and 4 of the SOW as with the other software and systems required to perform the SOW. Is this correct?</p> <p>4) The SOW states that the contractor shall perform “software updates required to ensure the system operates properly.” Is the “system” referred to solely the OMRS File 10 database (DRD PIC-VT-01)?</p> <p>5) Does “Maintenance of the NSTS 08171, OMRS File 10 database” include user account administration, user support, user application training, and hosting?</p> <p>6) Does the government require the ISS PI&C contractor to be responsible for disabling the Shuttle-specific components of the OMRS database and, if so, are application modifications included in the scope of that disabling task?</p>	<p>When Shuttle retires, the PI&C Contractor will be the only Contractor responsible for all OMRS administration.</p> <p>Yes. It is a government owned database. When Shuttle retires, all existing documentation/software will be transferred to the PI&C contractor.</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>No. The government anticipates that the incumbent will perform this function as part of closeout.</p>
19	Attachment J-1, DRD PIC-PC-01, Attachment 1 (Page J-A1-22): Formats 1-5 state “Error! Not a valid link.” Could the Government please provide the Formats?	Amendment 2 to the RFP provides the formats.

**International Space Station (ISS) Program Integration and Control (PI&C) Follow-on
Final Request for Proposal - NNJ09ZBG001R**

20	Section L, Part II, Section 1.0, Table (Page L-18): Would the Government increase the page limit for the Technical Approach section from 120 to 150 pages to allow us to provide proposal responses suitable for a comprehensive evaluation?	While NASA appreciates your suggestion, NASA has put an extensive effort into determining generous page counts for Offerors to document their intent in meeting the RFP requirements. Therefore, the page limit for the Technical Approach section will remain 120 pages.
21	Section L, Part II, Section 1.0 (Page L-19): The government requests that “Offerors shall also submit three (3) original executed model contracts, Sections A-J, with all fill-ins completed (those fill-ins required to be completed by the Offeror).” The Government has provided the Final RFP in PDF format. Would the Government be willing to provide the Final RFP in Word format?	The Government recommends use of PDF converter software or manually filling in the required fill-ins.
22	<p>Section L, Part II, Section 5.C (Page L-27): Milestone 4: Plans and Other Data Deliverables lists the following documents as needing to be complete and submitted for NASA review and/or approval (per DRD):</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. PIC-CM-01, Configuration Management Plan 2. PIC-IT-01, Information Technology (IT) Management Plan 3. PIC-PM-01, PI&C Management Plan 4. PIC-PM-03, Certification of Flight Readiness (CoFR) Plan 5. PIC-PR-03, Wage/Salary and Fringe Benefit 6. PIC-SA-01, Mission Assurance and Risk Management Plan <p>In reviewing Attachment J-1 (Data Requirements List and Data Requirements Descriptions), some discrepancies were noted:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. For PIC-CM-01, the First Submission Date is listed as “Ninety (90) days following contract start” (Page J-A1-6) 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. PIC-CM-01, First Submission Date is now listed as, “Thirty (30) days after Contract Award. Final due sixty (60) days after contract start.” Please see Final RFP.

**International Space Station (ISS) Program Integration and Control (PI&C) Follow-on
Final Request for Proposal - NNJ09ZBG001R**

	<p>2. For PIC-IT-01, the First Submission Date is listed as “30 days after contract start” (Page J-A1-11)</p> <p>3. For PIC-PM-01, the First Submission Date is listed as “Draft within thirty (30) days after contract award. Final within ninety (90) days after contract start” (Page J-A1-34)</p> <p>4. For PIC-PM-03, the First Submission Date is listed as “Draft within 30 days after contract award. Final within 60 days from contract start” (Page J-A1-38)</p> <p>5. For PIC-PR-03, the First Submission Date is listed as “30 days following contract start” (Page J-A1-42)</p> <p>6. For PIC-SA-01, the First Submission Date is listed as “Draft MA&RM plan by the end of the phase-in period. Final MA&RM plan within 90 days after contract start.”</p> <p>Could the Government please clarify which plans are due during the Phase-in Period and in which state (Draft or Final)?</p>	<p>2. PIC-IT-01, First Submission date is now listed as, “30 days after contract award.” Please see Final RFP.</p> <p>3. No adjustment needed, please carefully reread Section L, Part II, Section 5.0 Volume II Plans, B. Phase-in & Transition Plan.</p> <p>4. No adjustment needed, please carefully reread Section L, Part II, Section 5.0 Volume II Plans, B. Phase-in & Transition Plan.</p> <p>5. PIC-PR-03, First Submission Date is now listed as “30 days after contract award.” Please see Final RFP.</p> <p>6. No adjustment needed, please carefully reread Section L, Part II, Section 5.0 Volume II Plans, B. Phase-in & Transition Plan.</p> <p>Information provided in Section L and Attachment J-1 Data Requirements List (DRL) and Data Requirements Descriptions (DRDs).</p>
23	<p>Section L, Part II, Section 7.A (Page L-36): Are the CDs requested by the Government in this section in addition to the CDs requested by the Government in Section L, Part II, Section 2.0 (Page L-20)?</p> <p>In other words, does the Government want a total of four CDs, two of which contain the entire proposal (as defined in Section L, Part II, Section 2.0 [Page L-20]) and two of which contain just the cost volume (as</p>	<p>No</p> <p>No</p>

**International Space Station (ISS) Program Integration and Control (PI&C) Follow-on
Final Request for Proposal - NNJ09ZBG001R**

	requested by Section L, Part II, Section 7.A [Page L-36])?	
24	Section L, Appendix 5, Table L-2 (Page L-A5-4): SOW Section 6.4 is not listed in Table L-2. Is it the Government's intent that this section not be discussed as either Rollup or Detail?	<p>No. SOW Section 6.4 is covered in the Rollup of 6.0. In the event a SOW Section is not listed in Section L, Appendix 5 Table L-2, the Offeror is to address it in the respective roll-up SOW Section immediately prior to the unlisted SOW Section. [For example, SOW Sections 6.4, 6.6, and 6.7 identified in the SOW, but unlisted in the updated table shall be discussed in the rollup section 6.0.] Conversely, those items identified as detail are not required as part of the rollup. "Rollup" & "Detail" is discussed in more detailed in Section L, 4.0 Volume I, Technical and Management Approach.</p> <p>Section L, Appendix 5, Table L-2:PI&C SOW Proposal Level of Detail and WYEs has been modified for clarification.</p>
25	Section L, Appendix 5, Table L-2 (Page L-A5-4): SOW Sections 6.1, 6.2, 6.6, and 6.7 are listed as Rollup, whereas in the Draft RFP they were listed as Detail. Can the Government please confirm that these should be Rollup?	6.6, Quality Assurance and 6.7, Operations Safety are "Rollup" and 6.1, S&MA Management and Administration and 6.2, S&MA Integration are now "Detail." Amendment 2, Section L, Appendix 5, Table L-2, PI&C SOW Proposal Level of Detail and WYEs has been updated to reflect these changes.
26	Section L, Appendix 6, Section D (Page L-A6-4): Are the requirements to reconcile the section D table of resources with the Price Proposal appropriate considering the Price Proposal is based on Government provided sample hours by SLC and the Section D resource estimates required in Volume I are to be our estimates of the resources required to perform the SOW requirements?	Please see Amendment # 2 and the response to Question #13 below.
27	Section L, Appendix 6, Section A (Page L-A6-1): The required information about IT tools is extensive and would seem unnecessary for tools the Government is providing for contractor use. May we exclude from this section those tools that are	Yes. It is the Government's intent for the Offeror not to explain those tools listed in the referenced tables.

**International Space Station (ISS) Program Integration and Control (PI&C) Follow-on
Final Request for Proposal - NNJ09ZBG001R**

	<p>already known to the government and listed in the Addenda to Section C (Addendum 2, Table 1, Government Furnished Applications; Addendum 4, Table 1, COTS Software; Addendum 4, Table 2, ISS Prescribed Applications)?</p>	
<p>28</p>	<p>Section L, Appendix 6, Section D (Page L-A6-4) and the Final RFP Cover Letter: Are the sample TO's in Section L to be used in developing the resource estimates? The cover letter indicates the sample TO's are for informational purposes only and will not be part of the selection criteria, yet the sample TO's are the only source of workload indicators that are needed to develop resource estimates for FY10.</p>	<p>Yes, per the Final RFP Cover Letter, the task orders will not be a part of the selection criteria. Offerors may choose to use information in the Task Orders, the Statement of Work along with all information in the RFP, and technical library when developing proposals.</p>