

Research, Engineering, and Mission Integration Services 2 (REMIS2)				
Draft Request for Proposal (DRFP) Questions and Answers				
The questions in this document are reproduced as submitted in response to the DRFP posted from March 3-16, 2023				
#	Clause/ Provision	Reference	Question/Comment	Response
1	B 6	The contract type for the Research, Engineering, Mission, and Integration Services 2 (REMIS2) effort is Multiple-Award Indefinite-Delivery Indefinite-Quantity (IDIQ) contract with Firm-Fixed-Price (FFP) and Cost-Plus-Fixed Fee (CPFF) Task Orders (TOs)	The current REMIS contract uses a CLIN structure to align company capabilities with specific ISS program requirements (e.g., Research, Engineering, and Parts Purchase). TO RFPs are issued by CLIN to qualifying companies with demonstrated capabilities for each requirement type and are awarded in a rapid and streamlined manner (which are the primary purposes of multi-award IDIQ contracts). The lack of specific capability "swim lanes" in the REMIS 2 contract structure enables any company receiving a REMIS 2 master contract award the opportunity to propose on any TO RFP regardless of their verified capabilities. This complicates the TO RFP evaluation process and compromises the ability to make TO awards in a timely manner. We recommend the Government include a CLIN structure similar to REMIS in the REMIS 2 contracts to improve the efficiency of subsequent TO procurements.	The Government does not plan on using the CLIN structure used in REMIS. All TOs will be written against a single CLIN.
2	B 8 and B 9	B 8(a) states, "At the bottom of the table there is a row that allows indirect rates to be applied to any non-labor resources, except for travel, as required by task order, if applicable."	May contractors apply indirect burdens to travel cost under both FFP and CPFF task orders, in accordance with their disclosed accounting practices?	Offerors may apply indirects to other direct costs, including travel. Clauses B 8 and B 9 of the Final RFP will be updated to allow for additional indirect rates and for application of indirects to travel.
3	B 8 and B 9	Indirect Cost Rate applied to Non-labor resources	May offerors propose more than one indirect cost rate for non-labor resources in Tables B 8 and B 9, in accordance with their disclosed accounting practices for the type of non-labor cost (e.g., material vs ODCs/travel)?	Offerors may apply indirects to other direct costs, including travel. Clauses B 8 and B 9 of the Final RFP will be updated to allow for additional indirect rates and for application of indirects to travel.
4	B 8 and B 9		Sections B 8(a) and B 9(a) state, in part (emphasis added): "At the bottom of the table there is a row that allows indirect rates to be applied to any non-labor resources, except for travel." The double-asterisk below each table states (emphasis added): "Indirect Rate(s) to be applied to non-labor costs (i.e., material, travel) per contract year." Since offerors may have allowable and allocable indirect rates (e.g., general & administrative) applied to travel costs in accordance with Disclosure Statements and Generally Accepted Accounting Principles and in order to resolve the inconsistency, we respectfully request that "except for travel" be removed from Sections B 8(a) and B 9(a).	Offerors may apply indirects to other direct costs, including travel. Clauses B 8 and B 9 of the Final RFP will be updated to allow for additional indirect rates and for application of indirects to travel.
5	B 8 and B 9		Row 21 of the tables in Sections B 8 and B 9 captures the "Indirect Cost Rate applied to Non-Labor Resources if applicable to a Task Order." Since offerors may have different indirect rates for different cost elements (e.g., travel/ODCs and materials & subcontracts), please confirm that offerors may add rows to capture the various indirect rates.	Offerors may apply indirects to other direct costs, including travel. Clauses B 8 and B 9 of the Final RFP will be updated to allow for additional indirect rates and for application of indirects to travel.
6	B 8 and B 9		Please confirm that the CPFF labor rates in Section B 9 are exclusive of profit/fee since there is a row in the Labor Rates table that identifies the maximum fee rate to be applied. (Note that the rates in the Section B 9 tables will not match the calculated labor rates in Attachment L-5 (Cost Price Template) which are inclusive of fee.)	Cost Price templates will be remedied in the final RFP to reflect rates exclusive of profit/fee.
7	B 8	The labor rates are fully burdened composite team rates (prime and subcontractors); these composite labor rates include wages, overhead, and General and Administrative (G&A) but exclude profit.	Please indicate if the fully burdened composite rates are inclusive of all potential geographical locations or should separate tables be provided for each location.	The offeror is instructed to propose NTE max rates for this proposal. Clauses B 8 and B 9 state, "The rates in this table are maximum rates which may be proposed or negotiated for individual task orders during contract performance, for any place of performance, and will be used for evaluating task orders/revisions and determining price reasonableness."
8	B 8, Cost and Price Templates		Due to the firm fixed price (FFP) nature of FFP task orders, please confirm that the FFP Labor Rates in the Section B 8 tables are inclusive of profit (matching the calculated labor rates in Attachment L-5 (Cost Price Template) which are inclusive of profit). Further, the NTE Profit % in Row 22 should be removed since the FFP rates already include profit. The bold red parenthetical text above the rate table may also need to be revised to remove the reference to maximum profit rate.	Clause B 8a states: "The labor rates are fully burdened composite team rates (prime and all subcontractors); these composite labor rates include wages, overhead, and General and Administrative (G&A) but exclude prime profit." The cost price template has been updated to subtotal the rates exclusive of prime profit/fee.
9	B 8(c); B 9(c)	The Contractor shall perform the work under this contract at the Contractor's site, unless otherwise specified in the task order. Non-labor Resources, including but not limited to, materials, equipment, and facilities will be negotiated on a task order basis in accordance with Clause NFS 1852 216-80, Task Ordering Procedure [Applicable Only to IDIQ].	Performing work at contractor's facilities typically requires offerors to incorporate facility costs in the indirect rate applied to labor. This causes fully burdened labor rates to vary widely, based on the type of facility costs included in indirect rates (e.g., office space, laboratory space, fabrication and manufacturing facilities, etc.). This can make it very difficult for the government to conduct rate comparisons among offerors. Because the government indicates that facilities are among the non-labor resources that will be negotiated on a task order basis, we recommend that the government add a line to the rate tables in Sections B 8 and B 9 for facility burden (similar to the indirect rate applied to non-labor resources). As an alternative, we recommend the government exclude laboratory, fabrication/manufacturing, and similar facilities from proposed indirect rates. This will enable the government to make a more equitable comparison of labor rates among offerors.	The offeror is instructed to propose NTE max rates for this proposal. Clauses B 8 and B 9 state, "The rates in this table are maximum rates which may be proposed or negotiated for individual task orders during contract performance, for any place of performance, and will be used for evaluating task orders/revisions and determining price reasonableness."  Facility costs to be negotiated at the task order level would only be for direct facilities.
10	C	Second paragraph	Considering this is a multi-award IDIQ, will all TO RFPs be provided to all successful offerors who onboard the master contract, or will small business and socioeconomic set-asides be used for subsets of firms to bid on resulting TOs?	The Government has the ability to set-aside TOs. Refer to the clause at I 7, 52 219-13, Notice of Set-Aside Orders.

11	F 4		The current REMIS Contract contains a Period of Performance, Contract Section F 4, through September 5, 2024. The DRFP contains an anticipated contract award date of August 31, 2023, with an October 1, 2023, contract effective date. Will the two contracts have an overlapping period and both be effective simultaneously? And if so, what is the reasoning for this?	The Government does not anticipate transitioning TOs awarded on REMIS to REMIS2. As such there will be an overlap of the ordering periods of the two contracts. All new scope will be competed on REMIS 2 after award.
12	F 5		Section F 5: Should the number of days in the first paragraph of Section F 5 be 30 days instead of 3 days?	No
13	F 6, Cover Letter	The anticipated contract award date is August 31, 2023, with an October 1, 2023, contract effective date. <i>The contract will be performed offsite at the contractor's facilities. [emphasis added]</i> The Contractor shall perform the work under this contract at the Contractor's site, unless otherwise specified in the task order. [emphasis added]	The emphasized statements from the cover letter and paragraph F 6 appear to be in conflict. Please clarify the correct requirement regarding where REMIS 2 work is to be performed.	Noted for final RFP. Will add "unless otherwise specified in the task order" to cover letter.
14	G 7	(b) For any contract requiring a Facility Clearance Level (FCL) for access to Classified National Security Information (CNSI), the contractor shall adhere to the Agency-wide program policy and guidance related to the protection of CNSI by complying with the following: • NPR 1600 2, NASA Classified National Security Information (current version)	How does NASA plan to qualify prospective REMIS 2 Offerors to perform classified TOs? Please consider issuing a DD254 with the Final RFP and evaluating Offeror credentials as part of Volume IV, Responsibility Considerations.	In the event that a TO requiring classified clearance is required, the Government will take into consideration additional clearances as part of the RFTOP process.
15	H 5	OPI (Include Program Manager at a minimum)	The RFP requires identification of a Program Manager as key personnel (at a minimum), but there are no instructions or evaluation criteria related to Key Personnel in Sections L and M. We recommend including instructions in L 22.1 (e.g., MA3) for the identification of key positions and corresponding key personnel resumes, as well as related evaluation criteria in M 3.1. Please exclude this additional information from the page limits in Table L-2.	The Key Personnel clause is included to require the contractor to inform the Government upon a change in program management, but is not an evaluation criteria. Therefore, it is not requested in the management approach.
16	I 8		Section I 8: Deviation 19-02A is dated April 2022. However, the latest version of FAR 52.219-14 is dated October 2022. Please clarify.	The referenced clause/provision has been updated to the OCT 2022 version in the RFP.
17	I 9		Section I 9: Deviation 19-02A is dated April 2022. However, the latest version of FAR 52.219-27 is dated October 2022. Please clarify.	The referenced clause/provision has been updated to the OCT 2022 version in the RFP.
18	I 10		Section I 10: Deviation 19-02A is dated April 2022. However, the latest version of FAR 52.219-29 is dated October 2022. Please clarify.	The referenced clause/provision has been updated to the OCT 2022 version in the RFP.
19	I 11		Section I 11: Deviation 19-02A is dated April 2022. However, the latest version of FAR 52.219-30 is dated October 2022. Please clarify.	The referenced clause/provision has been updated to the OCT 2022 version in the RFP.
20	I 12		Section I 12: Deviation 20-02B is dated March 2022. However, the latest version of FAR 52.222-19 is dated December 2022. Please clarify.	The referenced clause/provision has been updated to the DEC 2022 version in the RFP.
21	I 19		Section I 19: Deviation 20-03B is dated March 2022. However, the latest version of FAR 52.244-6 is dated December 2022. Please clarify.	The referenced clause/provision has been updated to the MAR 2023 version in the RFP.
22	I 24		Section I 24: NFS 1852.225-71 is no longer listed in the NASA FAR Supplement as a valid clause. Please clarify.	The deviation in the DRFP is the current version in use by NASA. The FAR update does not take into account the subject matter of the class deviation.
23	I 25		Section I 25: 1852.239-74 is no longer listed in the NASA FAR Supplement as a valid clause. Please clarify.	The deviation in the DRFP is the current version in use by NASA. The FAR update does not take into account the subject matter of the class deviation.
24	J-1		Section J-1, DRD No. REMIS2-TC-03 (S&H Plan) (Page J-1-57): Please confirm that the reference to SOW 2.6 in Block 6 should be to SOW 2.7 instead.	Confirmed. This has been corrected in the final RFP.
25	J-1	1. Address the Contractor's plan for work definition and authorization, scheduling, budgeting, cost data accumulation and reporting, safety and quality assurance, subcontracting, material control, indirect cost management, baseline control, knowledge capture, and organization structure and culture, including the following:	There appears to be missing information following the "—" in this instruction since item 2 in the bulleted list follows immediately. Please clarify.	Thank you for bringing this to the board's attention. This formatting issue will be addressed in the final RFP.

26	J-4	Administrative Specialist III; Education/Experience: Typically requires high school degree or equivalent and 6+ years of related experience	We recommend years of experience be increased to 8+ This creates greater separation between the Level II and Level III positions, and is consistent with the experience requirements for other Level III positions among the Standard Labor Categories	After consideration, the Government maintains 6+ years of experience for Administrative Specialist III to allow for flexibility
27	K-9		Section K-9: NFS 1852 225-72 is marked as "Reserved" in the current version of the NASA FAR Supplement Please clarify	The deviation in the DRFP is the current version in use by NASA The FAR update does not take into account the subject matter of the class deviation
28	L-1 i		Section L-1 I (Page L-2): Please confirm the title of FAR 52 222-24 is "Preaward On-Site Equal Opportunity Compliance Evaluation" (instead of "Preaward On-Site Equal Opportunity Charges—Identification of Subcontract Effort")	"Preaward On-Site Equal Opportunity Compliance Evaluation" is the correct clause title
29	L-8		Section L-8: NFS 1852 239-73 is no longer listed in the NASA FAR Supplement as a valid clause Please clarify	The deviation in the DRFP is the current version in use by NASA The FAR update does not take into account the subject matter of the class deviation
30	L-9	NFS 1852 245-80 GOVERNMENT PROPERTY MANAGEMENT INFORMATION (JAN 2011)	Please confirm that the information requested in the referenced NFS clause is part of the Government Property Management Plan due 30 days after contract award (per Attachment L-9 )	Confirmed The RFP has been updated for clarity
31	L-20(a)(1)	Last sentence: Pages shall be formatted in a standard page style, without the use of numerous columns	Please define the number of specific columns that can be used in a standard page style	RFP language has been updated to remove column specifications
32	L-22-3	The instructions regarding Small Disadvantaged Business (SDB) participation apply to all Offerors	Please clarify instructions regarding SDB participation , especially with regard to small business offerors	As stated in L-22-3 SMALL BUSINESS UTILIZATION (SBU) - MISSION SUITABILITY SUBFACTOR 3 Small businesses are required to indicate the amount of effort proposed to be done by a small business either at the prime level or at the first-tier subcontract level All references to SDB Participation will be removed in the final RFP
33	L-22-3; Attachment J-1; DRD REMIS2-PR-04	In addition to submitting a Small Business Subcontracting Plan (Large Businesses only) in accordance with FAR clause 52 219-9, Alternate II, Offerors shall complete Exhibit A, SMALL BUSINESS SUBCONTRACTING PLAN GOALS,	Only the Small Business Subcontracting Plan is identified as required of Large Businesses only Please clarify which DRD requirements, if any, are required to be submitted by small business offerors; specifically, Exhibit A, Small Business Subcontracting Plan Goals; and Commitment to the Small Business Program	Please refer to provision L-22-3 All Offerors, except small businesses, must complete the portion of the instructions under Small Business Subcontracting specific to the Small Business Subcontracting Plan, (DRD-REMIS2-PR-04) Small businesses are not required to submit Small Business Subcontracting Plans; however, small businesses are required to indicate the amount of effort proposed to be done by a small business either at the prime level or at the first-tier subcontract level
34	L-23	(a) Offerors shall demonstrate past experience in all areas of the statement of work by submitting information on up to five (5) past contracts that best demonstrates their ability to perform the REMIS2 work	Please clarify if individual TOs awarded under an IDIQ contract contribute separately or collectively towards the five contract limit (i.e., do three REMIS TOs count as three contracts toward the five contract limit)	Offerors are to submit up to five contracts IDIQ contracts may consist of one or many task orders Each individual contract, regardless of the number of Task Orders placed against it, will be considered a single contract for the purposes of past performance evaluation
35	L-23	(a) Offerors shall demonstrate past experience in all areas of the statement of work by submitting information on up to five (5) past contracts that best demonstrates their ability to perform the REMIS2 work	Please clarify if the five contract limit is for the entire team inclusive of prime and subcontractors, or can each team member submit up to five contracts?	Offerors are limited to five submissions total, regardless of teaming arrangements
36	L-24 and Attachment L-5 Cost-Price Template	Section L-24 states, "Absent a FPRA/FPRR, the Offeror is instructed to submit a template for each indirect rate proposed (i.e., labor overhead, fringe benefits, general & administrative) and should list the cost elements of each pool and the dollar amount of each cost element by Contractor Fiscal Year " and Tabs 6a through 6c instructions state: "A current DCAA Forward Pricing Rate Agreement may be provided in lieu of completing this template for the respective [respective] rates "	Please confirm that offerors with an FPRA or FPRR are not required to complete tabs 6x In this case, where should offerors enter their FPRA/FPRR rates in the Cost/Price Template?	If Offeror is using FPRA/FPRR, then they do not need to fill out the info in the template Offerors shall submit FPRA or FPRR as part of their narrative
37	L-25(a)(2)	2) With Final Proposal Revision (FPR) or from the Apparent Awardee(s) (if no discussions are necessary)	Please confirm that the information requested by paragraphs h), i), j), and k) within this section are NOT required to be submitted with the REMIS 2 proposal	Correct, the information requested by draft RFP paragraphs L-25(a)(2)(h - k) are NOT required to be submitted with the initial proposals The numbering the RFP has been updated for clarity
38	L-27	Pursuant to FAR 52 227-15(b), the offeror is required to identify and represent limited rights data and restricted computer software necessary for fulfilling this contract's data delivery requirements	This requirement does not fall within the instructions for any of the proposal volumes Please clarify where we are to address this requirement	This requirement is to be completed in provision K-2
39	L-5 Cost-Price Template	Tabs 3 and 5, CPFF and FFP IDIQ Rate Development	Should offerors copy the Year 1 rate table vertically or horizontally to provide the rate development detail for subsequent contract years? Recommend adding instructions in Section L and/or within the tabs	Template will be pre-populated on the final RFP version
40	L-5 Cost-Price Template	Tab 8 FBACP	Is it the Government's intent that the data entered in the FBACP tab should reflect the total 9-year period of performance? Using totals for these values and the resulting percentages will reflect a weighted average over the total period, and as such, the total fringe percentage will not coincide with the fringe rates from the FPRA/FPRR or those entered in Tab 6x	It is the Government's intent that data entered in the FBACP tab shall reflect Year One of the period of performance
41	L-5 Cost-Price Template	Tab 8 FBACP Health and Welfare	Recommend the government update this section to only include fringe benefits that are considered "bona fide" fringe benefits in accordance with 29 CFR § 4 171 - "Bona fide" fringe benefits, and add a section for "Other Fringe Benefits" excluded from the "Health & Welfare" section	The Government respectfully declines this recommendation Offerors may identify other fringe benefits under the Health and Welfare Category

42	L-5 Cost-Price Template	Cost-Price Template formatting	Recommend the government update Cost-Price Template, such that every tab can include the Offeror's name and proprietary data disclosures	Offerors may add this information, if applicable, to the template header or footer
43	M 2	The Government will award a contract resulting from this solicitation to the responsible offeror whose proposal represents the best value to the Government	The evaluation model includes language indicative of a single-award, best value selection rather than multiple award IDIQ contracts. We respectfully request the Government provide specific standards that must be satisfied to receive a REMIS 2 award	Language will be updated for multiple awards
44	M 3		What is the Government's rationale for a numerical scoring of the Mission Suitability Subfactor for REMIS 2, as opposed to the High, Moderate and Low Confidence ratings of this subfactor in the original REMIS procurement? Even without representative IDIQ TOs, the nature of the evaluation has not changed and so it seems that the same adjectival rating for Mission Suitability would still be appropriate. If the Government elects to keep the numerical scoring of the Mission Suitability Subfactor, we recommend that the weight of small business participation be lowered to 100 points to more closely reflect the percentage value of the appropriate subcontracting goal for small business of 11.5% as a percentage of Contract Value	The Government can use any rating method or combination of methods to evaluate proposals received for a procurement. The Government has chosen to use numerical weights in the evaluation of this particular procurement. The numerical weights provided reflect the importance of the subfactors as described in the solicitation.
45	M 3	The Mission Suitability subfactors and their corresponding weights reflecting relative importance are listed below. These weights are intended to be used as a guideline in the source selection decision-making process.	We recommend that the government either use the evaluation points to establish a threshold at or above which all offerors receive a master contract award, or remove the points from the evaluation entirely and go to a confidence-based evaluation as was used in the current REMIS contract. If evaluation points continue to be used for evaluation, please clarify how small business offerors will be scored against the Small Business Participation subfactor. If evaluation points continue to be used for evaluation, we recommend that Small Business Subcontracting be reduced to 100 points, which is consistent with other JSC RFPs.	The Government does not plan to establish a mission suitability points threshold at or above which all offerors receive a master contract award. Each submittal will be evaluated against the entirety of the Mission Suitability subfactors.  Please refer to provision M 3.3 for information on how the SBU factor will be evaluated.
46	M 4	Relevance: If the contract is deemed recent, the Government will then determine the degree of relevance - i.e., level of pertinence of the contract based on size, content, and complexity.	What are the size criteria used by the Government in their determination of relevance? We recommend the size criteria reflect anticipated REMIS 2 task order sizes and not the contract as a whole.	No, the Government does not plan to establish a minimum size criteria for past performance relevance. Please refer to provision M 4(b), which states, in part, "The past performance of a prime or team member will be compared to the work proposed to be performed by that prime or team member and weighted accordingly in assigning the overall past performance adjectival rating to the offeror. The past performance of an existing joint venture will be weighted more heavily than work performed by its joint venture partners separately. This evaluation will consider what the corporate parent, affiliate, or other organizational entities (division(s), business units, segments) are responsible for and/or proposing to do on the REMIS2 effort and the specific resources (workforce, management, facilities, or other resources) to be employed and relied upon, such that the corporate parent, affiliate, or other organizational entity your company will have meaningful involvement in contract performance, in determining relevance."
47	M 5	(d) For purposes of source selection, and in accordance with FAR 52.217-5, Evaluation of Options, the total proposed cost/price will be utilized. The total proposed cost/price consists of the Base Period, and Options. The proposed and probable cost/price for the cost/price summary will be summed and presented to the SSA.	What is the impact on the evaluation of total proposed cost/price for additional labor categories proposed by Offerors? Should additional labor categories be proposed at zero hours to provide an accurate comparison between Offerors?	All non-standard labor categories shall be proposed at 0 hours.
48	M 7	L 26 - M 7 Volume V	Since a Model Contract is required will the Government please provide the final RFP in MS Word format for Offerors to populate?	A MS Word version of the model contract sections will be provided with the final RFP.
49	J-1	DRD REMIS2-PM-01 Program Management Plan	The Government has removed the requirement for a commercialization plan within the Program Management Plan (REMIS versus REMIS2). Is the Government discouraging commercial solutions/approaches?	While a commercialization approach was requested with the original REMIS proposals, the Government recognizes some Task Orders did not include sufficient funding to fully include the commercialization approach. The non-inclusion of a commercialization plan within the Program Management Plan does not preclude the Contractor(s) from pursuing commercial processes.