

SMAEC III Industry Day Questions and Answers

Questions received through 2/3/2023

No.	Question	Answer
1	<p>In our RFI we discussed the benefits of keeping the Past Performance (PP) recency period at 5-years, as was in the SMAEC II procurement. Given the consistency in S&MA and the long-term nature of HSF programs and projects will the Government keep the PP recency period at 5-years?</p>	<p>The SMAEC III procurement strategy has not been approved. Official evaluation criteria will be distributed with the final Request for Proposal (RFP). Recommendations for enhancing the SMAEC III solicitation will be considered.</p>
2	<p>In the SMAEC II RFP there were over 230 pages of scored technical/management/PP material and DRDs required in response to the requirements. This is a significant burden on all.</p> <p>Is NASA considering reducing the overall requirements to be submitted in response to the RFP? The IMOC III and JETS II were in the ~70 page range for mission suitability, this seems to be a trend across many NASA procurements. Less content to develop, submit, and review</p>	<p>See answer to question No. 1.</p>
3	<p>Does NASA JSC intend to have the full contingent of JSC DRD's due at proposal submittal? In many cases these DRDs do not offer a means to discriminate between offers.</p>	<p>See answer to question No. 1.</p>
4	<p>The BOEs are a significant burden on many organizations, often favor the incumbent, and may not provide a significant discriminator between bidders (I.e. you often just get back a number similar to the Government Resource Estimate (GRE) and already included in the Cost Volume). If BOEs are to be required would the Government consider a focus on specific technical scenarios allowing the offers to establish their understanding and apply their unique solution to this subset of the mission suitability requirements.</p>	<p>See answer to question No. 1.</p>
5	<p>Does the government intend to release a GRE of the FTEs and skills level that have historically been required to support the requirements of the SMAEC III SOW?</p>	<p>See answer to question No. 1.</p>

6	Will the Government consider providing average historical Direct Labor rates. This will ensure the contractor is able to adequately incorporate current incumbent salary into the proposed rates. Given the difficulty in recruiting and retaining critical skills this data would reduce the offers and the Governments phase-in and operation risk.	It is the responsibility of the offeror to provide the labor rates for their respective proposal.
7	Will the Government consider providing escalation rates?	It is the responsibility of the offeror to provide the escalation rates for their respective proposal.
8	The RFI and Industry Day charts listed the NAICS Code as 541330. Is there consideration for making this 541715, this is used on many of the other services contracts at JSC that support similar programs and projects (JETS II and IMOC III). Also, GRC, MSFC, JPL, and GSFC use 541715 as the NAICS for their S&MA prime contracts.	The 541330 NAICS code will remain for SMAEC III.
9	If not, will NASA consider applying the 541330 Aerospace exception of \$41.5M?	The 541330 Aerospace exception of \$47M will apply to the SMAEC III RFP.
10	Can the Government provide the number of on-site contractor desks that are provided at JSC and White Sands Test Facility (WSTF)? This will allow us to properly size the off-site facility needs to support the workforce.	Currently, on-site contractor desks are provided for the following SMA functions: all SMAEC II WSTF SMA support, JSC pressure systems support, JSC quality assurance inspectors, and Receiving, Inspection and Test Facility (RITF). In addition, on-site contractor desks are also currently provided for various other functions when the job dictates on-site desks are required. The total on-site contractor desks is currently approximately 10% of the total SMAEC II workforce. The offeror is ultimately responsible for meeting the worksite location requirements.
11	Can the Government provide a list of the SMA-unique user hardware and software not included with the NASA IT standard hardware/software configurations that is supported by the SAMEC III?	The government will provide the list of SMA-unique user hardware and software as part of the the Request for Proposal (RFP) Technical Library.
12	"Growing Partner portfolio combined with reduced resources". Does this mean the total SMAEC resources are being reduced, or does it mean the ratio of SMAEC personnel to a growing portfolio of projects is reducing?	The government operates in a dynamic environment with ever changing needs for customer expectations, therefore the contractors must remain agile and flexible in their SMA support of future programs/projects.

13	<p>“Determining appropriate balance of SMA in line (product development) vs. assurance (product review) services for emerging programs”. Can you define assurance versus in line services? Also can you discuss insight versus oversight (importance and distinction)?</p>	<p>The SMA Directorate provides assurance for review of provider products and deliverables in support of the Program/Project Development Lifecycle Process. There are times the SMA Directorate is requested to produce some of those products on behalf of the Program/Projects, which we identify as "in-line". With regards to insight versus oversight, the SMA Directorate tailors the applicable requirements with every Program/Project to determine the necessary level and type of support needed.</p>
14	<p>“Developing creative, non-traditional partnerships to allow collaboration with- commercial industry for providing SMA products and services”. Please describe how the model should/might change beyond the SAA partnerships in use today (ex: CCP).</p> <p>We note that most commercial space programs include S&MA in the commercial OEM contractor contract statement of work. Please discuss this shared S&MA model.</p> <p>Is the need for new methods driven by civil servant resource challenges? Other?</p>	<p>NASA has started a new initiative for partnering with commercial industry to provide government services to help enable the growth of the commercial space industry. JSC too began reaching out to commercial industry to offer unique JSC services. This has resulted in the SMA Directorate developing and partnering with JSC on new methods such as collaboration agreements and Space Act Agreements to support commercial industry's needs for understanding human spaceflight SMA processes, methodologies and requirements. Commercial OEM contractor statements of work are outside the scope of the SMAEC III requirement.</p>
15	<p>“Evolving core capabilities is essential for providing exploration leadership and integration with new commercial partners globally”. Please describe in more detail what evolving core capabilities are needed.</p> <p>Shift to a digital world? Shift to commercial best practices? Applying analytics? Other?</p>	<p>The SMA core capabilities are continuously evolving as new innovations for techniques, models and tools become available. In addition, their applications are also evolving as new requests are received. The SMA Directorate must continue to be agile as the growing commercial industry and new programs/projects seek our assistance.</p>
16	<p>As NASA is developing new nuclear technology for propulsion, space flight power, and extra-terrestrial surface power will the JSC SMAEC III contractor be involved in the SMA activities for these systems or will NASA nuclear technology SMA activities be the responsibility of another NASA center? If another center, which one?</p>	<p>The Glenn Research Center (GRC) is the lead NASA center for advanced propulsion technology though additional NASA centers might also be involved in some aspect of advanced propulsion technology development. If a human spaceflight program/project implements nuclear propulsion technology then the SMAEC III contractors may be involved in the integrated risk assessment aspect for use of this technology from an overall architecture/system level.</p>

17	We recommend that the SMAEC III solicitation include specific evaluation / selection criteria for an offeror's small business participation in contract performance.	See answer to question No. 1.
18	We recommend that the resultant SMAEC III contract include penalties (fee reductions) for the awardee for not meeting their commitments for small business participation.	See answer to question No. 1.
19	Will NASA JSC make public the list of industry attendees so that small businesses may identify potential prime offerors for teaming or subcontracting opportunities?	The government will post the Interested Parties List to Sam.gov.
20	We would appreciate receiving an update on NASA JSC's plans to create an industry workshop to discuss the challenge of attracting, recruiting, hiring and retaining aerospace personnel and how this can be factored into cost/price evaluations of procurements given the competitive environment for talent.	At this time there is not a scheduled event for an industry workshop. If that should change, the notification will be placed on Sam.gov.
21	We recommend that the Government consider extending the contract Period of Performance (PoP) to an 8 year time period due to the projected complexity of HSF missions from 2027-2030 (e.g., Commercial Free Flyers, ISS Decommissioning, Next Artemis Phases).	See answer to question No. 1.
22	What is NASA/JSC's position on future of work such as allowing a hybrid work schedule and more remote work vs. more on-site work?	JSC is currently endorsing a hybrid work model, however that is subject to change. Requirements for the balance between on-site vs. remote work varies depending on the specific programs and projects requirements.
23	Will the RITF still be a requirement under SMAEC III?	At this time it is anticipated that the RITF will remain as a requirement in the SMAEC III SOW. Final RITF requirements will be part of the Request for Proposal.
24	Will there be additional opportunities to network with potential firms associated with support to the SMAEC III contract?	The Interested Parties List will be posted to SAM.gov. In addition, the JSC Small Business Office is available to answer questions regarding small business opportunities at JSC (Office of Small Business, (281) 483-4512, Jsc-smallbusiness@mail.nasa.gov).
25	Will SMAEC III require development of any new software tools and products?	The SMAEC III awardee will need to have the capability to develop new software tools and products as required.

26	Will the training and education SOW requirement be applicable for training both civil servants and contractors?	The SMAEC III awardee will need to plan for training of both civil servants and contactors on SMA subject matter, as required.
27	Will SMAEC III require any security clearances to support tasks?	It is not anticipated that any security clearances will be required to execute the tasks for the SMAEC III contract. The final RFP will include information on security clearance if applicable.
28	Will the government continue to accept questions to improve the SMAEC III solicitation?	The Government will continue to accept suggestions and recommendations to enhance the final RFP for the SMAEC III solicitation. The next opportunity for Questions and Answers will be related to the release of the draft RFP that will be posted to SAM.gov later this calendar year. Any questions asked before the release of the draft RFP may not be answered by the Government.
29	Will the government consider utilizing 3 years vs. 5 years for Past Performance for the Prime and all major subcontractors?	See answer to question No. 1.