AMENDMENT OF SOLICITATION/MODIFICATION OF CONTRACT

1. CONTRACT ID CODE	PAGE	OF	PAGES
	1		3

2. AMENDMENT/MODIFICATION NO.	3. EFFECTIVE DATE	4. REQUISITION/PURCHASE REQ. NO.	5. PROJECT NO. *(If applicable)*
000004	See Block "16c"		

6. ISSUED BY CODE

NASA Goddard Space Flight Center (GSFC)
Office for Headquarters
Greenbelt, MD 20771

7. ADMINISTERED BY *(If other than Item 6)* CODE

8. NAME AND ADDRESS OF CONTRACTOR *(No., street, county, State and ZIP Code)*

CODE FACILITY CODE

(X) 9A. AMENDMENT OF SOLICITATION NO.
[X] NNH12424505Q
9B. DATED *(SEE ITEM 11)*
07/20/2012

10A. MODIFICATION OF CONTRACT/ORDER NO.
[ ]
10B. DATED *(SEE ITEM 13)*

11. THIS ITEM ONLY APPLIES TO AMENDMENTS OF SOLICITATIONS

[X] The above numbered solicitation is amended as set forth in Item 14. The hour and date specified for receipt of Offers [X] is extended, [ ] is not extended.

Offers must acknowledge receipt of this amendment prior to the hour and date specified in the solicitation or as amended, by one of the following methods: (a) By completing items 8 and 15, and returning 1 copies of the amendment; (b) By acknowledging receipt of this amendment on each copy of the offer submitted; or (c) By separate letter or telegram which includes a reference to the solicitation and amendment numbers. FAILURE OF YOUR ACKNOWLEDGMENT TO BE RECEIVED AT THE PLACE DESIGNATED FOR THE RECEIPT OF OFFERS PRIOR TO THE HOUR AND DATE SPECIFIED MAY RESULT IN REJECTION OF YOUR OFFER. If by virtue of this amendment your desire to change an offer already submitted, such change may be made by telegram or letter, provided each telegram or letter makes reference to the solicitation and this amendment, and is received prior to the opening hour and date specified.

12. ACCOUNTING AND APPROPRIATION DATA *(If required)*

13. THIS ITEM ONLY APPLIES TO MODIFICATION OF CONTRACTS/ORDERS. IT MODIFIES THE CONTRACT/ORDER NO. AS DESCRIBED IN ITEM 14.

CHECK ONE	
[ ]	A. THIS CHANGE ORDER IS ISSUED PURSUANT TO: *(Specify authority)* THE CHANGES SET FORTH IN ITEM 14 ARE MADE IN THE CONTRACT ORDER NO. IN ITEM 10A.
[ ]	B. THE ABOVE NUMBERED CONTRACT/ORDER IS MODIFIED TO REFLECT THE ADMINISTRATIVE CHANGES *(such as changes in paying office, appropriation date, etc.)* SET FORTH IN ITEM 14, PURSUANT TO THE AUTHORITY OF FAR 43.103(b).
[ ]	C. THIS SUPPLEMENTAL AGREEMENT IS ENTERED INTO PURSUANT TO AUTHORITY OF:
[ ]	D. OTHER *(Specify type of modification and authority)*

E. IMPORTANT: Contractor [ ] is not, [ ] is required to sign this document and return _____ copies to the issuing office.

14. DESCRIPTION OF AMENDMENT/MODIFICATION *(Organized by UCF section headings, including solicitation/contract subject matter where feasible.)*

Offerors are required to sign this document and return one (1) copy to the issuing office with their proposal submittal to acknowledge receipt of Amendment 000004.

The following changes are hereby made to Amendment 000004 (see Page 2 for Details):
(1) Extend the due date from "09/05/2012" to "09/07/2012";
(2) Revised the Solicitation Instructions and Evaluation Criteria (RFQ Cover Letter); and
(3) Revised the RFQ requirement to relax the Service Level percent availability.

Except as provided herein, all terms and conditions of the document referenced in Item 9A or 10A, as heretofore changed, remains unchanged and in full force and effect.

15A. NAME AND TITLE OF SIGNER *(Type or print)*		16A. NAME AND TITLE OF CONTRACTING OFFICER *(Type or print)*	
		Cedric M.T. Mitchener	
15B. CONTRACTOR/OFFEROR	15C. DATE SIGNED	16B. UNITED STATES OF AMERICA	16C. DATE SIGNED
(Signature of person authorized to sign)		Cedric Mitchener *(Signature of Contracting Officer)*	08/31/2012

SUMMARY OF CHANGES

1. **Extend the due date from "09/05/2012" to "09/07/2012:**

   • Enclosure I, Standard Form (SF) 1449, Block 8, "Offer Due Date / Local Time" is hereby revised to extend the due date from "09/05/2012" to "09/07/2012".

2. **Revised the Solicitation Instructions and Evaluation Criteria (RFQ Cover Letter):**

   • Subfactor 1, Technical Approach, and Subfactor 3, Representative Task Orders (RTOs), are combined into one Subfactor, which now reads: Subfactor 1, Technical Approach;
   • Subfactor 3, Management Plan, and Subfactor 4, Personnel Skill / Experience, are combined into one Subfactor, which now reads: Subfactor 2, Management Plan.
   • As a result of the above changes, the total page limit is hereby revised:

~~Proposal Component~~	~~Max. Pages~~
~~Cover Page, Indices, Tabs and List of Acronyms~~	~~Excluded~~
~~**Technical Proposal**~~	
~~Subfactor 1: Technical Approach~~ ~~Subfactor 2: Management Approach~~	~~30 pages total~~
~~Safety and Health Plan~~	~~Excluded~~
~~RTO Response 1, 2, and 3~~	~~75 pages total~~
~~Personnel Skill/Experience (1 page for each)~~	~~10 pages total (excluding position descriptions)~~
~~**Past Performance Proposal, including Past Performance Questionnaires**~~	~~Excluded~~
~~**Price Proposal** - Including SF 1449 **(Enclosure I)** and Loaded Labor Rate Matrix **(Attachment B of the BPA under Enclosure II)**~~	~~Excluded~~

Proposal Component	Max. Pages
Cover Page, Indices, Tabs and List of Acronyms	Excluded
Technical Proposal	
Subfactor 1: Technical Approach* Subfactor 2: Management Approach**	115 pages total
Safety and Health Plan	Excluded
Past Performance Proposal, including Past Performance Questionnaires	Excluded
Price Proposal - Including SF 1449 **(Enclosure I)** and Loaded Labor Rate Matrix **(Attachment B of the BPA under Enclosure II)**	Excluded

*The responses to the RTOs shall not exceed 75 pages out of the 115.
**The position descriptions are excluded from this page count.

- Reference Attachment A, "RFQ Cover Letter Final Showing Markup Changes"
- Reference Attachment B, "RFQ Cover Letter Final"

3. **Revised the RFQ requirement to relax the Service Level percent availability:**

• Appendix G – Service – level Metrics Definition Option 1 is hereby changed to relaxed the Service Level percent availability for search.nasa.gov from "99.995%" to "99.99%".

END OF AMENDMENT 000004

ATTACHMENT A

RFQ Cover Letter Final Showing Markup Changes

National Aeronautics and
Space Administration

Goddard Space Flight Center
Greenbelt, MD 20771

Reply to Attn of: 210.H

20 July 2012

TO ALL INTERESTED PARTIES

Subject: Request for Quotation (RFQ), Solicitation Number NNH12424505Q, for Web Enterprise Service Technologies (WEST) PRIME

National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA) is requesting quotations under subject request (hereinafter referred to as "WESTPRIME") in response to the enclosed Statement of Work (SOW) included under **Enclosure II, Draft BPA, as Attachment A of the Draft BPA entitled "Statement of Work"**. NASA intends to acquire these services by competing this requirement among several sources on the General Service Administration (GSA) Federal Supply Schedule (FSS) Information Technology (IT) 70, entitled: "General Purpose Commercial Information Technology Equipment, Software and Services". The Special Item Number (SIN) applicable to this procurement is 132-51, Information Technology Professional Services. Your company is being solicited since it appears on the GSA FSS IT 70 list of eligible contractors.

This request is not to be construed in any way as a commitment on behalf of the Government. Any award as a result of this request is contingent upon availability of Government funds. In addition, your quote must set forth full, accurate, and complete information as required by this letter.

QUOTATION PREPARATION AND SUBMISSION – SPECIAL INSTRUCTIONS

RFQ HIGHLIGHTS

- The Government intends to award one Blanket Purchase Agreement (BPA) under this effort.
- The BPA will be awarded for a one-year base period with four (4) one-year option periods, with orders being issued on a firm fixed price basis.
- The BPA will incorporate the terms and conditions of the successful Offeror's GSA Schedule Contract in addition to the required NASA clauses.
- The North American Industrial Classification System (NAICS) code for this acquisition is 541519. The small business size standard is $25.5 million.

INSTRUCTIONS, CONDITIONS, AND NOTICES TO OFFERORS

To facilitate evaluation of proposals, you are requested to present the narrative portion in the format below:

- **TECHNICAL PROPOSAL**
  - Subfactor 1: Technical Approach
  - Subfactor 2: Management Plan
  - ~~Subfactor 3: Representative Task Orders (RTOs)~~
  - ~~Subfactor 4: Personnel Skill/Experience~~

- **PAST PERFORMANCE PROPOSAL**

- **PRICE PROPOSAL**

TECHNICAL PROPOSAL

Subfactor 1 – Technical Approach

The offeror's proposed technical approach shall demonstrate its abilities in accomplishing the requirements within the SOW. In its response, the offeror shall include the anticipated logical sequence of tasks, methodology, techniques and quality assurance required to satisfy the SOW requirements. In detail, your proposal shall address the following:

a. Demonstrate an effective technical approach to accomplish current state operations for the websites and applications listed in Appendix A and Appendix B.
b. Demonstrate an effective understanding of the transition and migration of NASA's websites from their current, legacy platforms onto the target platform in the cloud. Initial migration of websites and applications are listed in Appendix A and Appendix B.
c. Demonstrate an effective technical approach to initially stand up Development (Dev)/Test, Quality Assurance (QA)/Staging, and Production platforms to include the methodology to support NASA platforms with an initial requirement for full support of integrated instances of Open Source content management systems (such as Drupal, WordPress and Alfresco) that would allow for content from one to be presented on the other as a multi-tenant platform to NASA.
d. Demonstrate an effective technical approach to initially standing up collaboration environment using open source tools to meet the requirements in the SOW.
e. Demonstrate an effective solution for streaming media services to meet the requirements in the SOW.
f. Demonstrate an effective solution for search as a service to meet the requirements in the SOW
g. Demonstrate an effective and cost efficient approach to FedRAMP Provisional Authorization by the FedRAMP Joint Authorization Board.
h. Demonstrate an effective technical approach in security and Incident Management as well as Change Control Management.
i. Demonstrate an approach to developing cost models and pricing calculators that promote incremental growth in the use of areas such as bandwidth, storage, and infrastructure.

The offeror shall provide a safety and health plan in accordance with NFS Provision 1852.223-73, entitled "Safety and Health Plan". The offeror shall discuss its approach to compliance with all applicable NASA policies and procedures relative to safety, occupational health, and NASA Procedural Requirements (NPR) 8715.3 "NASA General Safety Program Requirements."

This plan, as approved by the Government, will be included in any resulting contract. Offerors are directed to NPR 8715.3, Appendix E instructions regarding the contents of Safety and Health Plan. NPR 8715.3 can be accessed at the following website: http://nodis3.gsfc.nasa.gov/displayDir.cfm?t=NPR&c=8715&s=3C

~~**Subfactor 2 – Management Plan**~~

~~The management plan shall describe the Offeror's ability to provide the services proposed to deal with problems and assure overall control of the effort. The Offeror's proposal shall demonstrate your ability to provide flexibility, maximize efficiency, and provide coordination of workflow between the Offeror and the Government. The Offeror's proposal shall demonstrate the lines of communication between the Offeror and the Government interfaces. In detail, your proposal shall describe the following:~~

~~a. Your effective approach to team communication and collaboration with other I3P services.~~
~~b. Your effective approach to employ and maintain a technically trained and experienced workforce to satisfy the contract requirements.~~
~~c. Your ability to adequately identify risk that could negatively impact mission and develop realistic work around or mitigation steps to eliminate or reduce risk to an acceptable level.~~
~~d. Your personnel/skill level that are currently available and your approach to bring on more personnel if needed.~~
~~e. The flexibility of your personnel to work across all the Product Lines as referenced in the SOW.~~
~~f. Your teaming and collaboration abilities in working closely, side by side, with other Contractors and Government employees.~~
~~g. Your approach on intellectual property hand-over, data and asset transfer, and maintenance of service commitments. In addition, your procedures, protocols, and collateral to manage and implement all these matters carefully and rapidly.~~

~~**Subfactor 3 – Representative Task Orders (RTOs)**~~

The RTOs included in **Enclosure III**, are tasks to be used for evaluation purposes that may or may not be issued during the performance period. Each task provides the Offeror with the opportunity to demonstrate in detail their understanding of the requirements and to illustrate their processes that would typically be used to accomplish the task issued under the resultant BPA.

For each RTO, the Offeror shall provide a written task plan. The task plan shall identify the technical approach, labor categories, projected hours, Government interface, the flow of activities from start to completion (including time line), and any other information required to determine the adequacy and reasonableness of the Offeror's plan. The plan must be specific, detailed, and

complete to demonstrate a clear and full understanding of the objectives; describe the Offeror's technical and management approaches and provide a detailed price schedule. The task plan shall address the nature, scope, and complexity in which this work is to be performed. The task plan shall include a discussion of sufficient detail to communicate the Offeror's approach for identifying all risks and risk mitigation. Any assumptions made in preparing a response to the RTO must be clearly stated.

The Offeror shall provide the staffing plan and skill mix required to accomplish the RTOs, along with a discussion of the personnel categories proposed under the BPA and how the labor skill and mix will be employed to accomplish the work in an effective and efficient manner.

The Offeror shall identify any significant subcontractors, as defined in the Past Performance Section of this proposal, their roles and responsibilities, and their proposed effect on the performance of each RTO. External dependencies, such as performance by another contractor or the availability of any other sources, shall be fully identified. The Offeror shall describe the technical interfaces associated with the tasks. The Offeror shall describe the organizational interfaces, including those with the government and the users.

Within the offeror's response to RTO 3, for the Phase-In requirement, the offeror shall provide a detailed phase-in plan that addresses, at a minimum, the offeror's approach to phase-in sufficient to ensure continuity and a smooth transition with the incumbent contractor during the 90-day phase-in period. The phase-in plan shall clearly demonstrate an ability to assume full contract responsibility on the effective date of the contract. The phase-in plan shall also specifically address how ongoing work will be maintained, the proposed management organization, schedule, orientation and training of personnel. Because this effort involves onsite performance, the offeror shall address their preparation for the timely processing of the Personal Identification Verification (PIV) requirements. If the phase-in plan assumes any dependency upon the incumbent contractor, please identify. Also, the plan shall describe any involvement of NASA personnel during this period.

Subfactor 2 – Management Plan

The management plan shall describe the Offeror's ability to provide the services proposed to deal with problems and assure overall control of the effort. The Offeror's proposal shall demonstrate your ability to provide flexibility, maximize efficiency, and provide coordination of workflow between the Offeror and the Government. The Offeror's proposal shall demonstrate the lines of communication between the Offeror and the Government interfaces. In detail, your proposal shall describe the following:

a. Your effective approach to team communication and collaboration with other I3P services.
b. Your effective approach to employ and maintain a technically trained and experienced workforce to satisfy the contract requirements.
c. Your ability to adequately identify risk that could negatively impact mission and develop realistic work around or mitigation steps to eliminate or reduce risk to an acceptable level.
d. Your personnel/skill level that are currently available and your approach to bring on more personnel if needed.

e. The flexibility of your personnel to work across all the Product Lines as referenced in the SOW.
f. Your teaming and collaboration abilities in working closely, side by side, with other Contractors and Government employees.
g. Your approach on intellectual property hand-over, data and asset transfer, and maintenance of service commitments. In addition, your procedures, protocols, and collateral to manage and implement all these matters carefully and rapidly.

~~**Subfactor 4—Personnel Skill / Experience**~~

Offeror's shall describe its abilities to employ qualified personnel that can successfully complete each task in the SOW. This includes ensuring that the qualified personnel have in-depth, relevant, experience in creating an environment associated with hosting the NASA's Public Cloud offering for the purpose of ultimately consolidating most public facing websites into the public cloud and NASA's cloud offering to support the existing applications listed in Appendix A.

Offerors shall provide written position descriptions to be incorporated in the resultant contract as Attachment G for the specific labor categories envisioned for performance of this contract. **(Each position description shall not exceed 1 page. Position descriptions are excluded from the page count limitation).** The Offeror shall address the minimum requirements in the position qualifications, to include the necessary experience, summary of duties and responsibilities, specific requirements, minimum education and minimum experience as well as key skills required for the position.

PAST PERFORMANCE PROPOSAL

An Offeror's past performance record indicates the relevant quantitative and qualitative aspects of performing services or delivering products similar in size and content to the requirements of this acquisition.

The Offeror shall provide, at a minimum, the following information in support of its proposal to facilitate the evaluation of the offeror's past performance as related to the requirements of the proposed contract.

(a) *INFORMATION FROM THE OFFEROR*

Prime Offerors shall furnish the information requested below for all of your most recent contracts (completed and ongoing) for similar efforts with a minimum average annual cost/fee incurred of $2 million that your company has had within the last 3 years of the RFP release date. Relevance of a past or current contract is evaluated for size and content to include complexity within content. The fact that a contract meets the minimum dollar threshold for consideration (ex: $2M) does not guarantee any particular evaluation rating for size relevance. Indicate which contracts are most related (i.e. similar in size and content) and how they are related to the proposed effort, as well as which contracts were performed by the division of your company (if applicable) that will perform the proposed contract/subcontract. Content review will include complexity of the work performed.

For the purposes of the Past Performance Volume, a proposed significant subcontractor is defined as any proposed subcontractor that is estimated to be performing at least 25% of any of the proposed RTO requirements. *Note, the definition of significant subcontractor for the past performance evaluation may be different than for the cost evaluation.* The offeror shall provide the information requested below for any significant subcontractor(s) for those similar efforts within the last 3 years of the RFP release date with a minimum average annual cost/fee incurred of at least 25% of the estimated average annual dollar value of the proposed significant subcontract.

For example (note, these example numbers may not relate to this specific procurement), if a procurement is valued at an average annual value of $50M and a proposed significant subcontractor for the effort has a proposed average annual cost/fee of $16M, the offeror shall provide relevant current/past contract references that have a minimum average annual cost/fee incurred at/above $4M (25% of $16M) for that significant subcontractor.

If a prime offeror or significant subcontractor is submitting past performance data on a current/past contract vehicle that includes multiple tasks, orders, etc, all effort under that contract vehicle may be consolidated for the purposes of meeting the average annual cost/fee incurred in the instructions above and for the purpose of evaluating contract relevance for the proposed requirement.

The offeror shall provide an estimated value and percentage of work to be performed on this contract by the prime offeror and each significant subcontractor. Indicate the primary functions (SOW) to be performed by the prime offeror and each proposed significant subcontractor. Indicate which contracts are most related (i.e. similar in size and content) and how they are related to the proposed effort, as well as which contracts were performed by the division of your company (if applicable) that will perform the proposed contract/subcontract.

If applicable, Offerors may provide the experience or past performance of a parent or affiliated or predecessor company to an Offeror (including a parent or affiliated company that is being otherwise proposed as a subcontractor on this effort) where the firm's proposal demonstrates that the resources of the parent or affiliate or predecessor will affect the performance of the Offeror. The Offeror shall demonstrate that the resources of the parent or affiliate or predecessor company (its workforce, management, facilities or other resources) shall be provided or relied upon for contract performance such that the parent or affiliate or predecessor will have meaningful involvement in contract performance.

The offeror shall provide the following information on all past/current contract references that meet the above criteria for the prime offeror and each significant subcontractor:

- Customer's name, address, and telephone number of both the lead contractual and technical personnel most familiar with the offeror's performance record. *(Please verify the telephone numbers provided are current and correct).*

- Cage Code and/or DUNS Number of the contractor performing the work.

- Contract number, type, and total original and present or final contract value.

- The current contract expenditures incurred to date, the date in which the expenditures have been incurred through, and the Average Annual Cost/Fee Incurred to Date. For example (note, these example numbers may not relate to this specific procurement):

  A current five year contract that you are performing has a total estimated value of $100,000,000. As of the latest cost report which reflected cost/fee through the first 2 years and 4 months of performance, the total amount of cost/fee incurred by the offeror over the duration of the contract was $43,500,000.

  In this example, an Offeror would provide the following:

  Current Contract Expenditures incurred to Date: $43,500,000

  Date in which Expenditures have been incurred through: Insert Date of cost report that indicated cost/fee total of $43,500,000 after 2 years and 4 months of performance.

  Average Annual Cost/Fee Incurred to Date: $18,669,528 ($43,500,000/2.33 years)

- Date of contract, place(s) of performance, and delivery dates or period of performance.

- Brief description of contract work and comparability to the proposed effort. It is not sufficient to state that it is comparable in magnitude and scope. Rationale must be provided to demonstrate that it is comparable.

- Method of acquisition: competitive or noncompetitive.

- Nature of award: initial or follow-on. If initial, indicate whether award was preceded by a Government, customer, or offeror financed study.

- Identify and explain major technical problems and how they were overcome. List any major deviations or waivers to technical requirements that were granted by the customer.

- Identify and explain completion successes and delays, including adherence to program schedules. Provide an assessment of the performance (technical and schedule) on these past programs and support these assessments with metrics such as award or incentive fees earned.

- Cost management history; identify and explain any cost overruns and underruns, and cost incentive history, if applicable.

- Average number of personnel on the contract per year and percent turnover of personnel per year.

- Recent customer evaluations of past performance including Award Fee Evaluation results,

Fee Determination Official letters, Annual Performance Evaluation Forms, etc. (Excluded from the page limitation).

- List any contracts terminated (partial or complete) within the past 5 years and basis for termination (convenience or default). Include the contract number, name, address, and telephone number of the terminating officer (please verify telephone numbers). Include contracts that were "descoped" by the customer because of performance or cost problems. (Excluded from the page limitation).

(b) *PRIOR CUSTOMER EVALUATIONS (PAST PERFORMANCE QUESTIONNAIRES)*

The offeror and any proposed significant subcontractor(s) [as defined in paragraph (a)] shall provide the questionnaires provided as Enclosure V to each of the above references to establish a record of past performance. The Offeror shall instruct each of its references to return the questionnaire directly to the Government in a sealed envelope. The questionnaire respondent shall be a representative from the technical customer and responsible Contracting Officer with direct knowledge of your firm's performance. If possible, the Offeror and any proposed significant subcontractor(s) shall provide questionnaires to customers from NASA contracts, other Government contracts, and commercial contracts. For proposed significant subcontractor(s), references shall concern only work performed by the subcontractor's business entity that will perform the work under this contract, if awarded.

The Offeror is responsible for ensuring that the questionnaire is completed and submitted directly to the NASA Goddard Space Flight Center Contracting Officer no later than the closing date of this solicitation designated in Block 9 of the SF 33:

NASA Goddard Space Flight Center
Attn: Cedric Mitchener Code 210.H
Bldg. 17, Rm. S120
Greenbelt, MD 20771
Telephone: 301-286-6162
FAX: 301-286-0356

The Offeror shall include a list of those to whom the questionnaires were sent, including name of individual, phone number, organization, and contract number. Offerors shall include in their proposal the written consent of their proposed significant subcontractors to allow the Government to discuss the subcontractors' past performance evaluation with the Offeror.

(c) *SUMMARY OF DEVIATIONS/EXCEPTIONS (PAST PERFORMANCE PROPOSAL)*

Identify and explain the reason for any deviations, exceptions, or conditional assumptions taken with respect to these Past Performance Proposal instructions.

(End of provision)

PRICE PROPOSAL

A completed 1449 must be submitted with this offer. The offeror's proposal must be based on the labor categories covered under the offeror's GSA Schedule contract. The offeror shall submit its most competitive offer. In accordance with GSA Schedule contract clause 52.216-19 Order Limitations, additional concessions are being sought. Direct labor must be estimated based on the basis of productive effort. Productive effort is the estimated number of hours required to perform the work.

Final monetary extensions in the price proposal may be expressed as the closest whole dollar amount, with cents omitted.

LABOR CATEGORIES: The Offer shall complete Attachment B of the BPA, in accordance with the offeror's GSA schedule contract. These loaded labor rates shall be used to calculate and negotiate the price of performing the effort. These rates are "not to exceed" (NTE) rates. During BPA performance, offerors will be permitted to offer prices at lower rates than are listed in Attachment B; however, for purposes of pricing this RFQ, the offerors shall use the NTE loaded labor rates for pricing the RTOs. The offeror agrees to use the schedule as the basis for establishing the fixed price of individual orders, together with any other direct costs specific to the task order. The labor categories must reflect those labor categories which would probably be needed in the performance of the BPA.

REPRESENTATIVE TASK ORDERS (RTO): Offeror shall complete Enclosure IV for each of the RTOs. In this enclosure, offerors shall include all costs including loaded direct labor and ODCs associated with performing the RTO. Offerors shall use the "not to exceed" bid rates proposed in Attachment B, Loaded Labor Rate Matrix, for pricing all RTOs.

In addition to the summary price proposal enclosure for each RTO, offerors shall provide detailed back-up cost spreadsheets that include the following elements:

- Prime and, if proposed, teaming partner(s) labor, including hours, rates and labor categories;
- Contract Program Management costs; include and identify, if not included in indirect costs embedded in the loaded labor rates; and
- Other Direct Costs (ODCs), including detailed breakout of materials, equipment, travel, computer usage, subcontracts, and any other miscellaneous ODCs.

EVALUATION CRITERIA

The Government will award one BPA resulting from this request to the responsible Offeror whose quotation conforming to this request will be most advantageous to the Government. The following factors and subfactors will be used in evaluating offers:

- TECHNICAL FACTOR
  - Subfactor 1: Technical Approach
  - Subfactor 2: Management Plan
  - ~~Subfactor 3: Representative Task Orders (RTOs)~~
  - ~~Subfactor 4: Personnel Skill/Experience~~

Formatted: Indent: Left: 0.5", No bullets or numbering

- PAST PERFORMANCE FACTOR
- PRICE FACTOR

Formatted: Indent: Left: 0.5", No bullets or numbering

Each evaluating factor is equally important. Regarding the technical Subfactors, Subfactor 1, Technical Approach, is more important than Subfactor 2, Management Plan. The evaluating factors and subfactors will be weighted on an adjectival rating basis.

Formatted: Font: Not Bold

Offerors' proposals will be evaluated as follows:

TECHNICAL FACTOR

The Government will evaluate proposals by classifying findings as strengths, weaknesses, significant strengths, significant weaknesses, or deficiencies using the following:

- Weakness – a flaw in the proposal that increases the risk of unsuccessful contract performance
- Significant Weakness – a proposal flaw that appreciably increases the risk of unsuccessful contract performance
- Deficiency – a material failure of a proposal to meet a Government requirement or a combination of significant weaknesses in a proposal that increases the risk of unsuccessful contract performance to an unacceptable level
- Strength (not in FAR/NFS) – a proposal area that enhances the potential for successful performance or contributes toward exceeding the contract requirements in a manner that provides additional value to the government (this could be associated with a process, technical approach, materials, facilities, etc.).
- Significant Strength (not in FAR/NFS) – a proposal area that greatly enhances the potential for successful performance or contributes significantly toward exceeding the contract requirements in a manner that provides additional value to the government.

The Technical Factor will be evaluated using the following adjectival ratings:

ADJECTIVAL RATING	DEFINITIONS
Excellent	A comprehensive and thorough proposal of exceptional merit with one or more significant strengths. No deficiency or significant weakness exists.
Very Good	A proposal having no deficiency and which demonstrates over-all competence. One or more significant strengths have been found, and

	strengths outbalance any weaknesses that exist.
Good	A proposal having no deficiency and which shows a reasonably sound response. There may be strengths or weaknesses, or both. As a whole, weaknesses not off-set by strengths do not significantly detract from the offeror's response.
Fair	A proposal having no deficiency and which has one or more weaknesses. Weaknesses outbalance any strength.
Poor	A proposal that has one or more deficiencies or significant weaknesses that demonstrate a lack of overall competence or would require a major proposal revision to correct.

Subfactor 1 – Technical Approach

The proposed technical approach will be evaluated in terms of your ability to accomplish the requirements within the SOW, including the anticipated logical sequence of tasks, methodology, techniques and quality assurance required to satisfy the SOW requirements. In detail, the Government will evaluate the effectiveness of your proposal in the following areas:

a. Demonstrated technical approach to accomplish current state operations for the websites and applications listed in Appendix A and Appendix B.
b. Demonstrated understanding of the transition and migration of NASA's websites from their current, legacy platforms onto the target platform in the public cloud. Initial migration of websites and applications are listed in Appendix A and Appendix B.
c. Demonstrated technical approach to initially stand up Development (Dev)/Test, Quality Assurance (QA)/Staging, and Production platforms to include the methodology to support NASA platforms with an initial requirement for full support of integrated instances of Open Source content management systems (such as Drupal, WordPress and Alfresco) that would allow for content from one to be presented on the other as a multi-tenant platform to NASA.
d. Demonstrated technical approach to initially standing up collaboration environment using open source tools to meet the requirements in the SOW.
e. Demonstrate solution for streaming media services to meet the requirements in the SOW.
f. Demonstrated solution for search as a service to meet the requirements in the SOW
g. Demonstrated and cost efficient approach to FedRAMP Provisional Authorization by the FedRAMP Joint Authorization Board.
h. Demonstrated technical approach in security and Incident Management as well as Change Control Management.
i. Demonstrated an approach to developing cost models and pricing calculators that promote incremental growth in the use of areas such as bandwidth, storage, and infrastructure.

The Government will evaluate the adequacy of the offeror's Safety and Health Plan to ensure that supplies and services are furnished in a safe and healthful manner, and that the offeror develops, produces, and/or delivers products to NASA that will be safe and successful for their intended use.

The offeror's Safety and Health Plan will be evaluated for compliance with applicable Federal and State statutory and regulatory requirements, as well as compliance with NPR 8715.3, NFS 1852.223-73 and applicable NASA Agency-wide and Installation specific policies and/or procedures including the adequacy of protection of life, health, and well being of NASA and Contractor employees, property and equipment. Further, the Safety and Health Plan will be evaluated to determine the adequacy of protection for subcontractor employees for any proposed subcontract.

~~**Subfactor 2 – Management Plan**~~

~~The management plan will be evaluated in terms of your ability to provide the services proposed to deal with problems and assure overall control of the effort. The Offeror's ability to provide flexibility, maximize efficiency, and provide coordination of workflow between the Offeror and the Government will be evaluated. The Government will evaluate the proposed lines of communication between the Offeror and the Government interfaces. In detail, the Government will evaluate the effectiveness of your proposal in the following areas:~~

~~a. Effective approach to team communication and collaboration with other I3P services.~~
~~b. Effective approach to employ and maintain a technically trained and experienced workforce to satisfy the contract requirements.~~
~~c. Ability to adequately identify risk that could negatively impact mission and develop realistic work around or mitigation steps to eliminate or reduce risk to an acceptable level.~~
~~d. Personnel/skill level that are currently available and your approach to bring on more personnel if needed.~~
~~e. Flexibility of your personnel to work across all the Product Lines as referenced in the SOW.~~
~~f. Teaming and collaboration abilities in working closely, side by side, with other Contractors and Government employees.~~
~~g. Approach on intellectual property hand-over, data and asset transfer, and maintenance of service commitments. In addition, your procedures, protocols, and collateral to manage and implement all these matters carefully and rapidly.~~

~~**Subfactor 3 – Representative Task Orders (RTOs)**~~

For each RTO, the Government will evaluate the thoroughness and merit of discussion on how the task will be accomplished, including the technical and management approach to demonstrating a clear and full understanding of the objectives. The Government will evaluate the reasonableness of the detailed price schedule. Further, the government will evaluate the

offeror's approach for identifying all risks and the thoroughness of the response to mitigation/resolution, and the reasonableness of the basis for any assumptions made.

The Government will evaluate the appropriateness of the proposed staffing plan and skill mix for each RTO to include the rationale for identifying positions to determine realism, merit and sufficiency. The Government will evaluate the proposed hiring plan for its ability to recruit and retain qualified personnel to include incumbent workforce. The Government will also evaluate any other recruitment efforts for attracting staff not currently employed within the company.

The Government will evaluate the proposed significant subcontractors (as defined in the Past Performance Section of this contract), their roles and responsibilities, and their proposed effect on the performance of the RTOs to include the reasonableness and extent of the functional split of responsibilities between the prime and subcontractors. The Government will evaluate the offeror's ability to identify the technical organizational interfaces associated with the tasks, including those with the Government and users.

In addition to the evaluation criteria listed above for this section, the Government will specifically evaluate the offeror's response to RTO 3 for its ability to perform phase-in activities in an independent manner. The Government will also evaluate the effectiveness in ensuring continuity and a smooth transition with the incumbent contractor during the 90-day phase-in period. The Government will evaluate how clearly the phase-in plan demonstrates an ability to assume full contract responsibility on the effective date of the contract. The Government will evaluate how the phase-in plan specifically address how ongoing work will be maintained, the proposed management organization, schedule, orientation and training of personnel. The Government will evaluate the effectiveness of the offerors approach to meeting the Personal Identification Verification (PIV) requirements. Additionally, The Government will evaluate the reasonableness and the extent of dependency upon the incumbent contractor and NASA personnel during this period.

Subfactor 2 – Management Plan

The management plan will be evaluated in terms of your ability to provide the services proposed to deal with problems and assure overall control of the effort. The Offeror's ability to provide flexibility, maximize efficiency, and provide coordination of workflow between the Offeror and the Government will be evaluated. The Government will evaluate the proposed lines of communication between the Offeror and the Government interfaces. In detail, the Government will evaluate the effectiveness of your proposal in the following areas:

a. Effective approach to team communication and collaboration with other I3P services.
b. Effective approach to employ and maintain a technically trained and experienced workforce to satisfy the contract requirements.
c. Ability to adequately identify risk that could negatively impact mission and develop realistic work around or mitigation steps to eliminate or reduce risk to an acceptable level.

d. Personnel/skill level that are currently available and your approach to bring on more personnel if needed.
e. Flexibility of your personnel to work across all the Product Lines as referenced in the SOW.
f. Teaming and collaboration abilities in working closely, side by side, with other Contractors and Government employees.
g. Approach on intellectual property hand-over, data and asset transfer, and maintenance of service commitments. In addition, your procedures, protocols, and collateral to manage and implement all these matters carefully and rapidly.

Subfactor 4 – Personnel Skill / Experience

The Government will evaluate the offeror's ability to employ qualified personnel that can successfully complete each task in the SOW for reasonableness and effectiveness. The Government will evaluate the offeror's ability to ensure that qualified personnel have in-depth, relevant, experience in creating an environment associated with hosting the NASA's Cloud offering for the purpose of ultimately consolidating most facing websites into the cloud and NASA's cloud offering to support the existing applications listed in Appendix A.

The Government will evaluate the appropriateness and thoroughness of the position descriptions, Attachment G, including the rationale for identifying positions to determine realism, merit and sufficiency.

PAST PERFORMANCE FACTOR

An offeror's past performance will be evaluated based on the evaluation criteria in this provision. All past performance references must meet the "recent" and minimum average annual cost/fee expenditures criteria provided below for both prime contractor references and significant subcontractor references in order to be evaluated.

For purposes of past performance, the term "offeror" refers to a prime contractor and its significant subcontractors. Accordingly, the past performance of significant(s) subcontractors shall also be evaluated and attributed to the offeror. The past performance of a significant subcontractor will be compared to the work proposed to be performed by that subcontractor, and weighted accordingly in assigning the overall past performance adjectival rating to the offeror. The past performance of the prime contractor will be weighted more heavily than any significant subcontractor or combination of significant subcontractors in the overall past performance evaluation.

A "recent" contract is a contract that is ongoing or completed less than 3 years prior to the issuance of this RFP. Contracts completed more than 3 years prior to issuance of this RFP will not be considered recent and will not be considered or evaluated.

A "relevant" contract depends on the size and content of the contract with respect to this acquisition.

For a prime contractor's contract reference(s) to be considered at least minimally "relevant", it must meet/exceed an average annual cost/fee incurred of at least $2 million.

A proposed significant subcontractor for this procurement is defined as any proposed subcontractor that is estimated to be performing at least 25% of any of the proposed RTO requirements. *Note, the definition of significant subcontractor for the past performance evaluation is the same as that of the price evaluation.*

For a significant subcontractor's contract reference(s) to be considered at least minimally "relevant", it must meet/exceed an average annual cost/fee incurred of at least 25% of that portion of this procurement that the subcontractor is proposed (or estimated) to perform.

If the contract is deemed recent and meets the above minimum average annual cost/fee expenditures criteria, the Government will then determine the degree of relevance - ie., level of pertinence - of the contract based on size and content. Content is more important than size in the evaluation of relevance. The term "content" means the type and complexity of services, work, or supplies, in comparison to the requirements of this solicitation. The Government may consider past quantities and periods of performance in evaluating overall relevance.

The performance evaluation will be based primarily on customer satisfaction and/or contract data in meeting technical, schedule, cost, and management requirements. Additional performance factors may include contract administration, occupational health, safety, security, subcontracting plan goals and small disadvantaged business participation targets, if applicable, and other contract requirements.

The Government may review and consider past performance information on other contracts that it is aware of or that are made available from other sources and inquiries with previous customers. These contracts (if any) must meet the above "recent" and minimum average annual cost/fee expenditures criteria to be evaluated.

As part of the past performance evaluation, the Government may attribute the experience or past performance of a parent or affiliated or predecessor company (including a parent or affiliated company that is being otherwise proposed as a subcontractor on this effort) to the proposed prime contractor and/or significant subcontractor(s) where the proposal demonstrates that the resources of the parent or affiliate or predecessor company will affect the performance of the proposed prime contractor and/or significant subcontractor(s). The Government will take into consideration whether the resources of the parent or affiliate or predecessor company (its workforce, management, facilities or other resources) will be provided or relied upon for contract performance such that the parent or affiliate will have meaningful involvement in contract performance. These contracts (if any) must meet the above "recent" and minimum average annual cost/fee expenditures criteria to be evaluated.

An offeror shall not be rated favorably or unfavorably if the offeror does not have a record of "recent" and "relevant" past performance or if a record of past performance is unavailable. In such cases the offeror will receive a "Neutral" rating. However, an offeror with favorable, recent, and relevant past performance that meets the minimum average annual cost/fee expenditures indicated above may be considered more favorably than an offeror with no relevant past performance information.

The Government will consider an offeror's explanation of any problems encountered on any identified contracts, and any corrective actions taken by the offeror.

The overall confidence rating assigned to an offeror's Past Performance (see below) will reflect a subjective evaluation of the information contained in the oral presentation, if applicable; written narrative; past performance evaluation input provided through customer questionnaires; and other references, if any, that the Government may contact for additional past performance information.

Past Performance Ratings – The level of confidence ratings set forth below will be used to evaluate the Past Performance factor for each offeror.

Each of the adjective ratings below has a "performance" component and a "relevance" component as discussed above. As used in the ratings below, the term "pertinent" is equivalent to the term "relevant." The following adjectival rating guidelines will be used when subjectively assessing both components.

Very High Level of Confidence

The Offeor's relevant past performance is of exceptional merit and is very highly pertinent to this acquisition; indicating exemplary performance in a timely, efficient, and economical manner; very minor (if any) problems with no adverse effect on overall performance. Based on the Offeror's performance record, there is a very high level of confidence that the Offeror will successfully perform the required effort.

High Level of Confidence

The Offeror's relevant past performance is highly pertinent to this acquisition; demonstrating very effective performance that would be fully responsive to contract requirements with contract requirements accomplished in a timely, efficient, and economical manner for the most part with only minor problems with little identifiable effect on overall performance. Based on the Offeror's performance record, there is a high level of confidence that the Offeror will successfully perform the required effort.

Moderate Level of Confidence

The Offeror's relevant past performance is pertinent to this acquisition, and it demonstrates effective performance; fully responsive to contract requirements; reportable problems, but with little identifiable effect on overall performance. Based on the Offeror's performance record, there is a moderate level of confidence that the Offeror will successfully perform the required effort.

Low Level of Confidence

The Offeror's relevant past performance is at least somewhat pertinent to this acquisition, and it meets or slightly exceeds minimum acceptable standards; adequate results; reportable problems with identifiable, but not substantial, effects on overall performance. Based on the Offeror's performance record, there is a low level of confidence that the

Offeror will successfully perform the required effort. Changes to the Offeror's existing processes may be necessary in order to achieve contract requirements.

Very Low Level of Confidence

The Offeror's relevant past performance does not meet minimum acceptable standards in one or more areas; remedial action required in one or more areas; problems in one or more areas which, adversely affect overall performance. Based on the Offeror's performance record, there is a very low level of confidence that the Offeror will successfully perform the required effort.

Neutral

In the case of an Offeror without a record of relevant past performance or for whom information on past performance is not available, the Offeror may not be evaluated favorably or unfavorably on past performance [see FAR 15.305(a) (2) (ii) and (iv)].

(End of provision)

PRICE FACTOR

In accordance with FAR 8.405-2(d), Evaluation, the proposed price of each Representative Task Order (RTO) will be evaluated to determine reasonableness of the proposed labor hours, labor categories and other direct costs.

The combined total proposed price for all RTOs will be presented to the Source Selection Official.

There is no separate price evaluation of the BPA. The price factor is used to determine the reasonableness of the proposed price for the Government, should it be selected for award.

To note, Offerors are advised that a quotation meeting the objectives and requirements with the lowest price may not be selected if award to a higher priced Offeror is determined to be most advantageous to the Government. Also, an Offeror's information provided for one factor may be used to assess other factors if the Government deems appropriate.

QUOTATION SUBMISSION INSTRUCTIONS

Only the required minimum amount of information is requested to provide for proper evaluation. Efforts should be made to keep quotations as brief as possible, concentrating on substantive information essential for a proper evaluation.

The following table contains the page limitations for each portion of the proposal submitted in response to this RFQ.

Proposal Component	Max. Pages
Cover Page, Indices, Tabs and List of Acronyms	Excluded
Technical Proposal	

Subfactor 1: Technical Approach* Subfactor 2: Management Approach**	~~30~~115 pages total
Safety and Health Plan	Excluded
~~RTO Response 1, 2, and 3~~	~~50 pages total~~
~~Personnel Skill/Experience (1 page for each)~~	~~10 pages total (excluding position descriptions)~~
Past Performance Proposal, including Past Performance Questionnaires	Excluded
Price Proposal - Including SF 1449 **(Enclosure I)** and Loaded Labor Rate Matrix **(Attachment B of the BPA under Enclosure II)**	Excluded

*The responses to the RTOs shall not exceed 75 pages out of the 115.
**The position descriptions are excluded from this page count.

A page is defined as one side of a sheet, 8-1/2" x 11", with at least one inch margins on all sides, using not smaller than 12 point type. Line spacing or the amount of vertical space between lines of text shall not be less than single line (Microsoft Word's default line spacing). Character spacing shall be "Normal", not "Expanded" or "Condensed." The margins may contain headers and footers, but shall not contain any proposal content to be evaluated. Foldouts count as an equivalent number of 8-1/2" x 11" pages. The metric standard format most closely approximating the described standard 8-1/2" x 11" size may also be used. Diagrams, tables, artwork, and photographs may be reduced and, if necessary, run landscape or folded to eliminate oversize pages. Text in Diagrams, charts, tables, artwork, and photographs shall be no smaller than 10 point. Diagrams, tables, artwork, and photographs shall not be used to circumvent the text size limitations of the proposal.

Submit signed and dated quotations to the office specified under Proposal Due date herein at or before the exact time specified in this solicitation. Quotations may be submitted on the SF 1449. As minimum, quotations must show:

- The RFQ number;
- The time specified in the RFQ for receipt of quotations;
- The name, address, telephone and facsimile number of the offeror;
- A description of the items being offered in sufficient detail to evaluate compliance with the requirements of the RFQ; and
- Price and any discount terms

All quotations shall agree to hold the prices proposed in response to this RFQ for 275 calendar days from the date specified for receipt of quotations.

One original proposal and six (6) copies of ~~requested information~~the proposal shall be submitted along with a copy of your company's GSA Schedule Contract.

Two (2) electronic copies of the offeror's proposal shall be submitted (in addition to the hardcopies specified above). All volumes shall be prepared using either Microsoft Word (with backwards compatibility for Microsoft Word 2003) or a searchable Portable Document Format

(PDF) compatible with Adobe Reader 9. Price proposal charts shall use Microsoft Excel (with backwards compatibility for Microsoft Excel 2003). Formulas, not values should be used in Excel spreadsheets, unless otherwise directed in the cost model instructions, where amounts are calculated in electronic versions. DO NOT compress any electronic files. DO NOT password protect any portion of your electronic submission.

Electronic files of proposal shall be on virus free CD-ROM (CD-R format) discs with an external label indicating: (1) the name of the offeror, (2) the RFQ number, (3) the format and software versions used, (4) a list of the files contained on the disk and (5) date of the information. In the event of any inconsistency between data provided on electronic media and hard copies, the hard copy data will be considered to be correct.

The Government will answer relevant and appropriate questions regarding this RFQ. Any questions or comments regarding this solicitation and any terms and conditions shall cite the RFQ number and must be submitted in writing to Mr. Cedric Mitchener not later than seven (7) business days before the deadline for receipt of quotations. Mr. Mitchener may be reached on telephone number 301-286-6162, or e-mail at cedric.m.mitchener@nasa.gov (preferred method). Questions the Government may have otherwise answered, may not be answered if submitted too late to permit transmittal to all potential offerors reasonably in advance of the due date. Receipt of late questions will not be reason for an extension to the proposal due date. If you do not wish to submit a quotation for this effort, you are requested to notify Mr. Mitchener as soon as possible by e-mail.

Proposal Due Date

Quotations are due by the due date and time shown in block 8 of the SF 1449.

External Marking of Proposal Package(s)

All proposal packages must be closed and sealed.

The required mailing address and external marking for proposals is as follows:

NASA/Goddard Space Flight Center
Greenbelt, MD 20771
Building 16W-Shipping and Receiving Dock
Solicitation Number: NNH12424505Q
Attn: Cedric M. Mitchener
Building 17, Room S120
PROPOSAL – DELIVER UNOPENED

Suggested additional marking if delivery is made by a commercial delivery service:

"COMMERCIAL DELIVERY PERSONNEL: THIS PROPOSAL MUST BE DELIVERED TO THE DOCK MASTER, BUILDING 16W SHIPPING AND RECEIVING DOCK, NO LATER THAN (OFFEROR-ENTER DATE AND TIME)."

Designated Receiving Office

The designated receiving office for proposals is the Shipping and Receiving Dock, Building 16W, Goddard Space Flight Center, which must be accessed from Hubble Road off of Soil Conservation Road, north from Greenbelt Road. Proposals must be received at the designated receiving office **no later than the date and time stated on the SF 1449**.

The Building 16W Shipping and Receiving dock is open from 7:30AM to 3:30PM, Monday through Friday, except Government holidays. Contractor personnel conduct the GSFC receiving function, which include mailroom operations. Proposals will be marked with the date and time of receipt, subjected to security screening, secured, and delivered unopened to the Contracting Officer.

There is no public access to the Building 16W Shipping and Receiving Dock. GSFC passes are required for access to the receiving dock.

There are three suggested methods of delivery to the designated proposal receiving office:

U.S. Postal Service Express Mail
Commercial Delivery Service
Delivery by company employee or other individual agent

It is highly encouraged for all offerors to use U.S. Postal Service Express Mail or Commercial Delivery Services.

If proposals are going to be delivered by a company employee or other individual agent that does not already have badged access to NASA/GSFC, the offeror MUST comply with the following instructions and allow sufficient time (potentially one hour or more) for security processing through the North Gate on Hubble Road:

a. Vehicle must use the Truck Inspection lane (far right lane).

b. Driver (and any passenger(s)) must be a U.S. Citizen (no exceptions).

c. Driver shall state that they are delivering a proposal and provide the specific Solicitation Number. Driver must show a copy of the solicitation cover page (or appropriate solicitation instructions or amendment), which includes the solicitation number and proposal due date. The delivery date should be within 1 week of the proposal due date. The solicitation number shall match the solicitation number on the properly marked proposal packages (see section 1 of this provision).

d. Driver (and any passenger(s)) must provide a valid Driver's License to the Security Officer for identification and recording purposes.

e. Vehicle must undergo a GSFC Security vehicle inspection.

f. Driver will be provided with a pass authorizing them to proceed directly to the Shipping and Receiving Dock, Building 16W, ONLY.

g. After delivering the proposal, the vehicle must immediately exit GSFC back through the North Gate.

h. If the Solicitation documentation is not provided, the proposal packages are not properly marked, or the driver/vehicle does not pass security procedures, the driver may not be granted access through the North Gate and will be instructed to go the GSFC Main Gate on Greenbelt Road for security processing. If this happens, the driver should contact the Contracting Officer named in this solicitation for further assistance. Note, any delays associated with this process will not result in the Government's acceptance of a late proposal, which is why the use of the U.S. Postal Service or Commercial Delivery Services are highly encouraged.

Regardless of the method of delivery chosen, the offeror is responsible for delivery of the proposal to the designated receiving office no later than the date and time stated on the face page of the solicitation.

This request is not to be construed in any way as a commitment of the Government to pay for proposal preparation costs, nor does it obligate the Government to procure said service.

Sincerely,

Cedric M. Mitchener
Contracting Officer

Enclosures:
I, SF 1449
II, BPA
III, Representative Task Orders
IV, Price Proposal for Representative Task Orders
V, Past Performance Questionnaire
VI, Internal Applications and Websites
VII, External Websites
VIII, Quote Submittal Sheet
IX, Representations and Certifications

ATTACHMENT B

RFQ Cover Letter Final

National Aeronautics and
Space Administration

Goddard Space Flight Center
Greenbelt, MD 20771

Reply to Attn of: 210.H

20 July 2012

TO ALL INTERESTED PARTIES

Subject: Request for Quotation (RFQ), Solicitation Number NNH12424505Q, for Web Enterprise Service Technologies (WEST) PRIME

National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA) is requesting quotations under subject request (hereinafter referred to as "WESTPRIME") in response to the enclosed Statement of Work (SOW) included under **Enclosure II, Draft BPA, as Attachment A of the Draft BPA entitled "Statement of Work"**. NASA intends to acquire these services by competing this requirement among several sources on the General Service Administration (GSA) Federal Supply Schedule (FSS) Information Technology (IT) 70, entitled: "General Purpose Commercial Information Technology Equipment, Software and Services". The Special Item Number (SIN) applicable to this procurement is 132-51, Information Technology Professional Services. Your company is being solicited since it appears on the GSA FSS IT 70 list of eligible contractors.

This request is not to be construed in any way as a commitment on behalf of the Government. Any award as a result of this request is contingent upon availability of Government funds. In addition, your quote must set forth full, accurate, and complete information as required by this letter.

QUOTATION PREPARATION AND SUBMISSION – SPECIAL INSTRUCTIONS

RFQ HIGHLIGHTS

- The Government intends to award one Blanket Purchase Agreement (BPA) under this effort.
- The BPA will be awarded for a one-year base period with four (4) one-year option periods, with orders being issued on a firm fixed price basis.
- The BPA will incorporate the terms and conditions of the successful Offeror's GSA Schedule Contract in addition to the required NASA clauses.
- The North American Industrial Classification System (NAICS) code for this acquisition is 541519. The small business size standard is $25.5 million.

INSTRUCTIONS, CONDITIONS, AND NOTICES TO OFFERORS

To facilitate evaluation of proposals, you are requested to present the narrative portion in the format below:

- **TECHNICAL PROPOSAL**
  - Subfactor 1: Technical Approach
  - Subfactor 2: Management Plan

- **PAST PERFORMANCE PROPOSAL**

- **PRICE PROPOSAL**

TECHNICAL PROPOSAL

Subfactor 1 – Technical Approach

The offeror's proposed technical approach shall demonstrate its abilities in accomplishing the requirements within the SOW. In its response, the offeror shall include the anticipated logical sequence of tasks, methodology, techniques and quality assurance required to satisfy the SOW requirements. In detail, your proposal shall address the following:

a. Demonstrate an effective technical approach to accomplish current state operations for the websites and applications listed in Appendix A and Appendix B.
b. Demonstrate an effective understanding of the transition and migration of NASA's websites from their current, legacy platforms onto the target platform in the cloud. Initial migration of websites and applications are listed in Appendix A and Appendix B.
c. Demonstrate an effective technical approach to initially stand up Development (Dev)/Test, Quality Assurance (QA)/Staging, and Production platforms to include the methodology to support NASA platforms with an initial requirement for full support of integrated instances of Open Source content management systems (such as Drupal, WordPress and Alfresco) that would allow for content from one to be presented on the other as a multi-tenant platform to NASA.
d. Demonstrate an effective technical approach to initially standing up collaboration environment using open source tools to meet the requirements in the SOW.
e. Demonstrate an effective solution for streaming media services to meet the requirements in the SOW.
f. Demonstrate an effective solution for search as a service to meet the requirements in the SOW
g. Demonstrate an effective and cost efficient approach to FedRAMP Provisional Authorization by the FedRAMP Joint Authorization Board.
h. Demonstrate an effective technical approach in security and Incident Management as well as Change Control Management.
i. Demonstrate an approach to developing cost models and pricing calculators that promote incremental growth in the use of areas such as bandwidth, storage, and infrastructure.

The offeror shall provide a safety and health plan in accordance with NFS Provision 1852.223-73, entitled "Safety and Health Plan". The offeror shall discuss its approach to

compliance with all applicable NASA policies and procedures relative to safety, occupational health, and NASA Procedural Requirements (NPR) 8715.3 "NASA General Safety Program Requirements."

This plan, as approved by the Government, will be included in any resulting contract. Offerors are directed to NPR 8715.3, Appendix E instructions regarding the contents of Safety and Health Plan. NPR 8715.3 can be accessed at the following website: http://nodis3.gsfc.nasa.gov/displayDir.cfm?t=NPR&c=8715&s=3C

The RTOs included in **Enclosure III**, are tasks to be used for evaluation purposes that may or may not be issued during the performance period. Each task provides the Offeror with the opportunity to demonstrate in detail their understanding of the requirements and to illustrate their processes that would typically be used to accomplish the task issued under the resultant BPA.

For each RTO, the Offeror shall provide a written task plan. The task plan shall identify the technical approach, labor categories, projected hours, Government interface, the flow of activities from start to completion (including time line), and any other information required to determine the adequacy and reasonableness of the Offeror's plan. The plan must be specific, detailed, and complete to demonstrate a clear and full understanding of the objectives; describe the Offeror's technical and management approaches and provide a detailed price schedule. The task plan shall address the nature, scope, and complexity in which this work is to be performed. The task plan shall include a discussion of sufficient detail to communicate the Offeror's approach for identifying all risks and risk mitigation. Any assumptions made in preparing a response to the RTO must be clearly stated.

The Offeror shall provide the staffing plan and skill mix required to accomplish the RTOs, along with a discussion of the personnel categories proposed under the BPA and how the labor skill and mix will be employed to accomplish the work in an effective and efficient manner.

The Offeror shall identify any significant subcontractors, as defined in the Past Performance Section of this proposal, their roles and responsibilities, and their proposed effect on the performance of each RTO. External dependencies, such as performance by another contractor or the availability of any other sources, shall be fully identified. The Offeror shall describe the technical interfaces associated with the tasks. The Offeror shall describe the organizational interfaces, including those with the government and the users.

Within the offeror's response to RTO 3, for the Phase-In requirement, the offeror shall provide a detailed phase-in plan that addresses, at a minimum, the offeror's approach to phase-in sufficient to ensure continuity and a smooth transition with the incumbent contractor during the 90-day phase-in period. The phase-in plan shall clearly demonstrate an ability to assume full contract responsibility on the effective date of the contract. The phase-in plan shall also specifically address how ongoing work will be maintained, the proposed management organization, schedule, orientation and training of personnel. Because this effort involves onsite performance, the offeror shall address their preparation for the timely processing of the Personal Identification Verification (PIV) requirements. If the phase-in plan assumes any dependency upon the incumbent contractor, please identify. Also, the plan shall describe any involvement of NASA personnel during this period.

Subfactor 2 – Management Plan

The management plan shall describe the Offeror's ability to provide the services proposed to deal with problems and assure overall control of the effort. The Offeror's proposal shall demonstrate your ability to provide flexibility, maximize efficiency, and provide coordination of workflow between the Offeror and the Government. The Offeror's proposal shall demonstrate the lines of communication between the Offeror and the Government interfaces. In detail, your proposal shall describe the following:

a. Your effective approach to team communication and collaboration with other I3P services.
b. Your effective approach to employ and maintain a technically trained and experienced workforce to satisfy the contract requirements.
c. Your ability to adequately identify risk that could negatively impact mission and develop realistic work around or mitigation steps to eliminate or reduce risk to an acceptable level.
d. Your personnel/skill level that are currently available and your approach to bring on more personnel if needed.
e. The flexibility of your personnel to work across all the Product Lines as referenced in the SOW.
f. Your teaming and collaboration abilities in working closely, side by side, with other Contractors and Government employees.
g. Your approach on intellectual property hand-over, data and asset transfer, and maintenance of service commitments. In addition, your procedures, protocols, and collateral to manage and implement all these matters carefully and rapidly.

Offeror's shall describe its abilities to employ qualified personnel that can successfully complete each task in the SOW. This includes ensuring that the qualified personnel have in-depth, relevant, experience in creating an environment associated with hosting the NASA's Public Cloud offering for the purpose of ultimately consolidating most public facing websites into the public cloud and NASA's cloud offering to support the existing applications listed in Appendix A.

Offerors shall provide written position descriptions to be incorporated in the resultant contract as Attachment G for the specific labor categories envisioned for performance of this contract. **(Each position description shall not exceed 1 page. Position descriptions are excluded from the page count limitation).** The Offeror shall address the minimum requirements in the position qualifications, to include the necessary experience, summary of duties and responsibilities, specific requirements, minimum education and minimum experience as well as key skills required for the position.

PAST PERFORMANCE PROPOSAL

An Offeror's past performance record indicates the relevant quantitative and qualitative aspects of performing services or delivering products similar in size and content to the requirements of this acquisition.

The Offeror shall provide, at a minimum, the following information in support of its proposal to

facilitate the evaluation of the offeror's past performance as related to the requirements of the proposed contract.

(a) *INFORMATION FROM THE OFFEROR*

Prime Offerors shall furnish the information requested below for all of your most recent contracts (completed and ongoing) for similar efforts with a minimum average annual cost/fee incurred of $2 million that your company has had within the last 3 years of the RFP release date. Relevance of a past or current contract is evaluated for size and content to include complexity within content. The fact that a contract meets the minimum dollar threshold for consideration (ex: $2M) does not guarantee any particular evaluation rating for size relevance. Indicate which contracts are most related (i.e. similar in size and content) and how they are related to the proposed effort, as well as which contracts were performed by the division of your company (if applicable) that will perform the proposed contract/subcontract. Content review will include complexity of the work performed.

For the purposes of the Past Performance Volume, a proposed significant subcontractor is defined as any proposed subcontractor that is estimated to be performing at least 25% of any of the proposed RTO requirements. *Note, the definition of significant subcontractor for the past performance evaluation may be different than for the cost evaluation.* The offeror shall provide the information requested below for any significant subcontractor(s) for those similar efforts within the last 3 years of the RFP release date with a minimum average annual cost/fee incurred of at least 25% of the estimated average annual dollar value of the proposed significant subcontract.

For example (note, these example numbers may not relate to this specific procurement), if a procurement is valued at an average annual value of $50M and a proposed significant subcontractor for the effort has a proposed average annual cost/fee of $16M, the offeror shall provide relevant current/past contract references that have a minimum average annual cost/fee incurred at/above $4M (25% of $16M) for that significant subcontractor.

If a prime offeror or significant subcontractor is submitting past performance data on a current/past contract vehicle that includes multiple tasks, orders, etc, all effort under that contract vehicle may be consolidated for the purposes of meeting the average annual cost/fee incurred in the instructions above and for the purpose of evaluating contract relevance for the proposed requirement.

The offeror shall provide an estimated value and percentage of work to be performed on this contract by the prime offeror and each significant subcontractor. Indicate the primary functions (SOW) to be performed by the prime offeror and each proposed significant subcontractor. Indicate which contracts are most related (i.e. similar in size and content) and how they are related to the proposed effort, as well as which contracts were performed by the division of your company (if applicable) that will perform the proposed contract/subcontract.

If applicable, Offerors may provide the experience or past performance of a parent or affiliated or predecessor company to an Offeror (including a parent or affiliated company that is being otherwise proposed as a subcontractor on this effort) where the firm's proposal demonstrates that

the resources of the parent or affiliate or predecessor will affect the performance of the Offeror. The Offeror shall demonstrate that the resources of the parent or affiliate or predecessor company (its workforce, management, facilities or other resources) shall be provided or relied upon for contract performance such that the parent or affiliate or predecessor will have meaningful involvement in contract performance.

The offeror shall provide the following information on all past/current contract references that meet the above criteria for the prime offeror and each significant subcontractor:

- Customer's name, address, and telephone number of both the lead contractual and technical personnel most familiar with the offeror's performance record. *(Please verify the telephone numbers provided are current and correct).*

- Cage Code and/or DUNS Number of the contractor performing the work.

- Contract number, type, and total original and present or final contract value.

- The current contract expenditures incurred to date, the date in which the expenditures have been incurred through, and the Average Annual Cost/Fee Incurred to Date. For example (note, these example numbers may not relate to this specific procurement):

  A current five year contract that you are performing has a total estimated value of $100,000,000. As of the latest cost report which reflected cost/fee through the first 2 years and 4 months of performance, the total amount of cost/fee incurred by the offeror over the duration of the contract was $43,500,000.

  In this example, an Offeror would provide the following:

  Current Contract Expenditures incurred to Date: $43,500,000

  Date in which Expenditures have been incurred through: Insert Date of cost report that indicated cost/fee total of $43,500,000 after 2 years and 4 months of performance.

  Average Annual Cost/Fee Incurred to Date: $18,669,528 ($43,500,000/2.33 years)

- Date of contract, place(s) of performance, and delivery dates or period of performance.

- Brief description of contract work and comparability to the proposed effort. It is not sufficient to state that it is comparable in magnitude and scope. Rationale must be provided to demonstrate that it is comparable.

- Method of acquisition: competitive or noncompetitive.

- Nature of award: initial or follow-on. If initial, indicate whether award was preceded by a Government, customer, or offeror financed study.

- Identify and explain major technical problems and how they were overcome. List any major deviations or waivers to technical requirements that were granted by the customer.

- Identify and explain completion successes and delays, including adherence to program schedules. Provide an assessment of the performance (technical and schedule) on these past programs and support these assessments with metrics such as award or incentive fees earned.

- Cost management history; identify and explain any cost overruns and underruns, and cost incentive history, if applicable.

- Average number of personnel on the contract per year and percent turnover of personnel per year.

- Recent customer evaluations of past performance including Award Fee Evaluation results, Fee Determination Official letters, Annual Performance Evaluation Forms, etc. (Excluded from the page limitation).

- List any contracts terminated (partial or complete) within the past 5 years and basis for termination (convenience or default). Include the contract number, name, address, and telephone number of the terminating officer (please verify telephone numbers). Include contracts that were "descoped" by the customer because of performance or cost problems. (Excluded from the page limitation).

(b) *PRIOR CUSTOMER EVALUATIONS (PAST PERFORMANCE QUESTIONNAIRES)*

The offeror and any proposed significant subcontractor(s) [as defined in paragraph (a)] shall provide the questionnaires provided as Enclosure V to each of the above references to establish a record of past performance. The Offeror shall instruct each of its references to return the questionnaire directly to the Government in a sealed envelope. The questionnaire respondent shall be a representative from the technical customer and responsible Contracting Officer with direct knowledge of your firm's performance. If possible, the Offeror and any proposed significant subcontractor(s) shall provide questionnaires to customers from NASA contracts, other Government contracts, and commercial contracts. For proposed significant subcontractor(s), references shall concern only work performed by the subcontractor's business entity that will perform the work under this contract, if awarded.

The Offeror is responsible for ensuring that the questionnaire is completed and submitted directly to the NASA Goddard Space Flight Center Contracting Officer no later than the closing date of this solicitation designated in Block 9 of the SF 33:

NASA Goddard Space Flight Center
Attn: Cedric Mitchener Code 210.H
Bldg. 17, Rm. S120
Greenbelt, MD 20771
Telephone: 301-286-6162
FAX: 301-286-0356

The Offeror shall include a list of those to whom the questionnaires were sent, including name of individual, phone number, organization, and contract number. Offerors shall include in their proposal the written consent of their proposed significant subcontractors to allow the Government to discuss the subcontractors' past performance evaluation with the Offeror.

(c) *SUMMARY OF DEVIATIONS/EXCEPTIONS (PAST PERFORMANCE PROPOSAL)*

Identify and explain the reason for any deviations, exceptions, or conditional assumptions taken with respect to these Past Performance Proposal instructions.

(End of provision)

PRICE PROPOSAL

A completed 1449 must be submitted with this offer. The offeror's proposal must be based on the labor categories covered under the offeror's GSA Schedule contract. The offeror shall submit its most competitive offer. In accordance with GSA Schedule contract clause 52.216-19 Order Limitations, additional concessions are being sought. Direct labor must be estimated based on the basis of productive effort. Productive effort is the estimated number of hours required to perform the work.

Final monetary extensions in the price proposal may be expressed as the closest whole dollar amount, with cents omitted.

LABOR CATEGORIES: The Offer shall complete Attachment B of the BPA, in accordance with the offeror's GSA schedule contract. These loaded labor rates shall be used to calculate and negotiate the price of performing the effort. These rates are "not to exceed" (NTE) rates. During BPA performance, offerors will be permitted to offer prices at lower rates than are listed in Attachment B; however, for purposes of pricing this RFQ, the offerors shall use the NTE loaded labor rates for pricing the RTOs. The offeror agrees to use the schedule as the basis for establishing the fixed price of individual orders, together with any other direct costs specific to the task order. The labor categories must reflect those labor categories which would probably be needed in the performance of the BPA.

REPRESENTATIVE TASK ORDERS (RTO): Offeror shall complete Enclosure IV for each of the RTOs. In this enclosure, offerors shall include all costs including loaded direct labor and ODCs associated with performing the RTO. Offerors shall use the "not to exceed" bid rates proposed in Attachment B, Loaded Labor Rate Matrix, for pricing all RTOs.

In addition to the summary price proposal enclosure for each RTO, offerors shall provide detailed back-up cost spreadsheets that include the following elements:

- Prime and, if proposed, teaming partner(s) labor, including hours, rates and labor categories;
- Contract Program Management costs; include and identify, if not included in indirect costs embedded in the loaded labor rates; and

- Other Direct Costs (ODCs), including detailed breakout of materials, equipment, travel, computer usage, subcontracts, and any other miscellaneous ODCs.

EVALUATION CRITERIA

The Government will award one BPA resulting from this request to the responsible Offeror whose quotation conforming to this request will be most advantageous to the Government. The following factors and subfactors will be used in evaluating offers:

- TECHNICAL FACTOR
  - Subfactor 1: Technical Approach
  - Subfactor 2: Management Plan

- PAST PERFORMANCE FACTOR

- PRICE FACTOR

Each evaluating factor is equally important. Regarding the technical Subfactors, Subfactor 1, Technical Approach, is more important than Subfactor 2, Management Plan. The evaluating factors and subfactors will be weighted on an adjectival rating basis.

Offerors' proposals will be evaluated as follows:

TECHNICAL FACTOR

The Government will evaluate proposals by classifying findings as strengths, weaknesses, significant strengths, significant weaknesses, or deficiencies using the following:

- Weakness – a flaw in the proposal that increases the risk of unsuccessful contract performance

- Significant Weakness – a proposal flaw that appreciably increases the risk of unsuccessful contract performance

- Deficiency – a material failure of a proposal to meet a Government requirement or a combination of significant weaknesses in a proposal that increases the risk of unsuccessful contract performance to an unacceptable level

- Strength (not in FAR/NFS) – a proposal area that enhances the potential for successful performance or contributes toward exceeding the contract requirements in a manner that provides additional value to the government (this could be associated with a process, technical approach, materials, facilities, etc.).

- Significant Strength (not in FAR/NFS) – a proposal area that greatly enhances the potential for successful performance or contributes significantly toward exceeding the contract requirements in a manner that provides additional value to the government.

The Technical Factor will be evaluated using the following adjectival ratings:

ADJECTIVAL RATING	DEFINITIONS
Excellent	A comprehensive and thorough proposal of exceptional merit with one or more significant strengths. No deficiency or significant weakness exists.
Very Good	A proposal having no deficiency and which demonstrates over-all competence. One or more significant strengths have been found, and strengths outbalance any weaknesses that exist.
Good	A proposal having no deficiency and which shows a reasonably sound response. There may be strengths or weaknesses, or both. As a whole, weaknesses not off-set by strengths do not significantly detract from the offeror's response.
Fair	A proposal having no deficiency and which has one or more weaknesses. Weaknesses outbalance any strength.
Poor	A proposal that has one or more deficiencies or significant weaknesses that demonstrate a lack of overall competence or would require a major proposal revision to correct.

Subfactor 1 – Technical Approach

The proposed technical approach will be evaluated in terms of your ability to accomplish the requirements within the SOW, including the anticipated logical sequence of tasks, methodology, techniques and quality assurance required to satisfy the SOW requirements. In detail, the Government will evaluate the effectiveness of your proposal in the following areas:

a. Demonstrated technical approach to accomplish current state operations for the websites and applications listed in Appendix A and Appendix B.
b. Demonstrated understanding of the transition and migration of NASA's websites from their current, legacy platforms onto the target platform in the public cloud. Initial migration of websites and applications are listed in Appendix A and Appendix B.
c. Demonstrated technical approach to initially stand up Development (Dev)/Test, Quality Assurance (QA)/Staging, and Production platforms to include the methodology to support NASA platforms with an initial requirement for full support of integrated instances of Open Source content management systems (such as Drupal, WordPress and Alfresco) that would allow for content from one to be presented on the other as a multi-tenant platform to NASA.
d. Demonstrated technical approach to initially standing up collaboration environment using open source tools to meet the requirements in the SOW.

e. Demonstrate solution for streaming media services to meet the requirements in the SOW.
f. Demonstrated solution for search as a service to meet the requirements in the SOW
g. Demonstrated and cost efficient approach to FedRAMP Provisional Authorization by the FedRAMP Joint Authorization Board.
h. Demonstrated technical approach in security and Incident Management as well as Change Control Management.
i. Demonstrated an approach to developing cost models and pricing calculators that promote incremental growth in the use of areas such as bandwidth, storage, and infrastructure.

The Government will evaluate the adequacy of the offeror's Safety and Health Plan to ensure that supplies and services are furnished in a safe and healthful manner, and that the offeror develops, produces, and/or delivers products to NASA that will be safe and successful for their intended use.

The offeror's Safety and Health Plan will be evaluated for compliance with applicable Federal and State statutory and regulatory requirements, as well as compliance with NPR 8715.3, NFS 1852.223-73 and applicable NASA Agency-wide and Installation specific policies and/or procedures including the adequacy of protection of life, health, and well being of NASA and Contractor employees, property and equipment. Further, the Safety and Health Plan will be evaluated to determine the adequacy of protection for subcontractor employees for any proposed subcontract.

For each RTO, the Government will evaluate the thoroughness and merit of discussion on how the task will be accomplished, including the technical and management approach to demonstrating a clear and full understanding of the objectives. The Government will evaluate the reasonableness of the detailed price schedule. Further, the government will evaluate the offeror's approach for identifying all risks and the thoroughness of the response to mitigation/resolution, and the reasonableness of the basis for any assumptions made.

The Government will evaluate the appropriateness of the proposed staffing plan and skill mix for each RTO to include the rationale for identifying positions to determine realism, merit and sufficiency. The Government will evaluate the proposed hiring plan for its ability to recruit and retain qualified personnel to include incumbent workforce. The Government will also evaluate any other recruitment efforts for attracting staff not currently employed within the company.

The Government will evaluate the proposed significant subcontractors (as defined in the Past Performance Section of this contract), their roles and responsibilities, and their proposed effect on the performance of the RTOs to include the reasonableness and extent of the functional split of responsibilities between the prime and subcontractors. The Government will evaluate the offeror's ability to identify the technical organizational interfaces associated with the tasks, including those with the Government and users.

In addition to the evaluation criteria listed above for this section, the Government will specifically evaluate the offeror's response to RTO 3 for its ability to perform phase-in activities in an independent manner. The Government will also evaluate the effectiveness in ensuring continuity and a smooth transition with the incumbent contractor during the 90-day phase-in period. The Government will evaluate how clearly the phase-in plan demonstrates an ability to assume full contract responsibility on the effective date of the contract. The Government will evaluate how the phase-in plan specifically address how ongoing work will be maintained, the proposed management organization, schedule, orientation and training of personnel. The Government will evaluate the effectiveness of the offerors approach to meeting the Personal Identification Verification (PIV) requirements. Additionally, The Government will evaluate the reasonableness and the extent of dependency upon the incumbent contractor and NASA personnel during this period.

Subfactor 2 – Management Plan

The management plan will be evaluated in terms of your ability to provide the services proposed to deal with problems and assure overall control of the effort. The Offeror's ability to provide flexibility, maximize efficiency, and provide coordination of workflow between the Offeror and the Government will be evaluated. The Government will evaluate the proposed lines of communication between the Offeror and the Government interfaces. In detail, the Government will evaluate the effectiveness of your proposal in the following areas:

a. Effective approach to team communication and collaboration with other I3P services.
b. Effective approach to employ and maintain a technically trained and experienced workforce to satisfy the contract requirements.
c. Ability to adequately identify risk that could negatively impact mission and develop realistic work around or mitigation steps to eliminate or reduce risk to an acceptable level.
d. Personnel/skill level that are currently available and your approach to bring on more personnel if needed.
e. Flexibility of your personnel to work across all the Product Lines as referenced in the SOW.
f. Teaming and collaboration abilities in working closely, side by side, with other Contractors and Government employees.
g. Approach on intellectual property hand-over, data and asset transfer, and maintenance of service commitments. In addition, your procedures, protocols, and collateral to manage and implement all these matters carefully and rapidly.

The Government will evaluate the offeror's ability to employ qualified personnel that can successfully complete each task in the SOW for reasonableness and effectiveness. The Government will evaluate the offeror's ability to ensure that qualified personnel have in-depth, relevant, experience in creating an environment associated with hosting the NASA's Cloud offering for the purpose of ultimately consolidating most facing websites into the cloud and NASA's cloud offering to support the existing applications listed in Appendix A.

The Government will evaluate the appropriateness and thoroughness of the position descriptions, Attachment G, including the rationale for identifying positions to determine realism, merit and sufficiency.

PAST PERFORMANCE FACTOR

An offeror's past performance will be evaluated based on the evaluation criteria in this provision. All past performance references must meet the "recent" and minimum average annual cost/fee expenditures criteria provided below for both prime contractor references and significant subcontractor references in order to be evaluated.

For purposes of past performance, the term "offeror" refers to a prime contractor and its significant subcontractors. Accordingly, the past performance of significant(s) subcontractors shall also be evaluated and attributed to the offeror. The past performance of a significant subcontractor will be compared to the work proposed to be performed by that subcontractor, and weighted accordingly in assigning the overall past performance adjectival rating to the offeror. The past performance of the prime contractor will be weighted more heavily than any significant subcontractor or combination of significant subcontractors in the overall past performance evaluation.

A "recent" contract is a contract that is ongoing or completed less than 3 years prior to the issuance of this RFP. Contracts completed more than 3 years prior to issuance of this RFP will not be considered recent and will not be considered or evaluated.

A "relevant" contract depends on the size and content of the contract with respect to this acquisition.

For a prime contractor's contract reference(s) to be considered at least minimally "relevant", it must meet/exceed an average annual cost/fee incurred of at least $2 million.

A proposed significant subcontractor for this procurement is defined as any proposed subcontractor that is estimated to be performing at least 25% of any of the proposed RTO requirements. *Note, the definition of significant subcontractor for the past performance evaluation is the same as that of the price evaluation.*

For a significant subcontractor's contract reference(s) to be considered at least minimally "relevant", it must meet/exceed an average annual cost/fee incurred of at least 25% of that portion of this procurement that the subcontractor is proposed (or estimated) to perform.

If the contract is deemed recent and meets the above minimum average annual cost/fee expenditures criteria, the Government will then determine the degree of relevance - ie., level of pertinence - of the contract based on size and content. Content is more important than size in the evaluation of relevance. The term "content" means the type and complexity of services, work, or supplies, in comparison to the requirements of this solicitation. The Government may consider past quantities and periods of performance in evaluating overall relevance.

The performance evaluation will be based primarily on customer satisfaction and/or contract data in meeting technical, schedule, cost, and management requirements. Additional performance factors may include contract administration, occupational health, safety, security, subcontracting plan goals and small disadvantaged business participation targets, if applicable, and other contract requirements.

The Government may review and consider past performance information on other contracts that it is aware of or that are made available from other sources and inquiries with previous customers. These contracts (if any) must meet the above "recent" and minimum average annual cost/fee expenditures criteria to be evaluated.

As part of the past performance evaluation, the Government may attribute the experience or past performance of a parent or affiliated or predecessor company (including a parent or affiliated company that is being otherwise proposed as a subcontractor on this effort) to the proposed prime contractor and/or significant subcontractor(s) where the proposal demonstrates that the resources of the parent or affiliate or predecessor company will affect the performance of the proposed prime contractor and/or significant subcontractor(s). The Government will take into consideration whether the resources of the parent or affiliate or predecessor company (its workforce, management, facilities or other resources) will be provided or relied upon for contract performance such that the parent or affiliate will have meaningful involvement in contract performance. These contracts (if any) must meet the above "recent" and minimum average annual cost/fee expenditures criteria to be evaluated.

An offeror shall not be rated favorably or unfavorably if the offeror does not have a record of "recent" and "relevant" past performance or if a record of past performance is unavailable. In such cases the offeror will receive a "Neutral" rating. However, an offeror with favorable, recent, and relevant past performance that meets the minimum average annual cost/fee expenditures indicated above may be considered more favorably than an offeror with no relevant past performance information.

The Government will consider an offeror's explanation of any problems encountered on any identified contracts, and any corrective actions taken by the offeror.

The overall confidence rating assigned to an offeror's Past Performance (see below) will reflect a subjective evaluation of the information contained in the oral presentation, if applicable; written narrative; past performance evaluation input provided through customer questionnaires; and other references, if any, that the Government may contact for additional past performance information.

Past Performance Ratings – The level of confidence ratings set forth below will be used to evaluate the Past Performance factor for each offeror.

Each of the adjective ratings below has a "performance" component and a "relevance" component as discussed above. As used in the ratings below, the term "pertinent" is equivalent to the term "relevant." The following adjectival rating guidelines will be used when subjectively assessing both components.

Very High Level of Confidence

The Offeor's relevant past performance is of exceptional merit and is very highly pertinent to this acquisition; indicating exemplary performance in a timely, efficient, and economical manner; very minor (if any) problems with no adverse effect on overall performance. Based on the Offeror's performance record, there is a very high level of confidence that the Offeror will successfully perform the required effort.

High Level of Confidence

The Offeror's relevant past performance is highly pertinent to this acquisition; demonstrating very effective performance that would be fully responsive to contract requirements with contract requirements accomplished in a timely, efficient, and economical manner for the most part with only minor problems with little identifiable effect on overall performance. Based on the Offeror's performance record, there is a high level of confidence that the Offeror will successfully perform the required effort.

Moderate Level of Confidence

The Offeror's relevant past performance is pertinent to this acquisition, and it demonstrates effective performance; fully responsive to contract requirements; reportable problems, but with little identifiable effect on overall performance. Based on the Offeror's performance record, there is a moderate level of confidence that the Offeror will successfully perform the required effort.

Low Level of Confidence

The Offeror's relevant past performance is at least somewhat pertinent to this acquisition, and it meets or slightly exceeds minimum acceptable standards; adequate results; reportable problems with identifiable, but not substantial, effects on overall performance. Based on the Offeror's performance record, there is a low level of confidence that the Offeror will successfully perform the required effort. Changes to the Offeror's existing processes may be necessary in order to achieve contract requirements.

Very Low Level of Confidence

The Offeror's relevant past performance does not meet minimum acceptable standards in one or more areas; remedial action required in one or more areas; problems in one or more areas which, adversely affect overall performance. Based on the Offeror's performance record, there is a very low level of confidence that the Offeror will successfully perform the required effort.

Neutral

In the case of an Offeror without a record of relevant past performance or for whom information on past performance is not available, the Offeror may not be evaluated favorably or unfavorably on past performance [see FAR 15.305(a) (2) (ii) and (iv)].

(End of provision)

PRICE FACTOR

In accordance with FAR 8.405-2(d), Evaluation, the proposed price of each Representative Task Order (RTO) will be evaluated to determine reasonableness of the proposed labor hours, labor categories and other direct costs.

The combined total proposed price for all RTOs will be presented to the Source Selection Official.

There is no separate price evaluation of the BPA. The price factor is used to determine the reasonableness of the proposed price for the Government, should it be selected for award.

To note, Offerors are advised that a quotation meeting the objectives and requirements with the lowest price may not be selected if award to a higher priced Offeror is determined to be most advantageous to the Government. Also, an Offeror's information provided for one factor may be used to assess other factors if the Government deems appropriate.

QUOTATION SUBMISSION INSTRUCTIONS

Only the required minimum amount of information is requested to provide for proper evaluation. Efforts should be made to keep quotations as brief as possible, concentrating on substantive information essential for a proper evaluation.

The following table contains the page limitations for each portion of the proposal submitted in response to this RFQ.

Proposal Component	Max. Pages
Cover Page, Indices, Tabs and List of Acronyms	Excluded
Technical Proposal	
Subfactor 1: Technical Approach* Subfactor 2: Management Approach**	115 pages total
Safety and Health Plan	Excluded
Past Performance Proposal, including Past Performance Questionnaires	Excluded
Price Proposal - Including SF 1449 **(Enclosure I)** and Loaded Labor Rate Matrix **(Attachment B of the BPA under Enclosure II)**	Excluded

*The responses to the RTOs shall not exceed 75 pages out of the 115.
**The position descriptions are excluded from this page count.

A page is defined as one side of a sheet, 8-1/2" x 11", with at least one inch margins on all sides, using not smaller than 12 point type. Line spacing or the amount of vertical space between lines of text shall not be less than single line (Microsoft Word's default line spacing). Character spacing shall be "Normal", not "Expanded" or "Condensed." The margins may contain headers and footers, but shall not contain any proposal content to be evaluated. Foldouts count as an equivalent number of 8-1/2" x 11" pages. The metric standard format most closely approximating the described standard 8-1/2" x 11" size may also be used. Diagrams, tables, artwork, and photographs may be reduced and, if necessary, run landscape or folded to eliminate

oversize pages. Text in Diagrams, charts, tables, artwork, and photographs shall be no smaller than 10 point. Diagrams, tables, artwork, and photographs shall not be used to circumvent the text size limitations of the proposal.

Submit signed and dated quotations to the office specified under Proposal Due date herein at or before the exact time specified in this solicitation. Quotations may be submitted on the SF 1449. As minimum, quotations must show:

- The RFQ number;
- The time specified in the RFQ for receipt of quotations;
- The name, address, telephone and facsimile number of the offeror;
- A description of the items being offered in sufficient detail to evaluate compliance with the requirements of the RFQ; and
- Price and any discount terms

All quotations shall agree to hold the prices proposed in response to this RFQ for 275 calendar days from the date specified for receipt of quotations.

One original proposal and six (6) copies of the proposal shall be submitted along with a copy of your company's GSA Schedule Contract.

Two (2) electronic copies of the offeror's proposal shall be submitted (in addition to the hardcopies specified above). All volumes shall be prepared using either Microsoft Word (with backwards compatibility for Microsoft Word 2003) or a searchable Portable Document Format (PDF) compatible with Adobe Reader 9. Price proposal charts shall use Microsoft Excel (with backwards compatibility for Microsoft Excel 2003). Formulas, not values should be used in Excel spreadsheets, unless otherwise directed in the cost model instructions, where amounts are calculated in electronic versions. DO NOT compress any electronic files. DO NOT password protect any portion of your electronic submission.

Electronic files of proposal shall be on virus free CD-ROM (CD-R format) discs with an external label indicating: (1) the name of the offeror, (2) the RFQ number, (3) the format and software versions used, (4) a list of the files contained on the disk and (5) date of the information. In the event of any inconsistency between data provided on electronic media and hard copies, the hard copy data will be considered to be correct.

The Government will answer relevant and appropriate questions regarding this RFQ. Any questions or comments regarding this solicitation and any terms and conditions shall cite the RFQ number and must be submitted in writing to Mr. Cedric Mitchener not later than seven (7) business days before the deadline for receipt of quotations. Mr. Mitchener may be reached on telephone number 301-286-6162, or e-mail at cedric.m.mitchener@nasa.gov (preferred method). Questions the Government may have otherwise answered, may not be answered if submitted too late to permit transmittal to all potential offerors reasonably in advance of the due date. Receipt of late questions will not be reason for an extension to the proposal due date. If you do not wish to submit a quotation for this effort, you are requested to notify Mr. Mitchener as soon as possible by e-mail.

Proposal Due Date

Quotations are due by the due date and time shown in block 8 of the SF 1449.

External Marking of Proposal Package(s)

All proposal packages must be closed and sealed.

The required mailing address and external marking for proposals is as follows:

NASA/Goddard Space Flight Center
Greenbelt, MD 20771
Building 16W-Shipping and Receiving Dock
Solicitation Number: NNH12424505Q
Attn: Cedric M. Mitchener
Building 17, Room S120
PROPOSAL – DELIVER UNOPENED

Suggested additional marking if delivery is made by a commercial delivery service:

"COMMERCIAL DELIVERY PERSONNEL: THIS PROPOSAL MUST BE DELIVERED TO THE DOCK MASTER, BUILDING 16W SHIPPING AND RECEIVING DOCK, NO LATER THAN (OFFEROR-ENTER DATE AND TIME)."

Designated Receiving Office

The designated receiving office for proposals is the Shipping and Receiving Dock, Building 16W, Goddard Space Flight Center, which must be accessed from Hubble Road off of Soil Conservation Road, north from Greenbelt Road. Proposals must be received at the designated receiving office **no later than the date and time stated on the SF 1449**.

The Building 16W Shipping and Receiving dock is open from 7:30AM to 3:30PM, Monday through Friday, except Government holidays. Contractor personnel conduct the GSFC receiving function, which include mailroom operations. Proposals will be marked with the date and time of receipt, subjected to security screening, secured, and delivered unopened to the Contracting Officer.

There is no public access to the Building 16W Shipping and Receiving Dock. GSFC passes are required for access to the receiving dock.

There are three suggested methods of delivery to the designated proposal receiving office:

U.S. Postal Service Express Mail
Commercial Delivery Service
Delivery by company employee or other individual agent

It is highly encouraged for all offerors to use U.S. Postal Service Express Mail or Commercial Delivery Services.

If proposals are going to be delivered by a company employee or other individual agent that does not already have badged access to NASA/GSFC, the offeror MUST comply with the following instructions and allow sufficient time (potentially one hour or more) for security processing through the North Gate on Hubble Road:

a. Vehicle must use the Truck Inspection lane (far right lane).

b. Driver (and any passenger(s)) must be a U.S. Citizen (no exceptions).

c. Driver shall state that they are delivering a proposal and provide the specific Solicitation Number. Driver must show a copy of the solicitation cover page (or appropriate solicitation instructions or amendment), which includes the solicitation number and proposal due date. The delivery date should be within 1 week of the proposal due date. The solicitation number shall match the solicitation number on the properly marked proposal packages (see section 1 of this provision).

d. Driver (and any passenger(s)) must provide a valid Driver's License to the Security Officer for identification and recording purposes.

e. Vehicle must undergo a GSFC Security vehicle inspection.

f. Driver will be provided with a pass authorizing them to proceed directly to the Shipping and Receiving Dock, Building 16W, ONLY.

g. After delivering the proposal, the vehicle must immediately exit GSFC back through the North Gate.

h. If the Solicitation documentation is not provided, the proposal packages are not properly marked, or the driver/vehicle does not pass security procedures, the driver may not be granted access through the North Gate and will be instructed to go the GSFC Main Gate on Greenbelt Road for security processing. If this happens, the driver should contact the Contracting Officer named in this solicitation for further assistance. Note, any delays associated with this process will not result in the Government's acceptance of a late proposal, which is why the use of the U.S. Postal Service or Commercial Delivery Services are highly encouraged.

Regardless of the method of delivery chosen, the offeror is responsible for delivery of the proposal to the designated receiving office no later than the date and time stated on the face page of the solicitation.

This request is not to be construed in any way as a commitment of the Government to pay for proposal preparation costs, nor does it obligate the Government to procure said service.

Sincerely,

Cedric M. Mitchener
Contracting Officer

Enclosures:
- I, SF 1449
- II, BPA
- III, Representative Task Orders
- IV, Price Proposal for Representative Task Orders
- V, Past Performance Questionnaire
- VI, Internal Applications and Websites
- VII, External Websites
- VIII, Quote Submittal Sheet
- IX, Representations and Certifications