

ALICE General Questions and Answers
Updated 8/02/2016

Previous questions can be found on FedBizOpps by utilizing the following link: [Click me!](#)

Q25: Will further details be added to the "Resource Planning Document to include the resources, and organizational structure, for LaRC?

A25: No. Resource requirements for LaRC are detailed in Cost Volume III. This includes skill mix and hours.

Q26: Where in the L-1 document is training located or will it be tracked by NASA?

A26: On page 7 of attachment L-1, Resource Planning Document, it reflects a block titled "Contractor Management". Training falls under Contractor Management as stipulated in Section 4, Contract Management of the ALICE SOW. Specifically, paragraph 4.5, Training, states, "the Contractor shall document the process for sustaining trained and qualified personnel, including approaches that ensure personnel are fully trained, task proficient and task certified throughout the life of this contract in accordance with DRD M-11, Training and Certification Plan." The location of the Contractor Training Coordinator shall be determined by the Contractor Management Team. Please note that NASA will not track Contractor training but reserves the right to monitor and audit requirements contained in DRD-M11 throughout the life of the contract.

Q27: Will the ALICE RFP requirement allow for Secret FCL before contract start instead of at proposal submission?

A27: No, the requirement for the Secret facility clearance will remain unchanged and due at the time of proposal submission.

Q28: Can you provide Schedule of Requirements, Scope of Work, Terms of Reference, Bill of Materials required?

A28: This information can be found within the Draft RFP, which can be found by utilizing the following link: [ALICE Draft RFP](#)

Q29: Reserved

A29: Reserved

Q30: What is the estimated Budget for this procurement?

A30: Per clause, B.7 in the draft RFP for the Indefinite Delivery Indefinite Quantity portion the guaranteed minimum to be ordered under this contract is \$1M and the maximum which may be ordered under this contract is \$182,350,000.

Q31: Will the Government extend the date for proposal submission?

A31: Any extensions for proposal the proposal submissions will be posted to the ALICE website; however the Government does not anticipate extending the proposal due date at this time.

Q32: Are there any Addendum or Pre Bid meeting Minutes available?

A32: All information, including updates will be posted on FedBizOpps and the ALICE website. Please continue to monitor the ALICE website at:

<http://procurement.jsc.nasa.gov/alice/>

Q33: Per the All-Hands Meeting Presentation Slides, NASA indicates AOD will be transitioning to a leaner workforce. How does NASA plan to achieve this leaner workforce before the start of ALICE with the constraints of the existing CBAs? If NASA is unable to achieve the workforce targets before the start of ALICE than how will that affect the GREs, Composite Incumbent Labor Rates and Seniority Data provided in the ALICE RFP that bidders will utilize in their pricing strategy?

A33: NASA has no plans to achieve a leaner workforce prior to the start of ALICE. The GRE reflects the anticipated leaner staffing levels at contract start under the ALICE contract.

Q34: Reserved

A34: Reserved

Q35: Will the Government consider relief on the Secret Facility requirement (at RFP Submission) for a company waiting upon final approval from DSS as long as all interviews have been conducted? Request this be amended to state Secret Facility requirement required by Award Date.

A35: See answer 27

Q36: Is it necessary for the Executive PM to have NASA related experience? Is relevant industry related experience sufficient?

A36: No, it is not required that the Executive PM have NASA related experience. Refer to Section C, Appendix C.

Q37: Page C-13, 4.2.5.1, Table 4-1 does not show DRD-M13 yet Attachment J-1 has DRD-M13.

Please clarify the DRD-M13 requirement

A37: DRD-M13, Contract Phase-In Plan is due with the proposal, but is not a management deliverable under Table 4-1. The Phase-In will be complete prior to the start of the contract's period of performance.

Q38: Page C-36, 4.5.4.10 addresses welder training. Attachment L-1 Resource Planning Document does not show any Welders.

Please clarify the requirements for Welders that determine the staffing levels.

A38: Attachment L-1, Resource Planning Document has been changed to reflect a requirement for a welder. This change will be reflected within the final RFP.

Q39: Page Appendix D-7, 1.3 states requirements for Safety and IT Security Plans.

Please clarify if there is a program requirement for a single Safety plan (as defined in DRD S02) and a single IT Security plan (as defined in DRD M19) or if the contractor is to write separate plans for LaRC.

A39: The stated requirements DRD-S02, Safety and Health Plan and DRD-M19, Information Technology Security Program Plan and Reports are for JSC. The Langley requirement is Section J, Subsection J7, p.4. They are separate plans.

Q40: Page Appendix D-34, 9.1 1) Quality Control states the contractor will comply with the LMS-OP-0901 QAP. There does not appear to be a requirement for a contractor QAP at Ellington Field or ELP.

Please clarify the requirement for a contractor QAP covering all three sites.

A40: The reference you cited provides Langley requirements. There is no JSC/ELP requirement for a contractor QAP. The contractor is required to provide, within DRD-

M18 Contractor's Operating Manual, the processes and procedures associated with SOW Section 10, Quality.

Q41: Page F-2, F.5 Period of Performance and Page F-3/F-4, F.7 Option 2 both show an end date of 30 Sept 2022. Section B.3.3, all three B-1 tables show the end of Option 2 as 31 May 2022. Section L, L.34 shows an Option 2 end date of 31 May 2022.

Please clarify the Option 2 end date.

A41: A correction showing the period of performance ending 31 May 2022 will be made in final RFP.

Q42: Page H-21, H.39 requires ISO 9001 QMS at LaRC. The SOW does not address any ISO requirements and requires the contractor to use the Govt QAPs. Please clarify the QMS and QAP requirement for all ALICE locations.

A42: Neither JSC managed locations (see Section C, Subsection 2.2.1) or Langley require ISO 9001 contractor certification. Langley and JSC both require ISO 9001 contractor "compliance." NASA will revise Section C, Subsection 10.1 to clarify the JSC ISO requirement. Refer to Answer 40 for QAP requirements.

Q43: Page L-18, L.37.1, MA-1, MA-2, and MA-3. The ALICE RFP Table L-2 included a note stating the Safety and Health Plan was not included in the page count.

Please clarify if the identified plans will be considered in the 105 page count limit or if all "plans" are to be submitted as separate attachments and not counted against the 105 page limit.

A43: The 105 page limit applies to the plans referenced in the Management Approach (MA1, MA2, and MA3) and includes the Technical Approach (TA1). As stated in Table L-2, the Safety and Health Plan has no page limit.

Q44: Page L-21, L.37.4 (f) (1) and (2) Past Performance Environmental and Safety/Health data. The ALICE RFP Table L-2 included a note stating the OSHA Forms 300 and 300A were not subject to page count limitations.

Please clarify if these data elements will or will not count against the 50 page limit.

A44: As stated in Table L-2, OSHA Forms 300 and 300A are not subject to the page limitation.

Q45: Please clarify if the OSHA forms 300 and 300A are to be limited to only those programs presented as past performance exhibits or for all programs with the 488190 NAICS. Also, please verify that the OSHA forms 300 and 300A will not count against the page limitations.

A45: OSHA forms 300 and 300A are for all programs with the 488190 NAICS. Additionally, see Answer 44.

Q46: Page L-29, Table L.37.5-5 El Paso GRE shows 29 positions. Attachment L-1 page 12 shows 30 positions counting the FOL Depot Supv and the Guppy Team Lead. Table L.37.5-5 does not include the Logistics-Supply Technician shown on Attachment L-1 page 12.

Please verify the GRE for El Paso.

A46: The difference between the two cited references is that the logistics supply technician noted on L-1 is part of baseline and is not included in Table L.37.5-5. The L-1 Resource Planning Document will be updated to clarify completion form baseline labor resources.

Q47: Attachment L-1 Resource Planning Document slide 9 shows two “Maintenance Coordinators”. Page App C-7 and page L-28 Table L.37.5-3 address “Maintenance Controllers”.

Please clarify if Maintenance Coordinators are the same as Maintenance Controllers.

A47: Yes, the Maintenance Coordinator is the same position as the Maintenance Controller. NASA will revise Section C, Appendix C, Attachment L-1, and Table L.37.5-3 in the Final RFP to make the references consistent and refer to the position as Maintenance Control Coordinators

Q48: Attachment L-1 Resource Planning Document slide 16 shows one “Occupational Safety and Health” position. Page L-26, Table L.37.5-2 shows one “Occupational Safety and Health Team Lead” position.

Please clarify if the GRE is for two positions or if there is one position. If a single position, please confirm the correct title.

A48: Yes, the “Occupational Safety and Health” position is the same position as the “Occupational Safety and Health Team Lead.” NASA will revise Attachment L-1 in the Final RFP to match Table L.37.5-2.

Q49: Attachment L-1 Resource Planning Document slide 9 shows two Planner Schedulers. Table L.37.5-3 shows zero Planner Schedulers but one Senior Planner Scheduler. Appendix C does not have a definition for Planner Schedulers but does define Senior Planner Scheduler on page App C-11.

Please clarify the title and GRE for Planner Schedulers.

A49: Attachment L-1 will be revised in the Final RFP to correct inconsistencies. The two Planner Schedulers in Attachment L-1 will be renamed to one Senior Planner Scheduler and one Production Control Clerk.

Q50: Attachment L-1 Resource Planning Document slide 8 shows one NDI at ELP. Slide 12 shows one NDI at ELP under Support Functions.

Please verify there are two NDIs at EFP.

A50: There are three Non Destructive Inspections (NDI) technicians at Ellington Field and one NDI tech at El Paso. Attachment L-1, Resource Planning Document will be revised in the Final RFP to correct inconsistencies.

Q51: Attachment L-1 Resource Planning Document slide 16 shows 1 Project Spt Mgt Analyst. Table L.37.5-3 shows two Mgt Analyst.

Please clarify the number of Mgt Analysts.

A51: There is only one Management Analyst required. Table L.37.5-3 will be revised in the Final RFP to change the number of Management Analysts from two to one.

Q52: Attachment L-1 Resource Planning Document does not provide Government staffing for LaRC.

Please provide Government staffing requirements for LaRC.

A52: Attachment L-1 is for JSC only. Refer to Table L.37.5-6, LaRC IDIQ Government Specified Resource Estimate for LaRC staffing.

Q53: Attachment L-1 Resource Planning Document is not consistent for the Government to contractor links. Slide 7 shows the WB-57 as report to a separate Government WB-57 entity. Slides 9 and 11 show the WB-57 reporting to the Government “Lead, Maintenance Control”.

Please clarify the correct reporting lines.

A53: Slide 7 indicates the relationship between the WB-57 project and the associated contractor support to the project office. On the ALICE Maintenance Chart and the ALICE EFD “O” Level Maintenance Structure, contractor maintenance personnel report through the contractor chain of command but coordinate their activities and directly support the WB-57 aircraft.

Q54: Recommend the following clauses be added to the RFP.

- 52.246-24 Limitation of Liability—High-Value Items.
- 252.225-7043 Antiterrorism/Force Protection Policy for Defense Contractors Outside the United States.
- NASA 1852.228-70 Aircraft Ground and Flight Risk.

A54: Your recommendations will be considered.

Q55: Attachment L-1 Resource Planning Document slides 7-14 depict staffing numbers for both the “Existing Contractor Function” and for the “New Contractor Function or Realignment”

- Please clarify if the staffing numbers provided in the categories “Existing Contractor Function” and “New Contractor Function or Realignment” are additive or if the “Existing Contractor Function” staffing numbers are for information only with the requirement to price only the “New Contractor Function or Realignment” provided staffing numbers.
- For example, in the Quality Organization slide 8 shows 27 staffing positions (6 “Existing Contractor Function” and 21 “New Contractor Function or Realignment”).
- Are bidders to price all 27 positions or only the 21 designated as “New Contractor Function or Realignment”?

A55: There are only 21 positions. Offerors are required to price all 21 contractor positions. Attachment L-1 will be updated in the Final RFP to clarify the staffing numbers.

Q56: Attachment L-1 Resource Planning Document slide 8 identifies “Typical Staffing/Augmented Staffing”.

- Please define what is meant by Augmented Staffing. How many hours per year are associated with this position?
- What is the Government’s expectation for the staffing number of Collateral Duty Designated Systems Inspectors?

A56: Attachment L-1 will be updated in the Final RFP to add definitions for typical and augmented staffing. Typical and Augmented Staffing are full-time positions (1860 hours per year).

Typical Staffing is defined as the estimated number of full-time employees assigned to a work center to meet the expected workload for a particular shop or work center.

Augmented Staffing is defined as the estimated number of full-time employees available to be dispatched or reassigned to a shop or work center in order to fill a shortage or to provide particular skills to meet government priorities.

The Government anticipates approximately 25% of the Aircraft Mechanics will be Collateral Duty Designated Systems Inspectors. Final numbers will be established during contract phase-in.

Q57: Please clarify the differences between the following clauses:

- 1852.245-70 CONTRACTOR REQUESTS FOR GOVERNMENT-PROVIDED EQUIPMENT. (AUG 2015) ALTERNATE I (AUG 2015)
- 1852.245-71 INSTALLATION-ACCOUNTABLE GOVERNMENT PROPERTY. (JAN 2011) ALTERNATE I (JAN 2011)

A57: G.7 1852.245-70 deals with property the contractor will acquire that will be accountable to their contract .Contractor must have Contracting Officer approval prior to acquiring the items, unless as specified otherwise in the clause.

G.8 1852.245-71 deals with on-site Government provided equipment and materials supplied for use on this contract that will remain accountable to JSC. The contractor does not have to use that property, but may do so free of charge if they need to. If JSC does not track that property on site in a Government system, the contractor must have a system to do so, even though it is JSC accountable. If a contractor does not use this property (materials or equipment) then they do not have to track it. Additionally, if a contractor employee loses, damages, destroys, or steals any of that on-site property, the JSC Property Survey Board will decide if the contractor is liable.

Q58: Will further details be added to the "Resource Planning Document to include the resources, and organizational structure, for LaRC?

A58: No. See Answer 52

Q59: The DFRP speaks directly to the Executive Manager (Section 4.2.2, page C-27); however, there is no mention of the Executive Manager in the Resource Planning Document. Recommend this key position be added to the Resource Planning document to show continuity and reporting expectations.

A59: Contract management is not shown in the Resource Planning Document to allow the Offerors the flexibility to propose a management structure.

Q60: M.4 incorrectly references L.37.3; should be L.37.4

A60: Section M will be corrected in the Final RFP.

Q61: Reserved

A61: Reserved

Q62: How is Tab TC(c) to be completed if there are different benefit plans provided by the prime and major subcontractor? Are the offerors' required to provide the same benefit plan to all employees regardless of the company for which they work?

A62: Offerors' are not required to provide the same benefit plan to all employees regardless of the company for which they work. A separate TC (c) is required from the Prime and each major subcontractor. Additionally, a separate TC (c) is required for exempt, non-exempt and non-union, and non-exempt union employees.

Q63: There are Contradictions in the DD-254. Is this the correct form?

A63: The form number is correct. A revised DD-254 will be provided in the final RFP.

Q64: Crash Trailer Management requirement for "a sufficient number of personnel". What is a sufficient number?

A64: The training requirement will be determined by the contractor during contract phase-in.

Q65: Will the "Fee Distribution Plan" be provided prior to RFP release or with the final RFP?

A65: Yes, the Government intends to release the Fee Distribution plan prior to final RFP release. The final RFP will contain the Fee Distribution Plan.

Q66: Will the "List of Installation-Accountable Property" be provided prior to RFP release or with final RFP?

A66: The "List of Installation-Accountable Property" is contained in the Draft RFP. The first page of J-3 is a cover sheet. The List of Installation-Accountable Property has been included in subsequent J-3 attachments.

Q67: There are some shall statements with binding requirements are embedded in SOW notes. Recommend the Government include any binding requirements in the main text of the SOW. Examples:

(1) SOW paragraph 4.5.2, page C-32, Note 13: The Contractor shall provide NAMIS training for all Contractor personnel no later than six (6) months after contract start.

(2) SOW paragraph 4.11.2, page C-42, Note 24: The Contractor shall ensure an explosive facility license (AF IMT 2047) is posted in all facilities storing or handling explosives in accordance with Air Force Manual (AFMAN) 91-201, Explosive Safety Standards.

A67: NASA considered the request and elected to leave the binding requirements as is.

Q68: Page L-36 states: A “major subcontractor” is any team member (e.g., a subcontractor or inter-divisional organization) with an estimated total contract value that equals or exceeds \$5,000,000 per contract year. A “minor subcontractor” is any team member (e.g., a subcontractor or inter-divisional organization) with an estimated total contract value below \$5,000,000 per contract year.

However, other places in the DRFP states \$1,000,000 per contract year. (M10 page 1 of 2, L-22, L-34, L-43, L-46).

Will the Government please clarify whether the dollar value is \$1M or \$5M and whether it is calculated over the entire period of performance or per contract year?

A68: For evaluation purposes, the 'major subcontractor' value is \$5 million per contract year. This will be reflected in the final RFP.

Q69: Besides "Ellington Field" and "El Paso" Are there any additional CBAs for this effort? If yes, will copies be provided in the final solicitation?

A69: There are no other Collective Bargaining Agreements (CBAs) associated with the ALICE effort.

Q70: Within Table L-21, the section has two paragraphs labeled e. Is this an error?

A70: Yes, this section will be corrected in the Final RFP.

Q71: Is the Safety and Health data required for only past performance references used in the proposal?

A71: No, it is much broader. Refer to DRFP Section L.37.4 (g).

Q72: JSC Assigned aircraft table 1-3 shows a quantity of 3 WB 57 aircraft, In Attachment L-1 resource document illustrates a quality of 1 WB-57. How many are on station to support and is the resource manning correct to support that quality?

A72: For the purpose of the proposal, assume Qty: 1 WB-57 as reflected in Attachment L-1.

Q73: Reserved

A73: Reserved

Q74: Slide 5 of the 'All Hands Briefing' states that "Under the new ALICE contract, the Government will have overall authority and will provide priorities and tasking for all work." The Section C Statement of Work lists (almost exclusively in 7.0 Maintenance - as an example) tasks that the contractor will support at the Governments direction. However, in the first paragraph on page L-20 (section L.37.4) requires offerors to submit ". . .specific resources (workforce, management, facilities, or other resources) to be employed and relied upon. . ." Question - Will the Government reconcile the requirement in past performance so that it aligns with the Government's intent to lead the new program?

A74: Section L.37.4 speaks to what resources the Contractor proposes to satisfy the elements of the SOW (prime or sub) and to provide the relevant past performance for those resources.

Q75: Section L.37.4 - Paragraph A states: If the Past Performance volume includes data on any affiliated company, division(s), business units, segments, or other organizations of the Offeror's company, then provide a narrative as directed in Paragraph (d) shown below to RFP NNJ16556087R L-20 address what they will be responsible for and/or proposing to do and the specific resources (workforce, management, facilities, or other resources) to be employed and relied upon, such that said parent et al will have meaningful involvement in contract performance. - What Paragraph is the statement above referencing? Section L.37.4 - Paragraph (d) does not seem accurate.

A75: The reference paragraph should be Paragraph (e). Section L will be updated in the Final RFP to reflect the correction.

Q76: Section L.37.5 - Excel Pricing Model lists Minor subcontract Template (MST), G&A Template (GAT) and Overhead Template (OHT). The Topic Tabs are not listed in the Excel File.

A76: The Excel Pricing Model will be corrected in the Final RFP to include any missing tabs.

Q77: In Section F.7 - Option to Extend Performance - Option 2 the modified end dates seem to be incorrect. Should the end dates under Clause F.4 state May 31, 2022?

A77: Yes, the end date should be May 31, 2022. Section F will be updated in the Final RFP to reflect the correction. See also Answer 41.

Q78: Section B.4 Travel and Materials - Travel costs will be reimbursed at the actual cost, and no fee or profit shall be applied to travel costs. - Is the government expressly prohibiting the application of G&A on travel costs or only prohibiting the application of profit/fee? Please clarify.

A78: The government is only prohibiting the application of profit/fee.

Q79: Sec. B references Award fee; however, the DRFP does not provide the award fee instruction/criteria

A79: See answer 65.

Q80: Does clause H.32 intend for subcontractors greater than \$250K establish Associate Contractor Agreements (ACA) with LaRC contractors Jacobs Technology and SSAI? And Do the Jacobs and SSAI prime contracts contain reciprocal clauses requiring them to enter into similar agreements?

A80: No written agreements are needed by the prime or their subcontractors. The intent of the clause is to put the prime on notice that they will “interface” with LaRC’s facility maintenance and our science support contractor as needed. Additionally, there are similar enabling clauses in the Jacobs and SSAI prime contracts; however, they do not list the ALICE contractor as a contractor to interface with. Each enabling clause is different for each RFP depending on who the customers are.

Q81: Reserved

A81: Reserved

Q82: In Volume II Past Performance, offerors are required to submit an Organizational Chart with the volume, however, there is no guidance on what the chart should address (e.g. past organizations for the contracts cited, or a high level chart for the portion of the ALICE contract to be performed by the subcontractor, or other content). Question - will the Government clarify what is required in the Organizational Chart?

A82: Table L-2 will be modified in the Final RFP to remove the requirement for the referenced org chart.

Questions 83 thru 94 inclusive constitute all the questions that were received at the Preproposal Conference.

Q83: Will NASA have an all new CBA in place or a bridge by contract start?

A83: No, NASA is not a party to the ALICE Collective Bargaining Agreements (CBAs). The CBAs will be negotiated between the ALICE contractor and the respective union. See DRD-M08, Labor Relations Plan and DRD-M13, Contract Phase-In Plan for more details.

Q84: What is the expected release date of the RFP?

A84: It is anticipated that the final RFP will be released on August 25, 2016.

Q85: How long will offerors have to respond to the final RFP?

A85: It is anticipated that past performance will be requested by September 23, 2016 and proposals will be due on October 11, 2016.

Q86: Are any personnel from Langley on the Source Evaluation Board?

A86: No, Langley personnel are not a part of the Source Evaluation Board; however they are ex-officio members.

Q87: Is AS 9110 a requirement on ALICE? If so, why not?

A87: AS 9110 certification is not required. AS 9110 compliance is required.

Q88: Please clarify how many WB-57s there are at Ellington Field.

A88: NASA currently operates three WB-57 aircraft. However, for the purpose of proposal submission, assume one WB-57 will be in operation at time of contract start. Additionally, the L-1 resource planning document reflects staffing for one WB-57.

Q89: Will space outside at Ellington Field be provided by the Government to house the contractor procurement organization? If not will NAMIS be available off-site?

A89: The Government currently provides space at Ellington Field in Building 270 for the contractor procurement organization. It is anticipated that this location will remain the same upon the award of the ALICE contract. Refer to Section C, Statement of Work, Table 1-1 Ellington Field Facilities.

Q90: Will the G-III be supplemented by the G-V or will it be replaced?

A90: If acquired, the Gulfstream V will be supplemented by the Gulfstream III. For the purpose of proposal submission, assume one Gulfstream III and no Gulfstream V will be in operation at time of contract start.

Q91: Why is Langley not included in the overall organization charts? Will the final RFP include a Langley organization Chart?

A91: An LaRC organization chart is not anticipated in the final RFP. Langley's skill mix and hours are included in Volume III cost/price of the draft RFP.

Q92: Will the OV-10 Broncos being returned to NASA's control at Langley be supported by ALICE?

A92: Yes, should the OV-10 Bronco aircraft be returned to NASA's control at Langley, they will be covered under the ALICE contract.

Q93: Please confirm that offerors should only answer "yes" on the past performance matrix if the offeror is proposing to perform 30% of the work in that functional area under ALICE.

A93: Yes, this is correct. Offerors should only answer "yes" on the past performance matrix if the offeror is proposing to perform 30% of the work in that functional area under ALICE.

Q94: Does the Government expect that the individual plans (management, transition, etc...) will be included in their entirety as part of the respective proposal sections? If so, please confirm whether or not the count is against the page count.

A94: The 105 page limit applies to the plans referenced in the Management Approach (MA1, MA2, and MA3) and includes the Technical Approach (TA1). As stated in Table L-2, the Safety and Health Plan has no page limit.