

I. This amendment to Request for Proposals (RFP) No. DACS08P2215 shall accomplish the following:

- A. RFP Section H is amended as stated below; and,
- B. Provide answers to written questions and comments received on RFP No. DACS08P2215.

II. RFP No. DACS08P2215 is amended as follows:

- A. SECTION H – SPECIAL CONTRACT REQUIREMENTS is amended as follows:
 - 1. RFP Section H.16 ASSOCIATE CONTRACTOR AGREEMENTS (Sep 2008), paragraph h) is amended to correct the contract number for Air New Zealand Engineering Services LTD to be “PRS-06-12746”.

III. RFP QUESTIONS/COMMENTS AND ANSWERS

The below questions/comments and answers are continued from RFP Amendments 001, 003 and 004 (See RFP Amendment 001 for Q&As 1 through 32; See RFP Amendment 003 for Q&As 33 through 108; See RFP Amendment 004 for Q&As 109 through 129).

130. Question: RFP Section L 11.7.1.2.e states to provide an offerors chart of accounts. Our company has an extensive chart of accounts established within the accounting system which facilitates the tracking of costs. Is it the Government's intent to have all offerors provide a listing of their entire accounting chart of accounts as part of the cost proposal?

Answer: No, offerors are not required to provide a copy of their entire chart of accounts as part of the cost proposal. Specifically requested was a **summary description** of the accounting systems and chart of accounts. An explanation or description of the account string used in the chart of accounts should be sufficient to demonstrate how costs are accumulated and charged to project cost accounts.

131. Question: The Government recently posted the documents to allow contractors other than the incumbent to adequately price the Subcontracts, Leases, Charters, Operator Agreements listed in attachment 7. Additional time is needed to negotiate and price these agreements to comply with Table 15.2, FAR 15.408; and, to ensure the Government has the information it needs to make the appropriate determinations IAW FAR 15.404-3 regarding the pricing of subcontracts. In order to assure that all contractors, and not just the incumbent, have adequate time to properly price all subcontracts, we request the Government extend the proposal submission date to March 16, 2009.

Answer: The Government will not extend the proposal submission date of Feb 23, 2009.

132. Question: When will the “associated Contractor” contacts be posted? Without these documents we can not finalize our agreements. The Government has included paragraph H.16(e) stating:

“The contractor is not relieved of any contract requirements or entitled to any adjustment to the contract terms because of a failure to resolve a disagreement with an associate contractor.” Even though H.16(c) allows 90 days after award to complete the Associate Contractor Agreements and submit these for CO review prior to execution, the requirement in H.16(e) means that contractors, other than the incumbent, need to complete the Associate Contractor Agreements in advance of completing their cost/price proposal to ensure compliance with this clause. Not having the documents and a responsible point of contact for each of the four designated associate contractors’ impacts a contractors’ ability to meet the proposal deadline of February 23, 2009.

Answer: “Associated Contractor contacts” will not be posted. Contractors listed under Section H.16 should not be contacted by offerors. Contracts OPP-0413529, OPP-0634685, and NSF DACSPRSS-06C1005 set out in Section H.16 h) have been posted to FedBizOpps in a redacted format. Contract PRS-06-12746 will also be posted in the near future. The associate contractor agreements (ACA) are to be negotiated by the ASC awardee after award during the transition-in period. The ASC awardee will be provided the point-of-contact for the contracts stated in Section H.16 after award. The costs associated with the ACAs should be included under CLIN 0001 which is firm-fixed-price. Costs for new subsequent ACAs will be addressed in appropriate Annual Program Plans. While the costs associated with these agreements should be included in offerors’ proposals (as stated above), offerors should not and are not expected to negotiate these agreements with the ACA contractors in advance of proposal submittals.

133. Question: Amendment 4 extended the time for questions and answers. However, no extension was provided in the proposal due date. To allow the time needed to receive the answers, evaluate the sum total of the Government’s response; and, input the changes into the proposal, request the Government extend the proposal due date to March 16, 2009.

Answer: The Government will not extend the proposal submission date of Feb 23, 2009.

134. Question: Under what circumstance would the Government grant a waiver to add a non-U.S. citizen to the contract?

Answer: The Government would consider a waiver if no qualified U.S. citizens could be located. The burden of proof to demonstrate this would solely be the responsibility of the offeror.

135. Question: Subject RFP paragraph instructions state that *“Text will be single spaced and separation between paragraphs will be double spaced.”* The instructions also state that *“Text must be in Arial 11-point font size (‘narrow’ font versions not acceptable (and have proportional spacing)”* We define the term ‘double spacing’ for desktop publishing to be the use of one line between each row of text vice two ‘carriage returns’. We interpret the intent of the RFP instructions for spacing between paragraphs to require offerors to present equivalent (proportional) spacing of just one blank line (specifically 11 pts) between each paragraph.

Would the NSF please consider allowing offerors to present spacing between paragraphs by using one ‘blank’ line at 11 pts? Such spacing would still ensure evaluator ease of readability by presenting sufficient spacing between paragraphs, but would negate the need for actual double-spacing (e.g. two carriage returns).

Answer: No.

136. Question: The RFP does not presently exclude staffing plans (e.g. staffing position title and Full Time Equivalent (FTE)), from Volume II page count, and yet asks offerors to present their staffing approach. Volume IV requires offerors to present WBS staffing by staffing position title and Full Time Equivalent (FTE) and allows them to do so in a page unlimited format. However, we understand that technical evaluators will not be allowed to view any portion of Volume IV, even portions without price such as FTE staffing plans. We believe technical evaluators may wish to review detailed FTE staffing for each of the offeror's proposed organizational elements at each location. For offerors to meet such an expectation would require significant page count within the 200 page narrative limit. Would the NSF please consider allowing offerors to present FTE staffing in Volume II as a page excluded addendum to the 200 page narrative and to do so in either a reasonable number of 11x17 foldouts (less than fifteen) or one 'D-size' foldout? This would enable technical evaluators to gain full visibility of essential staffing across the proposed organization without the need to refer to Volume IV.

Answer: No.

137. Question: The RFP does not presently exclude the transition schedule in graphic format from Volume II page count, and yet asks offerors to present the timing and sequencing for mobilization tasks. We believe technical evaluators may wish to review transition mobilization in detail. For offerors to meet such an expectation would require significant page count within the 200 page narrative limit. Would the NSF please consider allowing offerors to present the transition schedule of mobilization tasks in sequence and timing in Volume II as a page excluded addendum to the 200 page narrative and to do so in a reasonable number of 11x17 foldouts?

Answer: No.

138. Question: Section 4.3 of the sample Surveillance Plan requires Third Party Registration. We interpret section 4.3 to require the contractor to obtain Third Party Registration (ISO 9001:2000 Certification) of its Quality Management System at the USAP project level. Certification requires additional time and resources above ISO compliance. Would the NSF please confirm whether or not the contractor is required to obtain Third Party Registration/ ISO certification?

Answer: The sample Surveillance Plan is a notional plan and is only a sample of what might be proposed by an offeror. There is no requirement to be ISO certified.