NASA is seeking feedback from well qualified firms based on the information requests contained in this document. For context in preparing responses, review the statement of work (SOW) attached to the SAM.gov RFI posting along with the background information provided in this request. Responses should be organized to match the section headings below and be limited to no more than 20 pages, single-space, 12-point Times New Roman font.

Background: As mentioned in the RFI, the operation and maintenance of the DSN and NSN will be managed under the Unified Network and Navigation Operations (UNNO) construct. There are two cost-type contracts currently supporting these efforts, 80NM0018D0004 (DSN) and 80GSFC19C0063 (NSN), that will be replaced by UNNO. UNNO will be structured as a hybrid firm fixed price (FFP)/Cost, Multiple Award Task Order Contract (MATOC). The work will be divided into two categories with award(s) made under each as follows:

Category 1 - Operation and Maintenance. Performance-based services with detailed Performance Work Statement (PWS) FFP Task Orders. NASA anticipates a single award under this category. CLIN structure will include an O&M FFP CLIN, Emergency and Non-Baseline O&M Cost Plus CLIN and Mission Surge Support (FFP or Cost Plus as appropriate) CLIN.

Category 2 – Development and Modernization. Statement of Work based Cost-Plus or FFP Task Orders as appropriate. NASA anticipates multiple awards and fair opportunity for each TO. Any cost-type TO must have a path toward FFP sustainment.

The UNNO MATOC will function with a single firm responsible for sustaining operations and maintenance for the unified network and multiple firms providing R&D and modernization. Collaboration and data exchange between Category 1 and Category 2 TOs will be a critical component in successful contract performance.

Requested Feedback:

Automation, Digitalization, and Cost Reduction

NASA has an interest in evaluating how automation could be used to streamline effort, improve quality, reduce cycle time, and lower total cost including but not limited to: artificial intelligence, machine learning, model-based engineering, digital twins, predictive analytics, or autonomous operations tools with human in command capability. Examples may include, but are not limited to: monitoring, ticketing, scheduling, workflow, maintenance, logistics, cyber defense, test, reporting, analytics, mission planning, and configuration management.

What information would your firm need from NASA to enable proposing innovative approaches that provide measurable value?

Proposal Evaluation

NASA is committed to efficient proposal evaluation. Given a preference for efficient and time sensitive evaluations, what format and evaluation factors would best convey the unique approaches and abilities your firm could offer NASA?

Transition Risk and Transition Planning

Identify the principal transition risks associated with transitioning to UNNO, including risks related to incumbent knowledge transfer, staffing, clearances, facilities, IT and OT systems, toolsets, supply chain, mission continuity, certifications, and geographically distributed operations.

Provide recommendations for mitigating transition risk before award, during phase-in, and during early operations.

Recommend an appropriate transition period and describe what activities should occur during that period.

Identify any work areas for which transition should occur in phases rather than in a single event and explain why.

Multi-Partner Space Network Environment

Identify challenges associated with working across multiple partners providing O&M, development and modernization, including technical, governance, contracting, scheduling, interoperability, cybersecurity, mission priority, data sharing, and decision authority challenges.

Recommend practical solutions, governance structures, interface mechanisms, standards, or performance management approaches to address those challenges.

Describe what contract clauses, data-sharing constructs, dispute-resolution mechanisms, or integrated planning forums would improve execution across multiple partners.

Contract Structure, Type and Pricing Considerations

In following the direction of EO 14402, a signification portion of the requirements will be transitioned from Cost-Plus to FFP.

What information is necessary to enable your firm to provide a FFP proposal for operation and maintenance of this network?

Identify which portions of the contemplated scope are best suited for Category 1 and Category 2.

In keeping with the direction in EO 14402, provide any categorical structure changes your firm would recommend and the reasoning.

Identify the challenges associated with using a firm-fixed-price approach for this type of requirement. For each identified challenge, recommend a mitigation strategy or alternative contract structure.

Describe any pricing assumptions, cost drivers, workload variability issues, technology refresh issues, operational uncertainty, mission tempo factors, or Government-furnished property and information issues that would materially affect pricing.

Performance Metrics and Incentives

Recommend performance metrics or service level measures that would appropriately drive mission outcomes, service reliability, safety, cybersecurity, and cost control without creating unintended consequences.

Identify any metrics that should be avoided because they may distort contractor behavior or undermine mission objectives.

Other Recommendations

Identify any draft requirements that appear unclear, conflicting, duplicative, overly prescriptive, or likely to increase cost or schedule risk without commensurate mission benefit.

Provide any recommended changes to the draft scope structure, section organization, or requirement allocation.

Provide any additional comments or recommendations the Government should consider.