Response to RFI #2 Questions (24 March 2010)

Nr.	Reference	Question	Response
1	RFI #2, Section entitled "Responses Regarding Technical Capabilities" (first paragraph and Item 4 thereunder)	Please clarify the request for reference name and telephone number referenced in Item 4. The Past Performance.docx. attachment does not have a column for reference name and telephone. Are these separate sections?	Past Performance.docx has been updated (and re-named Past Performance Rev 1.docx for purposes of clarity) to incorporate columns to be used for providing a customer reference name and telephone number for each referenced contract. Completion of Past Performance Rev 1.docx satisfies the request for information as outlined in Item 4. Respondents are reminded to adhere to the page margin, font type/size, and page limitations (five pages for Past Performance Rev 1.docx) for this sub-section.
2	RFI #2, Section entitled "Responses Regarding Technical Capabilities" (first paragraph and Item 4 thereunder)	Is Item 4 under the section entitled "Responses Regarding Technical Capabilities" (on page 5 of the RFI) separate from the information to be included in the provided matrix (attachment 140175-other-001-001, Past Performance.docx)? Should this information be provided in the technical section?' Is the technical response 10 pages not to include the past performance which is a separate 5 pages?	The past performance response is limited to five pages and must follow the format of attachment Past Performance Rev 1.docx. The technical capabilities response is limited to ten pages and comprises all remaining elements requested under the section entitled "Responses Regarding Technical Capabilities." Respondents are reminded to adhere to the page margin, font type/size, and page limitations (five pages for Past Performance Rev 1.docx, and ten pages for the remainder of the response) for this section, which are outlined in the first paragraph of the section.
3	SOW Rev 1 Sections C.3.1.3.4 through C.3.1.3.7	Should the sections entitled C.3.1.3.5 Audio Systems, C.3.1.3.6 Video Systems, and C.3.1.3.7 Voice Communications Systems be subsections to C.3.1.3.4 Audio, Video, and Voice Communication Systems instead of their own independent sections?	The sections following as outlined in the question should be subsections. Please pen-and-ink your copy of the Draft SOW as follows: 1) Replace C.3.1.3.5 Audio Systems with C.3.1.3.4.1 Audio Systems 2) Replace C.3.1.3.6 Video Systems with C.3.1.3.4.2 Video Systems 3) Replace C.3.1.3.7 Voice Communication Systems with C.3.1.4.3 Voice Communication Systems
4	Attachment entitled "Past Performance.docx"	In the last two columns of the attachment entitled "Past Performance.docx," you have requested information on the **"Size of Workforce Provided (Work Year Equivalents [WYEs])"** (in the second-to last column) and **"WYEs Provided Under the Contract"** (in the last column). Can you please clarify the difference between the two?	The first category, "**Size of Workforce Provided (Work Year Equivalents [WYEs])**," should be interpreted as the peak number of WYEs (only employees of your firm, and not including any subcontractors) on the contract at any single point of time during the life of the contract. The second category, "**WYEs Provided Under the Contract**," should be interpreted as the total number of WYEs (employees of your firm and employees of any of your subcontractors) provided over the life of the contract. Submissions should be submitted on the attachment entitled Past Performance Rev 1.docx.

Nr.	Reference	Question	Response
5	RFI #2, Section entitled "Responses Regarding Subcontracting Approach"	In your request, you have asked us for the Small Business approach we would take for the procurement. Given that the acquisition strategy has yet to be established, many companies can only provide a notional approach to utilizing small businesses as they do not sign on partners until they know the requirement is something that they can pursue as a prime (i.e., unrestricted versus small business). Identifying specific small business types against specific SOW areas seems to be premature as detailed discussions and teaming arrangements have likely not been concluded. In addition, socio-economic classes do not correlate to work capability (i.e., a specific HUBZone may be strong in software development or in information assurance and knowing where a company would allocate a HUBZone's services would only occur when a specific company with a specific skill has been added to the team). We recommend that the submission of specific company names within the Small Business strategy be eliminated as many things can change between now and October and there are likely many potential primes that have not formed their team or eliminate this requirement from the RFI.	NASA recognizes that complete development of teaming arrangements has not been finalized. However, NASA must assess the capability of individual firms to perform the requirements envisioned under the contract. As such, if your firm does not possess the core technical capability necessary to satisfy the requirements, NASA must understand how you would satisfy these requirements, if you intend to participate as a prime contractor. The responses of the various interested parties will provide NASA the date necessary to support a decision to set-aside the requirement or proceed under a full-and-open basis. Should a decision be made to proceed under a full-and-open basis, your well-considered input regarding which areas you view as appropriate for subcontracting will assist NASA in developing realistic subcontracting targets for inclusion in the Request for Proposals. If your firm has not yet completed identification of partner companies with which it will subcontract, please complete the attachment entitled "Subcontracting Approach" to the degree you are able, eliminating detail in the final two columns (Name(s) of Potential Subcontractors, and Duration of Partnership).
6	RFI #2, Section entitled "Responses Regarding Technical Capabilities" (first paragraph and Item 4 thereunder)	In the RFI section titled Responses Regarding Technical Capabilities, item number 4 asks for responses to include "a list of relevant work performed in the past five (5) years …" This appears to be identical to the information provided in the Past Performance spreadsheet except for the customer reference name and telephone number. Can this additional information be provided either on the Past Performance spreadsheet or do you want it in a separate table in the document? If you prefer a separate table, must it duplicate all of the data already in the spreadsheet, or can we just include the contract number, agency name and customer reference information (or some other acceptable subset of the information)?	Respondents shall satisfy the requirements under the section entitled "Responses Regarding Technical Capabilities," Item 4, by completing the attachment entitled "Past Performance Rev 1.docx." This document updates attachment "Past Performance.docx" by including the reference name and phone number. (See Questions #1 and #2 above.)
7	N/A	What is the last date you will accept questions with regard to the RFI?	Respondents are requested to submit questions regarding RFI submission not later than 3 PM Pacific time on Wednesday, March 24, 2010.