

970. **A.3.14. INSTRUCTIONS FOR PRICE PROPOSAL VOLUME** The following question, released with amendment 6, contradicts the instructions in A.3.15.4 and could cause major confusion. It says the discounts applied to the available components must be the same or better than those assigned by the product classification subgroups. Recommend issuing a clarification to reinforce that the discounts must be the same, not the same or better. 495. The subgroup discount that is to be entered into the "Group Database" tab does not appear to be linked to the discount percentage entry on the "Product Classification Page". Please define the subgroup discount that is required to be entered into the "Group Database" tab. Answer: It is up to the offeror to enter their proposed subgroup and discount. The subgroup must exist in the Product Classification Tab and the discount in the Group Database Tab must be the same or better than the proposed subgroup discount in the Product Classification Tab. So if the offeror proposes under Input/Output a subgroup named "OEM XYZ printers" and proposes a 10% discount for that subgroup; then if an XYZ printer is one of the mandatory items proposed, then in the Group Database, the subgroup would be "OEM XYZ printers" and the discount would need to be 10% or better?

**Answer: The answer to the question and the instructions are both correct as written. The question and answer was concerning the requirement that the discount match the subgroup discount and refers to the Classification tabs (i.e. the Available Component list); The instructions in 3.15.4. refers to the Group Database (i.e. Mandatory list) for which the discount can be same or better than the associated subgroup discount.**

971. **6.1. Network and Communication Devices** Reference 6.1.1.1.1.a. Definition of Ethernet - The change in the definition of Ethernet to "10/100/1000 UTP and 10/40/100 Gig and Fiber port base capability" is problematic. The 10/100/1000 Gig port base is for copper wires. The 10/40/100 Gig and Fiber port base refers to fiber. These two requirements cannot mix because of the backplane capabilities and intervening modules are orders of magnitude distinct. If the government requires adherence to this definition, it has a profound impact on the type and cost of LAN Switches and Routers that can be proposed to meet the minimum requirement. For example, the large network router (6.1.4.2.) requires 24 or more Ethernet interfaces. It is unclear what is meant by this requirement. Is it 24 port 100G, or 24 port 40G or 24 port 10G, or a combination thereof? Further, if we use the new definition of Ethernet, for the large network router this would translate into a cross-bar switch of  $80\% \times 100G \times 24\text{Ports} = 80\% \times 2.4 \text{ Terabits-sec} = 2 \text{ Terabits-sec}$  full-duplex minimum. This would be a VERY expensive router. Would NASA please confirm that they want all minimum mandatory routers and switches to meet the requirement for Ethernet : 10/100/1000 UTP and 10/40/100 Gig and Fiber port base capability or direct us on how they would like us to respond to this requirement?

**Answer: The RFP has been amended to indicate that Ethernet refers to 10/100/1000 UTP or 10/40/100 Gig or Fiber. Offerors may provide one or more of these port types.**

972. **D.7. Order modifications** Question 701 of the latest release contradicts Section III, which says a DUNS number should be included on the cover page. 701. Please provide guidance on what information should be included on the cover pages. Answer: There is no information that is required in the cover page.

**Answer: There is no information that is required in the cover page. Typical, the cover page identifies Offeror's company name, Solicitation Name and Number, Date, and "original" vs. "copy # of #" for each volume/binder. All potential Offerors are recommended to determine what information goes on the Cover Page for each Volume.**

973. **6.3. Advanced Video and Conference Tools** Reference 6.3.1.d Studio Lighting - In the Oct 23 version of the RFP, NASA asks for a 750 Watt Studio light bulb with Medium Bi-Pin (G9.5). In the corresponding MMD line item, it asks for 750 Watt Studio Lighting. Is NASA requesting a 750 watt studio light bulb or a studio lighting system with a 750 watt light bulb?

**Answer: A 750 Watt Bulb. As stated in the exhibits notes: "If there are any discrepancies between the text in the table and the referenced technical section, then the information in the referenced technical section in the RFP takes precedence".**

974. **4.2.1. Storage Devices Core Specification** 4.2.1 and 4.2.2.c and Question 439. Question 439 referred to the term "field installable". The Government response was: "It means that as delivered it should be able to be installed by the agency". In reference to Section 4.2.2.c of the RFP, Large robotic systems of this size require certified technicians to install them. Without the proper certification levels by the installer, the system warranty is voided. Thus the response to Q 439 creates an issue that does not exist in the RFP as written. Please verify that the Government is referring to "installed by a certified technician at the agency" in the case of 4.2.2.c.

**Answer: The question was what was meant by field installable – since installation is not part of the requirements, the offeror should assume the Government would take responsibility for ensuring correct personnel were used on such a theoretical installation.**

975. 6.1.6. Internet Protocol (IP) Telephony System SEWPV RFP has listed specifications in Group D Mandatory Section 6.1.6 for Internet Protocol (IP) Telephony System but in the PED Excel file this mandatory item is not listed. Please clarify if we are still required to provide a price for this item in the Excel file?

**Answer: IP telephony is now a desirable feature and therefore is not priced in the mandatory tab. If offered, it should be priced in the available components.**

976. **Re: A.1.35. NOTICE OF TOTAL SMALL BUSINESS SET ASIDE- ALT II (52.219-6)(NOV 2011); Q&A #710** The FAR clause referenced at solicitation section A.1.35 indicates that, under an opportunity reserved for small business offerors, a small business can only offer end items manufactured or produced by small business concerns. In Question #710, an Offeror asked whether the the FAR clause at A.1.35 of the solicitation document was applicable to Group C, to which only small businesses can respond. The Government's responded "Yes" - that Group C, to which only small businesses can respond, is restricted by the FAR clause at A.1.35, and so, only the products manufactured or produced by small businesses may be proposed. This Offeror does not understand that response, because Group C includes products such as scanners, printers, and plotters, which small businesses often maintain, but do not manufacture or produce. Please clarify.

**Answer: Group C is based on the service NAICS code 541519. NAICS code 541519 is designated for services; therefore, as per SBA guidelines, the non-manufacturer rule does not apply.**

977. **Re: Q&A 399** The answer to the question refers the reader back to this same question. Please correct the reference problem.

**Answer: Q&A 399 Response is corrected to "See answer to Question 398 above."**

978. **Re: Q&A 302; Conformed RFP page 133, A.3.6(b) table** The original RFP contained a version of the A.3.6(b) table that included "(a)", "(b)", and "(c)" designators in front of the volume sub-items.

Then, Amendment 4 item 15 provided the following table that removed the "(a)", "(b)", and "(c)" designators:

15) Section A.3.6.(b) Proposal Content and Page Limitations is deleted in its entirety and replaced with:

Proposal Component	Volume	Page Limitations
<b>Offer Volume</b>	<b>I</b>	<b>None</b>
<b>Management/Technical Approach Volume</b>	<b>II</b>	<b>90 Pages</b>
Cover Page, Indices,		Excluded
Deviations and Exceptions		Excluded
Tab 1		Excluded
<b>Price Volume</b>	<b>III</b>	<b>None</b>
Price Exhibits		Excluded
Deviations and Exceptions		Excluded
<b>Past Performance Volume</b>	<b>IV</b>	
Information from the Offeror		<b>10 Pages</b>
Cover Page, Indices, Customer Evaluations, Termination/De-scope information, and List of Acronyms		Excluded
Deviations and Exceptions		Excluded

Now, with the conformed RFP issued with Amendment 6, the table again includes the “(a)”, “(b)”, and “(c)” designators and the response to Q&A 302 addresses a question about how the “(a)”, “(b)”, and “(c)” designators should be used. Please clarify.

**Answer: The “(a)”, “(b)”, and “(c)” is to provide structure of the content, a form of organizing the components in each volume. It’s not intended to label each document with a letter. Please label documents with the description for the content specified in each volume, in the appropriate Volume as outline in the Solicitation.**

979. Re: Q&As 223, 309, 310, 311

The Government’s responses regarding the use of tabs in the Past Performance volume are not consistent. The response to Q&A 223 indicates that the use of two tabs in the Past Performance volume is fine. The response to Q&A 309 indicates that all references to tabs were removed related to the Past Performance volume. The response to Q&A 310 indicates that the use of three tabs in the Past Performance volume is fine. The response to Q&A 311 does not specifically respond to the Offeror’s question about the use of tabs in the Past Performance volume. Understanding that some elements of the Past Performance volume may apply to certain Offerors and not to others, please clarify whether tabs should be used in the Past Performance volume.

**Answer: The Government removed the reference to tabs in the Past Performance Volume because some elements of Past Performance are not applicable to all Offerors. However, potential Offerors may elect to use Tabs and label them in accordance with their specific documents that are being submitted under the Past Performance Volume. The Government will not dictate whether an Offeror should or should not tab a Past Performance document. It is a business decision determined by the Offeror. The objective is to submit required documents (for the Solicitation) with clear and concise covers/headers; in order for the Government to assess Offeror’s proposal submission.**

980. Re: Q&As 304 and 317; A.3.6(a)(2)

The Government’s responses regarding “indices” are not consistent. The response to Q&A 304 indicates that “indices” means “index or table of contents” when used in the Past Performance volume. The response to Q&A 317 indicates that “there is no requirement for indices” in the Management/Technical Approach volume, however, the table on page 133 of the solicitation indicates that there is a requirement for “(a) Cover Page, Indices” for that volume, just as there is for the Past Performance volume in that table. Please confirm that the generic term “indices” includes the Table of Contents, List of Figures, and List of Tables required by A.3.6(a)(2), and that both the Management/Technical Approach Volume and the Past Performance Volume require these three items.

**Answer: There are requirements for the Management/Technical Approach volume that will be only submitted electronically. Therefore, it was determined that indices for Volume II may present a challenge for Potential Offerors. Yes, there is a requirement for indices for both Volumes II and IV. The response to Question 317 is revised, removing "There are no requirements for indices".**

981. Re: 3.2.3.1. Hardware Configurations.

The previous spec asked for 6 minutes of runtime and I see it was changed to 30 minutes in yesterday's RFP release. Our engineers are concerned 30 minutes of battery runtime in a container will cause serious overheating as the chiller would not be running if the power goes out. We don't usually recommend more than 10 minutes of runtime for a container. We do however recommend a generator to provide the additional runtime past 10 minutes.

Also, the size of the container would need to be much larger and more expensive to accommodate for all the batteries.

I am concerned the due date of November 15th will not give us enough time to rebuild this solution and get over to our partners in enough time for them to engineer the rack buildouts.

Would you consider any of the following:

- A) pushing the due date back
- B) revising the runtime back to 6 minutes
- c) adding a generator specification

**Answer: The requirement will be modified to state 6 minutes with 30 minutes as a desirable, in Amendment 7.**

982. On the Group A Class 1 Computer system, your Amendment 6 changed processor requirements for the two socket "Oct-Core Intel 'SandyBridge'? processor from 2.3GHz and 2.5GHz "Desirable" (originally, the draft RFP requirements were stated as 2.6GHz) to 2.4GHz and 2.6GHz as desirable. This change will cause bidders a substantial amount of rework. Would NASA please consider keeping the processors at the 2.4GHz and 2.6GHz, desirable?

**Answer: The requirement will remain as stated in Amendment 6. Note that a processor of 2.3 Hz or greater will meet the minimum mandatory and a processor of 2.5Hz or greater will meet the desirable feature.**

983. A Replacement to Comment 8: On the Group A Class 1 Computer system, your Amendment 6 changed processor requirements for the two socket "Oct-Core Intel 'SandyBridge'? processor from 2.3GHz and 2.5GHz "Desirable" (originally, the draft RFP requirements were stated as 2.6GHz) to 2.4GHz and 2.6GHz as desirable. This change will cause bidders a substantial amount of rework. Would NASA consider keeping the processors at the 2.3GHz and 2.5GHz, desirable?

**Answer: The requirement will remain as stated in Amendment 6. Note that a processor of 2.3 Hz or greater will meet the minimum mandatory and a processor of 2.5Hz or greater will meet the desirable feature.**

984. In answering Question #389 the Government accepted as fact, the factually incorrect premise in the question that Intel does not have an 8 core 2.3 GHz processor. Intel does indeed have such a processor. It is the: Xeon E5-2470 2.3GHz/8.0GTS-20MB 1600MHz 95W 8C , Vendors who do not offer this processor can bid a higher clock rate processor without the Government changing the minimum requirement because any clock rate above 2.3GHz would meet (or exceed) the requirement as it existed. We request that the previously stated 2.4GHz 8 core requirement be re-instated.

**Answer: The requirement will remain as stated in Amendment 6. Note that a processor of 2.3 Hz or greater will meet the minimum mandatory and a processor of 2.5Hz or greater will meet the desirable feature.**

985. Given your response to Question # 683 (no minimum interconnects required) and the lack requirements in sections 3.2.3.1.1. Class 3/a Container-based Computer Systems and 3.2.3.1.2. Class 3/b Container-based Computer Systems for racks and switches of any type in the infrastructure suggests that there is no requirement that the proposed 1.8 PB and .9PB of required storage, respectively, to be attached to the associated & required compute (32 or 16) nodes. Is that correct? If the answer to the above is "yes", how do you reconcile that answer with the underlined (by us) part of your response to question #340 "Answer: Simultaneous support of iSCSI, FCoE, NFS, and CIFS is not required. The offeror shall propose the connections necessary to meet the requirement in its proposed configuration" Is your intent that the container based system should be provided simply as a collection of stand alone compute nodes and storage capacity that will be separately integrated into a container solution that already has a rack and switch infrastructure?

**Answer: The intent is to integrate all the required components "after delivery" into a functioning system.**

986. The change to 3.2.3.1.d to include a minimum run-time of 30 minutes represents a significant change to this requirement. As a container provider, this vendor can make the change without impacting our submission of our bid on a timely basis. Our repricing will cause significant delays to getting a new price to our distributors. Once the distributors receive our revised pricing, they will have to flow that price change out to their customers who make up a significant portion of the procurement community. Those vendors may not receive the price change in time to submit their own proposals. This change may have an impact of severely limiting the number of bidders to those companies who build their own containers. Based on the hardware configuration specified in the RFP we estimated that an orderly shutdown of our equipment could be accomplished within 10 minutes and based our estimate on that parameter. We request that the 30 minutes be reduced to 10 minutes or less or that a specific time be removed altogether.

**Answer: The requirement will be modified to state 6 minutes with 30 minutes as a desirable, in Amendment 7.**

987. Is Section 508 compliance information provided on a VPAT required for equipment without user interface?

**Answer: Yes.**

988. A.3.13(b) bullet 2 Customer Evaluations: Are the evaluations stated here directly related to only the "up to five... recent similar contracts" stated in paragraph 1 of section A.3.13(a)? Could the Offeror provide customer evaluations from contracts other than the five detailed?

**Answer: The evaluations stated are directly related to the "up to five most recent similar contracts..." as stated in section A.3.13. It is requested that Offerors provide up to five past performance contracts that meet the solicitation requirements.**

989. A.3.6(b)(1) table: Reference Past Performance Volume 9b) Cover page...Small Business Subcontracting Plan History...": The Small Business Subcontracting Plan History is mentioned here, but is not discussed at all in the detailed instructions for the Past Performance Volume in Section A.3.13. Can the Government clarify what information the Offeror should provide?

**Answer: See answer to question 272. Amendment 4 removed the Small Business Subcontracting Plan History from Volume IV.**

990. Should Past Performance be Volume III or Volume IV? The table in A.3.6(5) (b) (1) on page 132, lists it as Volume IV, however, A.3.13. lists Past Performance before the pricing volume.

**Answer: Past Performance is Volume IV.**

991. C.1.3.4 Electronic Processes: In the last paragraph, starting with "For technology refreshment..." there is nothing listed for 2). Is the information missing or should there only be one option?

**Answer: This was updated in the previous amendment to remove the 2.)**

992. 3.2.1.1 Hardware configuration: There is no rack unit specification for the nodes. What are the desired rack units per node type?

**Answer: There are no specified desired rack units per type. It is up to the offeror to propose the solution that meets the specified minimum mandates.**

993. 3.2.1.1 Hardware configuration: Is it government's desire to reduce the rack space as much as possible by utilizing smallest server footprint such as 1U servers?

**Answer: There is no specified requirement to reduce rack space.**

994. 3.2.1.1 Hardware configuration: For Management node data storage, is the minimum 36TB data storage raw capacity OR usable capacity? Is a RAID configuration (and hence a RAID adaptor) required? Does the system need to have a hot spare? And is the data storage in addition to the operating system drives?

**Answer: Raw capacity. There is no requirement for RAID. Hot spares are not required. Data storage (3.2.1.1.d.4) is in addition to the operating system drives (3.2.1.1.d.5).**

995. 3.2.1.1 Hardware configuration: There is requirement for shared file system for data cluster. Does the shared file system mean turning the combination of local storage into global shared file system or does the Government desire external shared file system such as NFS filer (ex: Netapp)?

**Answer: The shared file system is not a requirement; it is a desirable feature (3.2.1.1.i.3). The desirable feature could be met via an external or internal (local) implementation.**

996. 3.2.1.1 Hardware configuration: Is the scheduler software specified in midrange data cluster for cluster workload?

**Answer: There is no specified requirement beyond what is stated in the RFP.**

997. 3.2.1 d(1): Please verify that 2 CPUs are in each node type as having dual sockets is not always required to populate both sockets on motherboard.

**Answer: Requirements 3.2.1.1.d.1 and 3.2.1.1.d.1.i require at a minimum dual socket motherboards to be populated with Oct-Core Intel "SandyBridge" 2.3GHz processors.**

998. 3.2.1 d(4)(a): Is the 36TB raw capacity or usable capacity? Is there a performance requirement in terms of IOPS or spindles (# of disks). For instance for 36TB raw could be achieved with 12x3TB disk or 18x2TB disk. They would differ in capacity and performance.

**Answer: Raw capacity. There is no stated performance requirement.**

999. 3.2.1 d(4)(a): Is the direct attached storage externally connected to the node or capacity within the node itself? If it is direct attached external storage, please state the requirements of the direct attached storage – JBOD, RAID, RAID level (if applicable), hot spares, etc.

**Answer: The offeror can propose any configuration that meets the stated minimum mandates.**

1000. 3.2.1 d(5)(b): Is a RAID Controller that can provide capabilities beyond RAID0 and 1 desirable, such as a RAID controller which can do RAID5 or 10? If yes, is a battery backup cache RAID controller desirable?

**Answer: The only desirable feature stated is that the drives be hot-swappable.**

1001. 3.2.1 d(6): Does "head nodes" mean same as management nodes?

**Answer: Yes – this has been amended to read Management Nodes.**

1002. 3.2.1 e(1): Please verify that 2 CPUs are in each node type, as having dual sockets is not always required to populate both sockets on motherboard.

**Answer: Requirements 3.2.1.1.d.1 and 3.2.1.1.d.1.i require at a minimum dual socket motherboards to be populated with Oct-Core Intel “SandyBridge” 2.3GHz processors.**

1003. 3.2.1 e(3)(a): Is the 36TB raw capacity or usable capacity? Is there a performance requirement in terms of IOPS or spindles (# of disks). For instance for 36TB raw could be achieved with 12x3TB disk. Or 18x2TB disk. They would differ in capacity and performance.

**Answer: Raw capacity. There is no stated performance requirement.**

1004. 3.2.1 e(3)(a): Is the direct attached storage externally connected to the node or capacity within the node itself? If it is direct attached external storage, please state the requirements of the direct attached storage – JBOD, RAID, RAID level (if applicable), hot spares, etc.

**Answer: The offeror can propose any configuration that meets the stated minimum mandates.**

1005. 3.2.1 e(3)(b): Is a RAID Controller that can provide capabilities beyond RAID0 and 1 desirable, such as a RAID controller which can do RAID5 or 10? If yes, is a battery backup cache RAID controller desirable?

**Answer: The only desirable feature stated is that the drives be hot-swappable.**

1006. 3.2.1 g (1): Is there maximum weight limitation per rack on floor? What are the space and capacity requirements of the rack (such depth, width)?

**Answer: There is no specified requirement beyond supporting the proposed equipment.**

1007. 3.2.1 g (2): What is the power budget per rack?

**Answer: The offeror should determine any requirements based on their proposed solution.**

1008. 3.2.1 g (2): How many Power outlets mating the IEC309s/circuits will be available per rack? Please state voltage/phase and amperage being provided.

**Answer: The offeror should indicate the number of outlets required and any power requirements.**

1009. 3.2.1 g (2): Is the power being provided overhead from above or below?

**Answer: The offeror should indicate any requirements for how power is provided.**

1010. 3.2.1.2 d (1): Are drives to be dual ported fibre channel?

**Answer: There is no requirement that the drives be dual ported fibre channel.**

1011. 3.2.1.2 d (1): Are two switches, 50 ports each desired to support the tape drives?

**Answer: The offeror may propose any solution that meets the minimum requirements.**

1012. 3.2.1.2 e (1): What are the specifications for the 5PB Disk cache in terms of performance, I/O, RAID protection, etc. ?

**Answer: There is no specified minimum requirement.**

1013. 3.2.2.1 d (2): Are 2 CPUs requested for the configuration? The server can be populated with one or two CPUs

**Answer: The offeror may propose any solution that meets the minimum requirements.**

1014. 3.2.2.1 d (6) (a): Is a dual port (as opposed to a single port NIC) being requested? Please clarify.

**Answer: The offeror may propose any solution that meets the minimum requirements.**

1015. 3.2.2.1 f (8) (c): Is the 500GB usable or raw capacity?

**Answer: Raw capacity.**

1016. 3.2.3.1.1 a: What is meant by double density?

**Answer: This was removed in Amendment 4.**

1017. 3.2.3.1.1 e (2): Is the upgrade to 256GB supposed to preserve existing RAM to reduce cost?

**Answer: No.**

1018. 3.2.3.1.1 e (3): Is this raw or usable capacity? And in RAID, which level?

**Answer: Raw capacity. RAID is not a stated requirement.**

1019. 3.2.3.1.1 f (4): What is desired mix of SAS, SATA, and SSD drives in terms of capacity per drive type stated either in raw or usable format?

**Answer: There is no desired mix. The requirement is “or” not “and”.**

1020. 3.2.3.1.1 Class 3/a container server storage requirement: The protocol support requirement is for iSCSI, FCOE, NFS, and CIFS. Is all protocol support required or support for one or more sufficient? Is there a preferred protocol or set of protocols?

**Answer: All 4 protocols must be supportable but no more than one needs to be provided at a time.**

1021. 3.2.3.1.2 d (4): What is desired mix of SAS, SATA, and SSD drives in terms of capacity per drive type stated either in raw or usable format?

**Answer: There is no desired mix. The requirement is “or” not “and”.**

1022. 6.1.1.2.3: Certain devices (such as Wireless Access Points or VOIP phones) do not maintain this information locally in non-volatile storage. This is by design and would actually be a network security threat in many cases. However, these devices do have mechanisms to allow the device to be rebooted/recovered in the case of power failure. We believe these devices meet the spirit and intent of this requirement however; we would like clarification to ensure they are acceptable.

**Answer: If the information is not maintained locally, then this requirement is not applicable. In that case, the corresponding row in the MMD exhibit should be marked with a Y.**

1023. 6.1.4.1-2: Would the Government consider adding additional performance requirements for the medium and large router specifications? Since there are no specific performance requirements listed, very small routers could potentially meet the interface counts and the desired features specified. For instance, a router may have gigabit or even ten gigabit ports but only be able to process 5Mbps of data and thus are not practical.

**Answer: The offeror may propose any solution that meets the stated minimum mandatory requirements.**

1024. 6.1.6.j: Please describe the ‘meet me’ feature that the government is requesting in generic terms.

**Answer: “Meet-Me allows you to call a predetermined number at a scheduled time to host or join a conference.”**

1025. 6.1.7: Does the government expect the monthly service fees for such devices be paid to the VAR or the service provider?

**Answer: The monthly service fees are invoiced by and paid to the SEWP V contract holder.**

1026. 6.1.7.d.7: Please provide the government’s definition of 3G and 4G as these are marketing terms with no technical implications.

**Answer: Any offering that states it has 3G and 4G capability would meet the minimum mandatory requirement.**

1027. 6.1.7.e: What kind of service plan is being requested? Voice/Data service for the device or Hardware warranty/support?

**Answer: The plan must cover at a minimum the requirements in this section.**

1028. 6.2.2.c: May offerors provide solutions that consist of multiple physical appliances in an integrated and fully supported system, sold as a single unit?

**Answer: Yes.**

1029. 6.2.2.j: “Intent analysis” is technology that is specific to Barracuda. Since the Government is asking for two separate OEMs for the anti-spam solution, we ask that the Government provide a generic description of “intent analysis” so that offerors can ensure compliance with the requirement for other OEMs.

**Answer: Intent Analysis is the defense layer that catches phishing attacks.**

1030. 6.1.1.1.1 – Ethernet -----Requirement: 10/40/100 Gig

In Section 3.2.3.1.1: Container Based Computer Systems, the Ethernet requirement is as follows.

b. 10 Gbps Ethernet

c. 40 Gbps Ethernet (Desirable)

d. 100 Gbps Ethernet (Advanced Technology)

However, in the Ethernet requirement for the Core Network Technology in Group D (RFP 6.1.1.1.1), the same requirements are listed but the 40 Gbps and 100 Gbps are deemed mandatory requirements and not desirable or advanced technology. Will the Government consider assigning the same requirement structure of Class A to the Ethernet requirements in Class B: Group D and make the requirement of 40 Gigs and 100 Gigs desirable and advanced technology, respectively?

**Answer: No – the requirements will remain as stated.**

1031. 6.4 a- Medical Exam Station ----Requirement 6. HD Video Examination Camera

**Can the Government provide clarification on what is deemed High Definition in terms of horizontal lines?** The manufacturer’s product that the Government has most likely based the specifications on does not support a High Definition exam camera but supports a High Resolution camera.

**Answer: Generally any video image with more than 480 horizontal lines is considered high-definition. The requirement for HD has been changed to a desirable feature, in Amendment 7.**

1032. 6.4 a – Medical Grade Computer Carts ----Requirement 10. Ethernet Ready  
***Can the Government provide further details around what the Government considers “Ethernet Ready” when relating it to a Medical Grade Computer Cart?*** Through our sourcing efforts we have found this requirement to be ambiguous.

**Answer: The cart should be able to utilize a laptop over Ethernet as delivered.**

1033. As a result of Amend 06, RFP Section 6.1.1.1.a now includes Ethernet 10/40/100 Gig and Fiber port base capability as part of the Network Technology Core Specifications. Based on market research, this capability can not be found in current COTS equipment by any OEM for mandatory items in the Wireless Networking Equipment, LAN Switches, and Network Router categories. Additionally, RFP Section 6.1.4.3.4.( Ethernet Connectivity) appears to conflict with the common specification in 6.1.1.1.a by classifying Gigabit Ethernet as only a 'desirable' feature for all network routers. Please consider removing the 10/40/100 Gig and Fiber port base requirement and/or identify to which specific mandatory equipment, if any, it applies.

**Answer: See Answer to Question 971**

1034. Regarding the two MFDs (5.9.1 and 5.9.2), we would like to help clear up a bit of confusion caused by some misguided questions. Specifically, we are referring to 5.9.1.1.g. and 5.9.2.1.h.

- **Both are now:** “SMTP before SMTP authentication”
  - o Unfortunately, this is not a viable requirement because there is no such protocol
- **Both were:** “SMTP and POP before SMTP authentication”
  - o This is actually two separate (yet 100% viable) requirements: **“SMTP”** and **“POP before SMTP Authentication”**
    - SMTP
      - Stands for “Simple Mail Transfer Protocol”
      - A straight forward and well known protocol for sending emails
      - Allows for things like “scan to email” or “scan to fax”
      - It has its own Wikipedia page: <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/SMTP>
    - POP before SMTP Authentication
      - Many people complained and suggested this was a mistake. As it turns out, the complainers were themselves mistaken!
      - “POP before SMTP Authentication” is a real protocol
        - o It is not the same as having “Post Office Protocol” or “POP” by itself
      - On MFD-type devices, it is used to authenticate a user before allowing access to certain functions (like “scan to email”, or “fax to email”)
      - Though it is an older protocol, there are modern devices which still support this feature
        - o I have attached a page from the user manual of a compliant, current-model MFD to illustrate this fact
      - It is sometimes needed to allow for backward compatibility, (ex: When you need to quickly replacing an broken MFD)
      - It too has a dedicated page on Wikipedia: [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/POP\\_before\\_SMTP](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/POP_before_SMTP)
- **Suggestion:** I would suggest the respective entries for both MFDs be modified to something like the following:
  - o Support for Simple Mail Transfer Protocol (SMTP)
  - POP before SMTP Authentication (desirable)

**Answer: The words “before SMTP Authentication” have been removed in Amendment 7.**

Amendment #7

1035. Section 6.3.2.b.3.: This line was modified in response to question # 228, but it appears that a typo was made in the aspect ratio value "16:6". Based on the response to question # 228 and industry standards this should instead be "16:9". Please verify that the correct specification required is "16:9"?

**Answer: This was a typo and has been revised to 16:9 in Amendment 7.**

1036. There appears to be a typo in the SUM formula in PEA ...Please advise.

**Answer: This has been fixed in Amendment 7.**

1037. Based on 6.4 (a) product specifications provided, it appears NASA is seeking the GlobalMed Transportable Exam Station (or a very similar product). The HD camera described on GlobalMed's website, TotalExam HD Examination Camera, is not yet compatible with this mobile system. After lengthy discussions with GlobalMed's engineers, we have learned that they are currently working on this capability and it should be available sometime early 2014.

We respectfully request NASA change the HD requirement to "desirable" or change the requirement from HD to High Resolution, as, after exhaustive research, we have concluded that there are no commercially-available products which meet the HD requirement.

**Answer: Amendment 7 has changed HD to be a desirable feature.**

1038. In the answer to question 281 NASA indicates that the only during the proposal stage that an offeror must match the proposed discount for the available components with the proposed subgroup discount. In the answer to question 495 indicates that the discount would need to match or be better. Can you please clarify if the available component discount must match the subgroup discount or can it exceed the subgroup discount?

**Answer: Question 495 referred to the Group Database tab, which is the mandatory items and was correctly answered. The Government states consistently: for available components, the discount must equal the proposed discount for the proposed subgroup. For mandatory items, the discount must be equal to or better than the proposed discount for the proposed subgroup.**

1039. 5.6.3 Data Input Devices (Complete motion detection system)  
What is the product being utilized for?  
Indoor Infrared Motion detector  
Fire resistant case? Does this mean fire retardant or ? Could you please give details of the request?

**Answer: The product is for a system that detects motion and provides information concerning that motion through the IP communication module. There is no minimum requirement beyond this basic requirement. The fire resistant case is a desirable feature (i.e. not a mandatory requirement) that could be met by any form of fire resistance casing including a fire retardant.**

1040. 6.2.3. Anti-spyware Software  
Can you please verify that for the Server level Intrusion Protection and Detection Software is for 25 servers? Or as it is referenced in the Anti-Spyware Software it is asking for 25 users and this would normally mirror this same seats. The product for the Server level Intrusion Protection and Detection Software is sold by 1 server and xx number of seats. Please advise.

**Answer: Pricing should be for 25 servers with a minimum of 1 seat per server.**

1041. 3.2.2. Class 2: High-End Cluster Given your response to Question # 686 ?The implicit required number of racks is one. The 3/b container must be capable of holding up to 10 racks.? If there implicit requirements for server racks, are there also implicit requirements for storage racks? If the answer is yes, we recommend that the Government make the requirement explicit in sections 3.2.3.1.1 3/a and 3.2.3.1.2 3/b and explicitly require that vendors provide a sufficient number of racks required to hold vendors propose server and storage solution.

**Answer: The only requirement from the number of racks is that there are enough racks proposed for the items being proposed. As stated in the RFP the 3/b container must be capable of holding up to 10 racks. It is already stated in the RFP and the requirement for the number of racks is for all proposed equipment.**

1042. V. OFFEROR REPRESENTATIONS AND CERTIFICATIONS--COMMERCIAL ITEMS (52.212-3) (AUG 2013)--ALTERNATE I (APR 2011)

Ref A.5.1 Reference Section 516 reporting. Please confirm that based on the implementing guidance, this section must be completed postaward at time of quoting and not with initial proposal submission as part of the reps and certs.

**Answer: As previously answered the Section 516 requirements are handled at the delivery order level and not the contract level. Accordingly, there is no Section 516 reporting requirement with the proposal.**

1043. Are we permitted to submit the Exceeding the Minimum / Desirable Features Matrix Exhibit form electronically (CD) and not copy the form into the proposal?

**Answer: Offerors are only required to submit this exhibit electronically on CD.**

1044. A.3.5. PROPOSALS REQUESTED --Formulas, not values should be used in Excel spreadsheets, unless otherwise directed in the cost model instructions, where amounts are calculated in electronic versions. Is it the Government's intent for Offerors to enter formulas into the pricing spreadsheets (i.e. PEA.xlsx)? For example, are Offerors instructed to enter "=300" into column G of the Group database tab, instead of 300?

**Answer: Values only should be entered into the exhibits. Placement of any formulas may result in invalid results and an invalid proposal that will not be evaluated.**

1045. 6.3. Advanced Video and Conference Tools --Amendment 6 changed 6.3.1.a.6 to F10 Sensitivity from "Horizontal resolution > 700 TV Lines Per Picture Height". The corresponding specification in the EMDF table shows "Horizontal resolution > 700 TV Lines". Since these two specifications now do not relate to each other as do other MM and EMDF specifications, can you advise if this is an accurate statement of the requirements?

**Answer: This is a typo in the EMDF exhibit that is fixed in Amendment 7.**

1046. 6.3. Advanced Video and Conference Tools --Amendment 6 changed 6.3.1.a.3 to HD images in both 1080i and 720p formats from Minimum of 14-bit A/D sampling. The EMDF table shows 14 bit Analog to-Digital conversion. Since these two specifications now do not relate to each other as do other MM and EMDF specifications can you advise if this is an accurate statement of the requirements?

**Answer: This is a typo in the EMDF exhibit that is fixed in Amendment 7.**

1047. 5.2. Printers--5.2.1.1 k. Clearing/overwriting an image after completion of each job (Compliance with NIST SP800-88 and NIST SP 800-36) to meet this requirement we would have to add a hard drive. Do we need to include a hard drive to satisfy this mandatory or can we use a printer that states immediate image overwrite of memory?

**Answer: A printer that has an immediate image overwrite of memory would meet this requirement.**

1048. RFP Section 1.5.1 Section 508 Information states that offeror must submit 508 documentation, "preferably the Government Product Accessibility Template (GPAT)" GPATs are only available through [buyaccessible.gov](http://buyaccessible.gov). This site has been down for maintenance since the release of Amendment 6. Would the Government consider extending the SEWP V due date until five days after [buyaccessible.gov](http://buyaccessible.gov) becomes available?

**Answer: A google search finds GPAT forms in other places. The GPAT is not required but is one of the options: VPATs or other supporting documentation may be provided. Therefore there is no need to extend the due date for this reason.**

1049. Regarding Q+A Set 3, Question 589. A question was submitted referencing paragraphs 3.2.1.1.d.3 and 3.2.2.1.d.6. The first is a Mid-Range Cluster paragraph, the second is a High-End Cluster paragraph. The answer given appears to be in direct conflict with a requirement for the High-End Cluster from paragraph 3.2.2.1.h which states at the beginning “Provide a Local Area Network 10 GbE Switch with the following configuration”.

This appears to conflict with the answer given to question 589: “Network switches are not part of the minimum mandatory requirements.”

Please advise if in fact switches are a minimum mandatory requirement where the requirement begins “Provide a ... Switch”.

Question B:

In Q&A Set 3, Question 556. A bidder asked the following question: “There are no requirements for network infrastructure switches, etc. (Ethernet or Infiniband). Section 3.2.3.1.p lists Converged networks as desirable. Are there any network infrastructure requirements for Class 3 servers, either Class 3/a or Class 3/b?”

NASA provided the following answer to question 556: “Answer: If no requirements are listed, then there are no stated requirements.”

However, the RFP requirement 3.2.3.1.1.b is “10Gbps Ethernet”. It is unclear from NASA’s answer whether we are required to provide a 10Gbps switch, or simply to ensure that the servers include 10Gbps NICs.

Should we include 10Gbps Ethernet Switches in our pricing for Class 3/a containers? (yes/no)

Should we include 10Gbps Ethernet Switches in our pricing for Class 3/b containers? (yes/no)

**Answer: The 10GBe switch should not be included in the price of the container solution. A separate line item exists in the Price exhibit for a 10 GBe switch. Therefore the switch should be separately priced.**

1050. Can we add charts/graphs/etc. into an Appendix section for our Tech Volume II write up? Can you omit the Appendix from our page count for VOL II?

**Answer: No, Charts and graphs are required to be with related content. No, appendices will not be removed from the page count for Volume II.**

1051. Exhibit MMC: Please confirm that the last row in Exhibit MMC should read 5.11.b.2. Hardware engineer experience. It currently reads 5.10.b.2.

**Answer: This typo was fixed in Amendment 7.**

1052. 5.2.1.1.k. - Clearing/Image Overwrite: The answer to question 430 states that image overwrite was changed to a desirable with Amendment 6. However, this requirement remains mandatory at 5.2.1.1.k for the Monochrome Laser Printer. Please confirm that 5.2.1.1.k. should be a desirable requirement.

**Answer: Question 430 was in reference to the Multi-functional devices in Section 5.9. If images are saved on the printer proposed for 5.2.1.1, then there must be the ability to clear the print file after the job is completed.**

1053. Because of the release of nearly 700 Q&A in Amendment 6 posted on 10/24/13, 57 more Q&A posted on 10/30/13, and NASA’s notification that more Q&A are to be posted, we request that the proposal submission deadline be extended to 11/25/13 to provide industry and the OEMs and distributors that they work with sufficient time to address all the spec changes that must be reflected in the proposal.

**Answer: The Government has revised the proposal submission due date to December 3, 2013.**

1054. The SEWP V Tab 4 Excel spreadsheet (EMDFD Group D) will not print all pages. The cells are locked so you can not select the entire document to print. Should vendors just submit Tab 4 in landscape at 80% as an electronic submission? Otherwise there is no way to print the government required document to include as Tab 4.

**Answer: The Exhibits are only required to be submitted electronically.**

1055. Does the non-manufacturer rule waiver apply to this contract? Is it acceptable for the small, WOSB or 8(a) prime bidder to have a teaming agreement with a large manufacturer?

**Answer: There are five (5) separate competitions under the SEWP V Solicitation, all falling under one of two categories: Category A (Computer Systems/Servers), which has one (1) competition under NAICS 334111; and Category B (Complementary Products), which has four (4) competitions under NAICS 541519. Each competition is uniquely defined by a business size designation, and by the combination of the mandatory requirements.**

**NAICS code 541519 is designated for services; therefore, as per SBA guidelines, the non-manufacturer rule does not apply.**

**Category A (Computer Systems/Servers) – NAICS 334111 is a Full and Open competition; therefore, the Non-Manufacturing is not considered applicable. Small business concerns may team with any large or small manufacturer as defined by the NAISC 334111.**

1056. The requirement in 4.2.2.c, Large Robotic Device, was changed to make the STK T10000 drives desirable, presumably to increase competition. However, there are two other requirements, 4.2.2.c.3 : audit time of under 40 minutes and 4.2.2.c.4: average cell to drive time of less than 11 seconds that need clarification. Do these requirements apply only to the 2PB (native) basic configuration in 4.2.2.c.1, or do they apply to the expandable to 500PB (native) configuration in 4.2.2.c.2, or both?

Our technical market survey leads us to believe that if these requirements apply to the 500PB configuration, then the Oracle SL8500 will still be the only product on the market that will meet the requirement for a Large Robotic Device. In that case only authorized Oracle resellers will be able to be responsive to Category B Group B. There may also be the same issue with the 2PB configuration. To ensure that there is adequate competition, could the requirements for the audit time be relaxed to under 60 minutes, and the cell to drive time to less than 19 seconds?

**Answer: The requirements in 4.4.4.c.3. and 4.2.2.c.4. apply to the base 2PB configuration; not the expandable (500 PB) configuration. The specifications for audit and cell to drive time have been updated in Amendment 7.**

1057. Through extensive market research we have determined speakers meeting the requirements of 6.3.2.a are made in China. We have contacted over 20 manufacturers and suppliers either advertising on their website or promoting through marketing literature that their speakers originate from TAA compliant countries such as Taiwan. When pressed to provide documentation that speakers are TAA-compliant, all companies have either been unwilling to provide any assurance that the products are TAA compliant or have disclosed that the speakers are, in fact, produced in China. To avoid future issues, please make the speaker requirement a desirable feature.

**Answer: The frequency requirement (6.3.2.a.4.) has been made desirable in Amendment 7. A number of made in USA speakers are available that meet the remaining mandatory requirements.**

1058. Reference 4.1.(a) Single Storage Devices – Blu-ray Disc Player: After an extensive product search and interaction with 3D Blu-Ray Player manufacturers, there don't seem to be any 3D Blu-ray players currently available that are manufactured in TAA compliant countries.

Accordingly, I request that the government reconsider the classification of this device under Category B: Group B: Computer System Single Storage Devices 4.1(a) and replace it with a different IT storage device for evaluation.

**Answer: Based on industry feedback and changes made to the requirements based on that feedback, the requirement will remain as stated.**

1059. Reference 4.1.(a) Single Storage Devices – Blu-ray Disc Player: After an extensive interaction with 3D Blu-Ray Player manufacturers, there is consensus that Section 508 information for this consumer electronics device is not available. Further, the consumer divisions within the OEM's are not able to produce Accessibility documentation for resellers, indicating that the "primary market" for these consumer electronics devices are the "consumer" markets and "not the Federal Government market".

Accordingly, I request that the government reconsider the classification of this device under Category B: Group B: Computer System Single Storage Devices 4.1(a) and replace it with a different IT storage device for evaluation.

**Answer: The requirement for 508 compliance information and the required item remain as stated in the RFP.**

1060. Is it the Government's intent to limit the Available Components proposed by large business offers to only TAA compliant products?

**Answer: There are 2 parts to the TAA issue: For mandatory items, regardless of business size or Group being proposed in, all mandatory items must be from TAA compliant countries. For the Available Components, TAA is handled at the delivery order level. Therefore, you can submit items that are not TAA compliant as Available Component, but when the items are loaded into the SEWP online database of record after contract award, they must be identified as Compliant, non-Compliant or Not Applicable per Section A.1.19.**

1061. (2) Will the large business Offeror be eliminated or evaluated negatively by proposing non TAA products as part of their Tab 3 Available Components response?

**Answer: No, there is no TAA component to the Mission Suitability evaluation.**

1062. (3) If it is not the Government's intent to limit the Available Components proposed by large business offerors should the Offeror complete the TAA certificate and list all products that are not TAA with their proposal submission? How will this be evaluated?

**Answer: The TAA certificate should be completed and the offeror may propose both TAA and no-TAA compliant items as available components. As noted above, there is no TAA component to the Mission Suitability evaluation.**

1063. When your requirements for 6.1.6 Internet Telephony System states: "The system in its entirety is desirable" Does that mean that an offer will be accepted for consideration even if the offeror does not

propose an IP telephony system solution, or if the offeror proposes a system that meets some but not all of the specifications?

**Answer: As stated in the RFP, the IP telephony specification is its entirety is desirable which conversely means that none of the IP telephony specification is mandatory. Also as noted in the RFP, if at least all of the listed features are included in a proposed IP telephony system as part of the available components, then the desirable feature would be met.**

1064. Part I: The answer to Question 919 indicates that the “Management Network Switch” costs for the Mid-range and High-End Configurations need to be provided on Row’s 12 and 25 of the PEA.xls. Based on the requirements specified in Attachment A we understand Row 12 should be based on the requirements specified in Section 3.2.1.1f for the Mid-Range Cluster, and Row 25 should be based on the requirements specified in Section 3.2.2.1g for the High-End Cluster. We request that you clarify this understanding to ensure bidders are pricing the appropriate requirement for these lines.

**Part I Answer: That is correct. The Management Switch priced on Row 12 is for the mid-range cluster and the Management Switch on Row 25 is for the high end cluster. The management network switch should not be priced as part of the cluster price.**

Part II: Attachment 6 Section 3.2.1.1 and 3.2.2.1 specifies that ; “shall provide the following minimum capabilities, unless noted as a desirable” and “are required of these Class 2 computer systems” respectively. Included in the Mid-Range Cluster and the High-End Cluster is a requirement for providing a “Management Network Switch”. PEA.xls requires a price for the Mid-Range Cluster on Row 7, and for the High-End Cluster or Row 20; which includes the Management Network Switch. Based on the answer to Question 919 it is our understanding that vendors are directed to provide the costs of the required switches both as part of the total costs for the Mid-Range and High-End Cluster Configurations (Rows 7 and 20); and stand alone as part of the Management Network Switch Costs (Rows 12 and 24). Please confirm this understanding to ensure bidders are providing compliant pricing as required.

**Part II Answer: That is incorrect. As has been stated in answer to several past questions, if an item is listed in the price exhibit as a separate item, it should not be included in the associated cluster. Therefore the Management Network Switch should not be included in the price of the cluster, as it is separately priced.**

Part III: Attachment 6 Section 3.2.1.1 and 3.2.2.1 specifies that ; “shall provide the following minimum capabilities, unless noted as a desirable” and “are required of these Class 2 computer systems” respectively. Included in the Mid-Range Cluster and the High-End Cluster is a requirement for providing a “KVM implementation”. PEA.xls requires a price for the Mid-Range Cluster on Row 7, and for the High-End Cluster or Row 20; which includes the KVM implementation. Based on the answer to the Questions referenced it is our understanding that vendors are directed to provide the costs of the required implementation both as part of the total costs for the Mid-Range and High-End Cluster Configurations (Rows 7 and 20); and standalone as part of the KVM Implementation Costs (Rows 13 and 28). Please confirm this understanding to ensure bidders are providing compliant pricing as required.

**Part III Answer: That is incorrect. As has been stated in answer to several past questions, if an item is listed in the price exhibit as a separate item, it should not be included in the associated cluster. Therefore the KVM should not be included in the price of the cluster, as it is separately priced.**

Part IV: Attachment 6 Section 3.2.1.1 and 3.2.2.1 specifies that ; “shall provide the following minimum capabilities, unless noted as a desirable” and “are required of these Class 2 computer systems” respectively. Included in the Mid-Range Cluster and the High-End Cluster is a requirement for providing a “Smart

PDU". PEA.xls requires a price for the Mid-Range Cluster on Row 7, and for the High-End Cluster on Row 20; which includes the Smart PDU. Based on the answer to Question 964 it is our understanding that vendors are directed to provide the costs of the required implementation both as part of the total costs for the Mid-Range and High-End Cluster Configurations (Rows 7 and 20); and standalone as part of the Smart PDU Costs (Rows 11 and 24). Please confirm this understanding to ensure bidders are providing compliant pricing as required.

**Part IV Answer: That is incorrect. As has been stated in answer to several past questions, if an item is listed in the price exhibit as a separate item, it should not be included in the associated cluster. Therefore the Smart PDU should not be included in the price of the cluster, as it is separately priced.**

**Please note: If an item is listed separately in the pricing exhibit, it should be priced only on that separate line item and not as part of the cluster pricing**

1065. Does the POS System Software have to be 508 compliance? After extensive research many POS systems do not have a 508 compliance document or VPAT available.

**Answer: Yes - a VPAT, GPAT or other 508 compliant information must be provided. If documentation has not previously been produced for a given product, then as part of the proposal process, the appropriate template should be filled out either by the manufacturer, the offeror or a third party.**

1066. In the Pricing Exhibit, Group Database tab (all groups), column I offerors can populate any warranty quantity. If a value greater than 36 is populated, there is an error in the formula that creates a negative dollar amount, which is then incorporated into the calculation of Proposal Total displayed on the Summary Sheet. This negative value is multiplied by the Government-provided estimated quantities for the Warranty, increasing the impact of this error by significantly reducing the overall evaluated price for an offeror incorrectly. For example, when we entered 37, in error, it resulted in reducing our overall bid price by \$1M, for just one product (the 21" monitors in Group C).

While the answer to question 369 attempts to address this error, the SEWP RFP instructions were not changed to reflect the answer preventing non-compliance if a number greater than 36 is populated into the referenced column in the associated tab of all Pricing Exhibits.

**Answer: If a submitted pricing exhibit places a value greater than 36 in that column, the Government will change the value to 36 during the price evaluation.**

1067. Ref: PEC.XLS, Available components Tab-----Please explain how the available components tab in the PEC calculates all proposed available components costs as the pricing for them appears to be limited to certain formula. For example the \$ amount for the available components we are proposing in our computer systems tab does not appear accurately in the summary tab. In the sample .xls under maint.warranty tab there are two items totaling \$10K and it shows up in the summary tab as \$3M with 0 disc.? If that's the way it should be working please let me know.

**Answer: As explained in Section A.3.15.4.1. <Classification> Worksheets, the calculation that is performed is a normalized discount applied to a Government provided Evaluation quantity:**

**"The Proposed Price column in the Available Components Worksheet is automatically calculated by summing the list prices (Column G) and calculated SEWP prices (Column I) in the various <Classification> Worksheets to calculate the overall proposed discounts for each Product Classification and then multiplying that computed discount by a Government Evaluation dollar value associated with that Product Classification. The value derived for each Product Classification is then summed to obtain the Total Available Components value."**

**For example, if in Group C, all of the items proposed are given a 0% discount, then the normalized discount will be 0% regardless of the dollar amounts of the items proposed; and the Proposed Price for Computer Systems in the Available Component worksheet will remain at the original \$5,500,00.**

**If on the other hand, all the proposed computer systems had a discount of 10%, then the normalized discount will be 10% regardless of the dollar amounts of the items proposed; and the Proposed Price for Computer Systems in the Available Component worksheet will remain at the original \$4,950,000.**

**If 4 items are proposed in the Computer System worksheet as follows:**

**Item 1: List = \$100; discount = 0%**

**Item 2: List = \$200; discount = 0%**

**Item 3: List = \$5000; discount = 10%**

**Item 4: List = \$10000; discount = 10%**

**The normalized discount will be 9.8% and the Proposed Price for Computer Systems in the Available Component worksheet will be \$4,960,784**

**If the discounts were flipped to be:**

**Item 1: List = \$100; discount = 10%**

**Item 2: List = \$200; discount = 10%**

**Item 3: List = \$5000; discount = 0%**

**Item 4: List = \$10000; discount = 0%**

**The normalized discount will be 0.2% and the Proposed Price for Computer Systems in the Available Component worksheet will be \$5,489,216**

1068. Solicitation Reference: (Section 1.6 and Q&A #366) All proposed mandatory products must meet applicable EPEAT and Energy Star requirements where applicable. For purposes of proposing mandatory products only, these standards will be considered to apply if there are 5 or more products that both meet the associated standard and all other minimum mandatory requirements.

Related question: When the government says, “these standards will be considered to apply if there are 5 or more products that both meet the associated standard and all other minimum mandatory requirements” it seems to clearly indicate EPEAT and Energy Star do not apply unless five or more products comply with all requirements for EPEAT, Energy Star, Section 508, TAA, and being in new condition. Is that a correct assumption? If not, please clarify the government’s intent

**Answer: The statement means that the EPEAT compliant requirements only apply if there are at least 5 products that meet all minimum mandatory requirements and are EPEAT compliant; similarly the Energy Star compliant requirements only apply if there are at least 5 products that meet all minimum mandatory requirements and are Energy Star compliant. This statement has no**

**effect on the requirement that all minimum mandatory requirements must be met – it refers only to the applicability of the EPEAT and/or Energy Star requirement to a particular item**

Related question: When the government says, “these standards will be considered to apply if there are 5 or more products that both meet the associated standard and all other minimum mandatory requirements” does the government mean that none of the minimum mandatory requirements apply unless five or more products comply with all minimum mandatory requirements including EPEAT, Energy Star, Section 508, TAA, being in new condition and product-specific requirements? Is that a correct assumption? If not, please clarify the government’s intent.

**Answer: No. The statement only refers to the applicability of the Energy Star and EPEAT requirements. As is clearly stated in the RFP all minimum mandatory requirements must be met. The referenced section identifies when EPEAT/Energy Star compliance is a minimum mandatory that must be met. If fewer than 5 products that meet the minimum mandatory requirements are EPEAT/Energy Star compliant, then they are not required to have that compliance. TAA, new condition, Section 508 and all product specific requirements must be met.**

Related question: When the government says, “these standards will be considered to apply if there are 5 or more products that both meet the associated standard and all other minimum mandatory requirements” does the government mean that none of the minimum mandatory requirements apply unless five or more fully compliant products can be found? If not, please clarify the government’s intent.

**Answer: No. The statement only refers to the applicability of the Energy Star and EPEAT requirements. As is clearly stated in the RFP all minimum mandatory requirements must be met. The referenced section identifies when EPEAT/Energy Star compliance is a minimum mandatory that must be met. If fewer than 5 products that meet the minimum mandatory requirements are EPEAT/Energy Star compliant, then they are not required to have that compliance.**