

1129. Since the RFP states “we do not include the discounts for each item in a subgroup, but the minimal discounts within that subgroup”, so when we prepare our response Vender Catalog, should it include the actual discounts for each item within the subgroup or just the retail price?

Answer: Please carefully review the RFP instructions. The subgroup discounts are listed in the Product Classifications. Then each item proposed as a minimum mandatory is listed in the Group Database with all appropriate rows filled out including List price and discount; each proposed available component should be listed in the appropriate <Classification> tab with all appropriate rows filled out including List price and discount. Review the information provided in the RFP, the Pricing Exhibit README file and the sample price exhibit.

1130. When we submit the CLIN verification report post-award, should it include the retail price and the SEWP price for each item in a subgroup?

Answer: The information in the CLIN verification file is listed in D.3. CLIN Verification Reports. This file is for delivery orders. The unit price noted in that section refers to the quoted price.

1131. In the contractor’s catalog being submitted, should it just include the items being offered in the Price Exhibit, i.e. PEC?

Answer: If the question refers to Section A.3.14.3 Required Commercial Price Data, then the required backup data is just for the mandatory requirements.

1132. The solutions for Motion Detection Systems as described in the MMC for 5.6.3 in reference to 508 compliant, EPEAT, Energy Star and three year warranty, have not all been found in one solution; hence, will SEWP consider relaxing these requirements? For example, for the solutions sold in the open market, Section 508 is not applicable and then they are not rated for Energy Star.

Answer: The Government does not understand the “open market” reference as related to Section 508 compliance. Section 508 compliance is required for all Government purchases of applicable IT products, regardless of purchase methodology – open market purchasing is not exempt from 508 compliance. As noted in the RFP, 508 compliance, EPEAT and Energy Star are required where applicable – if a mandatory item does not fit a 508 compliant category, then 508 compliance is not required. In that case it is recommended that the offeror include a statement as to why 508 is not applicable for that item. The applicability requirements for Energy Star and EPEAT are provided in Attachment A, Section 1.6. Environmentally Preferable Purchasing Program and will not be restated here. Last, the cost of warranting the product is required. If the proposed product comes with a 3 year (or more) warranty included in the price, then \$0 should be put in the warranty section. If the proposed product comes with less than 3 years of warranty, then a monthly cost of warranty must be provided. If the offeror is not providing a warranty for a product, then the replacement cost should be put in the warranty section of the pricing exhibit.

1133. Some manufacturers have not rated energy star, EPEAT nor do they all address Section 508. Our question is, does this automatically disqualify a vendor’s MM submission if the manufacturer doesn’t address Section 508, and/or EPEAT, and/or Energy Star?

Answer: See response to Question 1132. If a requirement is applicable, then failure to provide compliance information will disqualify the proposal. Specifically, if 508 compliance is applicable, failure to provide 508 documentation will disqualify the proposal.

1134. The Answers to questions 982 through 984 mention that a 2.3 GHz processor meets the minimum mandatory requirements of the Group A Class 1 computer systems. Please make changes to the RFP document since that document takes precedence.

Answer: This section was revised in Amendment 8.

1135. Are we required to include a list of line items and their prices (list and discounted) for each line item in the Group Database Tab of the PEA Document? If so, how should this be included in the pricing volume?

Answer: The individual items that make up a bundle / configuration should be listed and priced separately in the appropriate Available Component tabs.

1136. Based on question #1040 from Question and Answer Set 5, the Intrusion Protection and Detection Software should be priced for 25 servers. From the Pricing Evaluation spreadsheet, it appears that the evaluation quantity is 25,000 sets of 25 licenses, or a total of 625,000 server licenses, and the Proposed Price from the Pricing Evaluation spreadsheet is significant. It is proportionally much higher than the other items in Group D. Can you please confirm that the evaluation quantity for this item is correct in the Pricing Evaluation spreadsheet?

Answer: Amendment 9 revises the Exhibit to change the PED pricing quantities.

1137. I. CONTRACT TERMS AND CONDITIONS--COMMERCIAL ITEMS (52.212-4) (JUL 2013)
Regarding Q & A 1054 (below), the response indicates an electronic submission of Tab 4; however, the instructions indicate the pages will be included in the page count. While the instructions for Tab 3 specify "electronic form only" the instructions for Tab 4 do not state this. Could you please clarify? 1054. The SEWP V Tab 4 Excel spreadsheet (EMDFD Group D) will not print all pages. The cells are locked so you cannot 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.

Answer: See Response to Question 1067 in Q and A Set #6.

1138. A.3.11. COMPLIANCE WITH MINIMUM MANDATORY SPECIFICATIONS (Tab 1)
In Q&A #5 (Question #1054), it was clarified that Tab 4 should only be submitted electronically but would still count towards the 90 page count limit. The Instructions to Offerors do not provide sufficient information on how bidders should properly allocate page count for the Tab 4 Excel file. Could NASA provide further instruction as to the number of pages that should be allocated for Tab 4? Or would NASA consider removing the requirement that Tab 4 is included in the 90 page count limit?

Answer: See Response to Question 1067 in Q and A Set #6.

1139. A.3.11. COMPLIANCE WITH MINIMUM MANDATORY SPECIFICATIONS (Tab 1)
The responses to Questions #1043 and #1054 indicated that all Exhibits, including EMDF, should only be submitted electronically. This is not reflected in the RFP (Exceeding the Minimum and Desirable Features / Instructions). Please clarify whether the EMDF Exhibit is an electronic submission only. If EMDF is only submitted electronically, how many pages will be counted toward the total page count?

Answer: See Response to Question 1067 in Q and A Set #6.

1140. A.3.14. INSTRUCTIONS FOR PRICE PROPOSAL VOLUME In the Pricing Exhibits, Vendor ID tab cell B33 (E-mail 2) is locked. Please unlock this cell so an additional contact may be provided.

Answer: Vendor may add a second one, by placing a comma list in the email row or in one of the technical exhibits.

1141. A.3.7. PROPOSAL VOLUMES Section A.3.8: Are offerors required to submit a Model Contract (Parts I and II of the RFP) in Volume I? There is a discrepancy between instructions in A.3.8 in Amendments 6 and 7 and the answer to Question #249.

Answer: Correction made in Amendment 8.

1142. 3.2. Group A: Computer System Class Specific Specifications The Government's SEWP V Amendment 7, and accompanying SOW, Dated 11/07/2013, reflected some changes from the SOW version issued with Amendment 6, consistent with some Answers to Questions #5, but not others. Answers to questions #982, #983, #984, #997 and #1002, which queried the minimum processor type required for the Class 1A (Mid-Range Cluster - 36-node) Computer System, have been answered to state that the minimum requirement is to have: two "Sandy Bridge" sockets/processors, 8 core each with a 2.3GHz clock rate (mandatory) and 2.5GHz clock rate(desirable.) However, these answers were not updated to the SOW, MMA and EMDFA issued with Amendment 7. The SOW still shows the values that were first introduced on 10/23/2013 in Amendment 6, which itself was a change from the prior SOW version issued on 8/16/2013. We request that the government update the SOW, MMA and EMDFA tables to reflect the 2.3 GHz/mandatory and 2.5 GHz/desirable values in section 3.2.1.1. d. and 3.2.1.1. e. and eliminate the confusion caused by the conflict between the latest answers to questions and the latest versions of the SOW, MMA and EMDFA. This correction would be consistent with the spirit of the government's response to Question # 575, and would use the input from the lengthy Draft and RFP Q&A process to maximize competition, allowing offerers with either 2.3 or 2.4 GHz solutions to be compliant.

Answer: This section was revised in Amendment 8.

1143. A.3.14.3. Required Commercial Price Data Required Commercial Price Data: Will Distributor databases and links to the Supplier Websites containing the Manufacturer's Suggested Retail Price (MSRP) for each mandatory item satisfy commercial data requirements?

Answer: No. As noted in the last sentence of A.3.14.3 Required Commercial Price Data, an electronic copy is required:

The Contracting Officer requires additional supporting documentation. This documentation shall be recorded in a form regularly maintained by the manufacturer or offeror. This form may be a catalog, price list, schedule, or other verifiable and established record. The record shall (i) be published or otherwise available for customer inspection and (ii) state current or last sales prices to a significant number of buyers constituting the General Public. An electronic copy of the current verifiable and established record shall accompany the price proposal.

1144. We were not able to download the MMA.xlsx file which was issued with Amendment 8.

Answer: There is no known problem with downloading the file. Try again and if problems persist, send an email to sewp5@sewp.nasa.gov. Files can be opened using Internet Explorer or Fire Fox.