

1145. Given the release of Amendment 8 on Friday November 15th and Amendment 9 November 18, 2013, resulting in configuration changes, this vendor respectfully requests an extension to the due date until December 20, 2013

**Answer: The Proposal Due date has been revised to December 10, 2013, under Amendment 10.**

1146. Please issue one **FINAL AMENDMENT** with all changes, questions and answers, and updates to pricing files. Please do not do a bit-by-bit release. This way, we can get after our OEMs and get them to send us the final pricing. Again, navigating these horrible and mammoth Pricing Sheets is a real nightmare!!!

**Answer: The Government has issued a complete RFP conformed releases beginning Amendment 6 through 8. Amendment 9, there were no revisions to the RFP. The pricing files changed the quantity fields. The print format changed from Portrait to Landscape in the EMDF exhibits.**

1147. Please extend the FINAL PROPOSAL DUE DATE TO ATLEAST 2 WEEKS FROM THE LAST AMENDMENT. At the very least, we would really appreciate if the proposal due date is extended to December 10.

**Answer: The Proposal Due date has been revised to December 10, 2013, under Amendment 10.**

1148. Amendment #8 of Solicitation NNG13451284R (SEWP V) states, "All final questions pertaining to the RFP shall be submitted in writing, by mail or electronically ... on or before November 15, 2015", and we are aware this date has now passed. However, in the case of a patent ambiguity in a solicitation, the contractor has a duty to seek clarification from the government and failure to do so prevents the contractor from raising an ambiguity argument after contract award. As any ambiguity which a "obvious, gross, [or] glaring" or involves "facially inconsistent provisions" that would "place a reasonable [offeror] on notice" of a conflict or discrepancy is considered patent, and since Akira Technologies, Inc., being a reasonable offeror, has already found the following two solicitation provisions in apparent conflict, it seems prudent for us to seek clarification from the government as soon as possible pre-award. Also, as we understand, it has been ruled that even if there are evaluation criteria, the proposal instructions are implicit in the award, and offerors' violations and omissions with respect to these result in an offer being considered non-compliant. Therefore, despite having just discovered this conflict of solicitation provisions after the deadline for final questions passed, we request that the Government treat the following as a patent ambiguity and resolve this pre-award:

Section A.4.7 of IV. Evaluation-Commercial Items (52.212-2) (Jan 1999) (Modified) of the RFP (p. 154) states that an "unacceptable" past performance will bar contract award entirely (rather than lower the technical proposal score by an amount), but section A.4.2 (p. 149) states that for a contractor to meet the "mandatory minimum" the contractor must only meet the mandatory minimum technical specifications by responding in TAB 1. Can the Government resolve this ambiguity? We suggest that Section A.4.2 be revised to include "acceptable" past performance as an additional mandatory minimum requirement.

**Answer: There is no ambiguity. There are outlined sections of requirements in the SEWP V RFP for the Government to evaluation based on the evaluation criteria in the solicitation. Therefore, the Government will not include "acceptable" past performance as an additional mandatory minimum requirement.**

1149. Below is a screen shot of Tab 4 that could be inserted into the written proposal. This printed Excel spreadsheet is a sensible means of inserting Tab 4 that achieves several important objectives. First, it is easy to read and all rows are contained in one straight-line presentation, making them easy for evaluators to read. Second, it is efficient in page count allowing other important information about our proposal to be transmitted in our submission. Third, it is a typical print procedure used by Excel users to make print output of spreadsheet information understandable. When we downloaded the current version of EMDFB in IE format, we received a file that was scrunched and basically unreadable with columns that were too short for the information in them. We assumed that could be caused by transmission issues and not intended to be absolute in characteristics. Printing that file without re-establishing the column width and print

parameters, took over 20 pages. We feel certain that this length is not the intent of NASA SEWP. When we put the file into the format below and printed it on Legal Size paper (to be folded to eliminate oversized pages as allowed by the response to question 319 and 320), we get a decent page count of 4. We are concerned about using this print format that is best for all concerned in our opinion because of the language in the answer to question 1067 that states, "The printout must use the formatting as provided. If any changes to the format are done, the Government will re-print in the original format to perform the page count." While we did not change the cell formatting, the means of managing a reasonable and effective print format does require changing one column size, and using the print parameters as stated. Is our rationale of printing Tab 4 acceptable to NASA as we believe it meets all solicitation rules and provides an easier format for evaluation?

**Answer: The Government recommendation is exhibit input should be "short", one word or number responses. Based on your Comment/Question, it is an Offerors decision to print out 20 pages.**

1150. Amendment 9 indicates that the EMDFD exhibit was changed. However, on the SEWP V website the EMDFD exhibit is still the V8 111313 version that was included with Amendment 8. Is there a new version of EMDFD?

**Answer: The release for EMDFD exhibit only had a format change from portrait to landscape (preview/printing).**

1151. For the POS System is there any requirement for the POS software? Is there a certain industry you want the POS software to focus on? I.E. (retail software, restaurant software, healthcare software etc...)

**Answer: The desirable is for generic POS software. This is not a required deliverable. The desirable feature would be met by offering one or more POS related software packages in the available components.**

1152. (1) Re: Amendment 8 RFP Letter

a. Item #1 for 3.2.1.1 says 'replace "2.5GHz" with "**2.4GHx**". This does not agree with the updated contents of Section 3.2.1.1 of the RFP. Letter should read 'replace "2.6GHz" with "**2.5GHx**"?

b. Item #2 for 3.2.2.1 says 'replace "2.5GHz" with "**2.4GHx**". This does not agree with the updated contents of Section 3.2.2.1 of the RFP. Letter should read 'replace "2.6GHz" with "**2.5GHx**"?

c. Under "**RFP Exhibits:**", the item for MMA 3.2.1.1 says 'replace "2.5GHz" with "2.4GHx"'. This does not agree with the updated contents of Section 3.2.1.1 of the RFP. Letter should read 'replace "2.6GHz" with "**2.5GHx**"?

d. Under "**RFP Exhibits:**", the item for EMDFD 3.2.2.1 says 'replace "2.5GHz" with "2.4GHx"'. This does not agree with the updated contents of Section 3.2.2.1 of the RFP. Letter should read 'replace "2.6GHz" with "**2.5GHx**"?

**Answer: The RFP is correct. For Clarification: the Cover Letter for Amendment 8 should have read.**

**RFP updates:**

At 3.2.1.1, replace "2.4GHz" with "**2.3GHz**" and replace "2.6GHz" with "**2.5GHz**".

At 3.2.2.1, replace "2.4GHz" with "**2.3GHz**" and replace "2.6GHz" with "**2.5GHz**"

And for the exhibits:

**RFP Exhibits:**

MMA:

- 3.2.1.1.. replace “2.4GHz” with “2.3GHz”
- 3.2.2.1. replace “2.4GHz” with “2.3GHz”

EMDFA:

- 3.2.1.1.. replace “2.5GHz” with “2.4GHz”.
- 3.2.2.1. and replace “2.5GHz” with “2.4GHz”

1153. (2) Re: Amendment 8 SF30 form

- a. Under item A, reference is made to Sections “3.2.1, 3.2.2.1”. There are no updates to the high-level section 3.2.1 in the RFP. SF30 form should read “3.2.1, 3.2.2.1”?
- b. By referring to “MMA, MMB, EMDFB, EMDFA, all MM and EMDF and PEB”, the Government means “All MM and EMDF technical exhibits and the PEB pricing exhibit”?

**Answer: Yes “All” referred to both the MM and EMDF exhibits.**

1154. (3) Re: Amendment 8, Q&A Set #6, Q&A 1069

- a. Reference is made in the answer to Question 1065 in Q&A Set #5. That question does not deal with the same topic, but rather deals with the 508 compliance of the Point of Sale system. Please correct the reference made by Question 1069

**Answer: The reference to 1065 should have been to 1067.**

1155. (4) Re: Amendment 8, Q&A Set #6, Q&A 1108

- a. The answer to the question directs the reader to Question 1079, which does not deal with the same issue of acronym lists. Please correct the reference made by Question 1108

**Answer: the reference to 1079 should have been to 1074.**

1156. (5) Re: Amendment 7 and 8, Questions 1067 and 1068

- a. Please be aware that the Government issued Q&As with numbers 1067 and 1068 in Q&A Set #5, and has reused those two Q&A numbers in Q&A Set #6 in Amendment 8. This is especially problematic because a variety of questions in Q&A Set #6 refer back to Q&A # 1067, and questions with that same number appear in both Q&A Set #5 and Q&A Set #6 The RFP

**Answer: Unfortunately there is duplication. You can just note that the references in Q and A Set 6 to 1067 refer to the 1067 that is part of Q and A set 6.**

1157. The summary sheet is not populating/calculating properly with the addition of lines within the Available Components sheets. Does the Government intend to release a revised PED file?

**Answer: Yes, a revised PED will be released with Amendment 10. The revised exhibit is named PEDextended**

1158. – Can you please confirm – If only the mandatory items need to have TAA documentation in the proposal.” By documentation, do you mean the “Y” on the MMD? Or, a separate document certifying each mandatory item is compliant? If yes, Is there any specific format that need to be used like the VPAT documentation?

**Answer: Yes, "Y" on the MMD is sufficient. No specific format or additional documentation.**

1159. Given the large number of questions companies need to review within the last two amendments and the fact that next week is a short week due to the holiday, will NASA consider providing companies with a two week extension?

**Answer: The Proposal Due date has been revised to December 10, 2013, under Amendment 10.**

1160. Based on questions #1040 and #1136, the Anti-Spyware Software (Windows PC) should be priced for 25 client seats. From the Pricing Evaluation spreadsheet, it appears that the evaluation quantity is 50,000 sets of 25 client seats, or a total of 1,250,000 clients seats. Can you please confirm that the evaluation quantity for this item is correct in the Pricing Evaluation spreadsheet?

**Answer: The Government evaluation quantity has been revised in Amendment 10.**

1161. Requirement calls out for compatibility with Eudora email servers. According to our research: Qualcomm is no longer developing Eudora OSE. Furthermore, the last released version is based on an old version of Thunderbird which is no longer supported, and has known security issues. Current or potential users of Eudora OSE might like to try Thunderbird as an alternative email program, although of course the user interface and features of the two programs are not the same? Therefore, we request Eudora be removed from the minimum requirement.

**Answer: Eudora has been removed from the requirement.**

1162. Based on question #1136 from Question and Answer Set 7 and 1040 from Set 5, the Anti-spyware ware should be priced for 25 servers. From the Pricing Evaluation spreadsheet, it appears that the evaluation quantity is 50,000 sets of 25 licenses, or a total of 1,250,000 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: The Government has revised its estimates and updated the evaluation quantity in the PED exhibit, as part of Amendment 10.**

1163. The exhibits link on the SEWP V web site states: Update (November 17, 2013) The following exhibits for the SEWP V RFP have been updated and are available below: (PED.xlsx, EMDFA.xls, EMDFB.xls, EMDFC.xls, and EMDFD.xls) PED.xlsx shows a version of v9; while EMDFA.xls , EMDFB.xls , EMDFC.xls and EMDFD.xls still show a version of v8 and have the same date as the Amendment 8 versions.

**Answer: The update was a format only change and the header on the spreadsheets was not updated.**

1164. Dear Contracting Officer, NASA has released another Amendment (#9) and another Q/A document (#7). There are now over 1100 Q/A issues to study. The Government may be unaware of the turmoil that is created by modifying RFP's this late in the game, and the impact on schedules of those offerors trying to respond & incorporate the modified requirements - and of companies who are trying to procure final pricing quotes from their suppliers. Furthermore, in this case, every release of the NASA SEWP V pricing exhibits IN PARTICULAR causes enormous turmoil because of the Government's refusal to unlock the spreadsheets, which allows them to control the uniformity of source selection, but which, however, causes the standard 'copy & paste' to not work in repopulate a new version of a worksheet which has only had minor changes. Instead, offerors must re-key all of their data into the new worksheets, which as the Government well-realizes are very substantial in size. Each re-keying means the possibilities of errors being introduced, necessitating an extensive Quality Assurance process on the manual entry process of populating the Government's pricing exhibits. It may not be an exaggeration to say that given the number of expected SEWP V proposals, each time the pricing exhibits are re-released, the Government has added a thousand hours of aggregate work to the SEWP V offeror community. The Government has stated

that the deadline will remain at December 3rd, however, we would like the Government to consider that given the locked worksheets in the pricing exhibits and the huge amount of effort involved in restarting exhibit preparations every time the Government releases new version so these exhibits, we would respectfully ask the Government to consider that this is patently unfair and that an equitable extension, of even 1 week, should be called for.

**Answer: The Proposal Due date has been revised to December 10, 2013, under Amendment 10.**

1165. Amendment 9 indicates that the EMDFD exhibit was changed. However, on the SEWP V website the EMDFD exhibit is still the V8 111313 version that was included with Amendment 8. Is there a new version of EMDFD?

**Answer: The update was a format only change and the header on the spreadsheets was not updated.**

1166. The current MMD template cuts-off the header at the top Exhibit MMD: Class D Minimum Mandato13 Should vendors adjust the header to fit or will you send out another MMD revision?

**Answer: There is no need to make adjustments for a header to an exhibit as this is not material to the proposal.**

1167. 6.2.4. Server Level Intrusion Protection and Detection Software Based on question #1136 from Question and Answer Set 7 and 1040 from Set 5, the Vulnerability Assessment Software should be priced for 2500 seats. From the Pricing Evaluation spreadsheet, it appears that the evaluation quantity is 1,250 sets of 2500 licenses, or a total of 3,125,000 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: See response to Question 1162.**

1168. These exhibits issued with Amendment 9 on November 17, 2013 have headings that still reflect Amendment 8 and its related issuance date. Please confirm that these exhibits are the most current copies as of Amendment 9, even though the headings reflect an older Amendment.

**Answer: The Government issued a new release under Amendment 9, only the format for "print" changed.**

1169. A.3.15 PRICING EXHIBITS Would NASA please move the deadline for proposals to Friday, December 6, due to issues created by the heavy Thanksgiving holiday travel, particularly for vendors who plan to hand-deliver their proposals?

**Answer: The Proposal Due date has been revised to December 10, 2013, under Amendment 10.**

1170. 6.3.3 Virtual Environment Devices In the answer to question 1037, government stated: "Answer: Amendment 7 has changed HD to be a desirable feature." The latest version of the RFP released with Amendment 8 added a desirable feature (6.4.a.6.i HD video examination camera (desirable), however HD is still listed as a mandatory requirement for 6.4.a.6.

**Answer: HD is removed from Section 6.4.a.6. in Amendment 10.**

1171. In response to Question 1131 concerning the requirement noted in Sol paragraph A.3.14.3 to provide commercial price data, the Government states that, "the required backup data is just for the mandatory requirements." However, the same paragraph states that the offeror should provide prices as back up for list price information supplied in the pricing exhibits. Pricing exhibits may include more than just the mandatory items and therefore the answer to Q&A 1131 and requirement in Sol A.3.14.3 appear to be contradictory.

RFP NNG13451284R

Q & A Set #8

Please indicate if commercial price data (as described in Sol paragraph A.3.14.2 in the form of a catalog, price list, schedule or other verifiable and established record) should include only mandatory items or if it should include all offered items.

**Answer: Only the mandatory items are required.**