Amendment	Tracking #	RFP Reference	RFP Page	Question/Comment	Response
Final RFP Questions					
01	1	F.4, Attachment J-28, and responses to questions 42 and 43	F-2	Given Attachment J-28 only allows for the pricing of DOL rates at Stennis or Marshall, please confirm that for initial pricing and evaluation purposes only, bidders are to price effort under the assumption that all of the work will be done at those two NASA locations.	For pricing and evaluation purposes, the SSC and MSFC sites are the only performance locations. The only NSSC service being performed at MSFC is the ESD Satellite Office so that is the only service that should be priced using MSFC DoL rates.
01	2	L.3(a)(1) and Attachment J-14	L-1	Please confirm that offerors should include a completed copy of Attachment J-14 with their Price Proposal.	Offerors should not include a completed copy of Attachment J-14 with their Price Proposal. J-14 will be used by the Government to order service transactions and level of effort support after contract award.
01	3	Section L.17	L-12	RFP specifies questions are now due NLT 22 August. Is this correct? 22 August does not seem to offer the government sufficient time to evaluate and respond; or offer contractors sufficient time to	August 22, 2014 is the deadline to submit questions. Offerors are encouraged to submit questions as early as possible, particularly

Amendment	Tracking #	RFP Reference	RFP Page	Question/Comment	Response
				react, prior to proposal submission.	questions that may have a significant impact, so that the Government can provide a timely response. If a question asked near the end of the accepted period for questions does have a significant impact, the Government would consider extending the due date for proposals. The Government will only answer questions received after the cut-off date if circumstances permit.
01	4	Section L.19, Table L-1	L-14	Would the government consider increasing the past performance volume page count to 40 to permit a more thorough response to the past performance requirements?	The Government will increase the page limit for Volume II from “thirty (30)” to “thirty-five (35)” pages to account for the increase in prime Offeror contract references to “up to five (5)” and to allow for a more thorough response.

Amendment	Tracking #	RFP Reference	RFP Page	Question/Comment	Response
01	5	L.21	L-32	Please confirm that the past performance questionnaires shall be submitted to that customer entity with which the company offering the reference has the direct privity of contract. We request that this answer be provided as soon as possible given the past performance volume is to be submitted on 8/15 (20 days prior to the rest of the proposal).	The subcontractor shall submit questionnaires to the customer, not the prime contractor. The customer is the Government or commercial entity paying for the services. Having a prime Offeror on this solicitation provide performance feedback on another company that may also be proposing as a prime or as a subcontractor for a different prime could create questions regarding objectivity.
01	6	Section L.21(a)	L-32	Would the government consider increasing the threshold for prime past performance to 5?	Yes, the Government will increase the threshold for prime Offeror contract references from “up to three (3)” to “up to five (5).”
01	7	L.21(a)	L-32	Please confirm that the ability to cite commercial contracts as past performance references does not extend to intercompany contracts, transfers, and any other agreements whereby both the provider and the customer for the service(s) are under common	Confirmed. RFP Section L.21 has been revised to specifically prohibit Offerors from citing intercompany contracts, transfers, and any other

Amendment	Tracking #	RFP Reference	RFP Page	Question/Comment	Response
				ownership, financial control, and/or management.	agreements whereby both the provider and the customer for the service(s) are under common ownership, financial control, and/or management.
01	8	L.22(b)	L-34	L-22(b) states, "The proposal shall disclose the rates, ratios, percentages, and factors in sufficient detail to facilitate the Government's understanding and ability to mathematically verify these estimating tools." Please confirm that the Government is requiring that offerors include a complete bases of estimate (BOE) for each of the 33 transactional services to include the things already noted in L-22(b) along with the offerors detailed rationale as to why the estimates being proposed are reasonable.	The Government is NOT requesting a complete basis of estimate for each transactional service. Price reasonableness will be established through competition and using any of the techniques cited in Section M.4(D) *Price Factor*. The Government requires supporting information such as escalation rates, estimating factors and productivity factors to facilitate its understanding and ability to mathematically verify these estimating tools.
01	9	L.22(c)	L-35	Please confirm that the requirement to provide financial statements and accompanying notes for the last two fiscal years applies equally to joint ventures intending to prime or subcontract	Yes, this requirement applies to all entities, including joint ventures.

Amendment	Tracking #	RFP Reference	RFP Page	Question/Comment	Response
				(at a level above the $3M annual threshold).	
01	10	L.22(c)	L-35	Please confirm that audited financial statements can be provided by subcontractors directly to the Government in a sealed package.	Yes. Financial statements from subcontractors can be provided to the Government directly in a sealed package or provided to the Prime in a sealed package for delivery with the proposal.
01	11	M.4(D) and Attachment J-28	M-13	Section M.4(D) states that the Government will evaluate the "Degree to which the proposal includes information on business systems and hourly rates and fringe benefits proposed for employees covered by the SCA are provided in sufficient detail to allow for an adequate evaluation and can be directly traced back to the proposed transactional service rates or fully burdened labor rates." Given the information requested in Attachment J-28 does not demonstrate how ratios, percentages, and factors are reflected in the pricing nor does it allow for traceability of SCA rates to the transactional service rates; please confirm that offerors should include a detailed cost and price model as supporting documentation that shows the price build up for each of the 33	No. The Government is NOT requesting Offerors to include a separate, detailed cost and price model or information other than that requested in Section L.22 *Volume III: Price Proposal Instructions*. The Government believes that the information requested specifically in sections P-1A, P-2F, and P-2G are sufficient to allow an evaluation of an Offeror's compliance with the Service Contract Act.

Amendment	Tracking #	RFP Reference	RFP Page	Question/Comment	Response
				transactional services (hours by category, direct labor rates, indirect rates, margin, etc).	
01	12	Attachment J-1, PWS 2.2 and 3.5.2	12, 92	These two PWS sections appear to overlap. Given PWS 3.5.2 appears to be a transactional effort, should this be limited to the imaging task with PWS 2.2 as an LOE being the document/data management task?	The Government does not believe an overlap exists. PWS 2.2 deals with comprehensive document management in accordance with applicable regulations and policies. PWS 3.5.2 deals with managing the receipt, imaging, filing and storage of documents. Some form of document management exists for every service. The personnel in PWS 2.2 will ensure that all documents (including internally generated) are appropriately filed, classified and retained and destroyed.
02	13	Att. J-28	3.2 Summary Tab Cells C5:J5	These summary cells exclude the 3.2.3.7 Task area, and therefore are 1.02 WYE short. This is also evident in the "Contract Summary" tab. Total WYE should be 87.05.	Att. J-28 3.2 Summary Tab Cells C5:J5 have been corrected.
02	14	B.5(f)	B-4	Will the Contractor be required to use the labor rates found within Attachment J-13 to price task orders for new services ordered	Yes. The labor rates incorporated into Contract Attachment J-13 will apply to all

Amendment	Tracking #	RFP Reference	RFP Page	Question/Comment	Response
				pursuant to Clause B.5 (f)?	orders. If a new task order requires skill sets that are not included in the contract, those new labor categories will be negotiated and added to Attachment J-13.
02	15	G.7(d) and (e)	G-8	The RFP instructs contractors to invoice ODCs on cost reimbursable basis; however, the RFP does not include standard clauses (e.g. 52.216-7) applicable to cost reimbursable type contracts. Please clarify if it is the Government's intent to add additional clauses that will be applicable to the cost reimbursable portion of the Contract.	Reimbursement of ODCs is covered in Clause B.8 *Other Direct Costs.* This clause has been revised to better define the terms and conditions for reimbursement and payment of ODCs
02	16	Att. J-13	N/A	Please clarify Att. J-13 will be limited to the information proposed within the Excel Pricing Model Transaction Band Prices (P-2B) and Level of Effort Labor Rates (P-2C).	Please see question #26 below.
02	17	L.19(b)	L-15	The Excel Pricing Model (EPM) to be provided with Volume III: Price Proposal does not comply with formatting requirements specified in L.19 (b), which includes protected cells that cannot be modified. Please confirm the page formatting requirements do not apply to the EPM.	The page formatting requirements in L.19(b) do not apply to the Government provided Excel Pricing Model in Attachment J-28.
02	18	L.22 and Att. J-28	L-36	The worksheet entitled "LOE Labor Rates" in the Excel Pricing Model does not request overtime rates for categories that are	L.22(k) and L.22(l) have been revised to include overtime rates

Amendment	Tracking #	RFP Reference	RFP Page	Question/Comment	Response
				determined to be non-exempt from the Fair Labor Standards Act. Does the Government anticipate overtime to be required in support of the NSSC effort? If so, will the Government consider adding provision for offerors to propose OT rates?	for non-exempt employees. The Intructions, Stennis DoL Labor Rates and Marshall DoL Labor Rates Tabs in Att. J-28, have been revised for the entry of non-exempt hourly overtime rates. Please also see question #26 below.
02	19	L.23	L-38	Per the instructions found at Section L.21 (f), Att. J-29 is supposed to be submitted by each of its references directly to the Contracting Officer in a sealed envelope by the date specified in Table L-2. Please confirm Att. J-29 is to be included with Volume IV: Model Contract. If required with Volume IV, please confirm that the information will only include Section I – Information to be completed by the Contractor requesting evaluation.	The Government does not expect any information to be submitted as Attachment J-29. In accordance with L.21(f), the completed J-29 Past Performance Questionnaires will be provided to the Government separately. Upon contract award, Attachment J-29 will be deleted.
02	20	L.23	L-38	It is understood that Transaction Band Prices (P-2B) and Level of Effort Labor Rates (P-2C) from Att. J-28 will be used to populate Att. J-13 Labor and Transaction Rates to be used pursuant to Section B.5 – Ordering Procedures for Transactional and Level-of-Effort Services. In lieu of incorporating the complete Att. J-	Yes, it is sufficient to just include Transaction Band Prices (P-2B) and Level of Effort Labor Rates (P-2C) from Att. J-28 as Att. J-13. The hourly overtime rates

Amendment	Tracking #	RFP Reference	RFP Page	Question/Comment	Response
				28 Price Template into Volume IV: Model Contract, would it be sufficient to just include Transaction Band Prices (P-2B) and Level of Effort Labor Rates (P-2C) from Att. J-28, possibly as Att. J-13? If not, please clarify the Government's intent to incorporate the complete Att. J-28 into the awarded Contract.	for the non-exempt labor categories from the J-28 Stennis and Marshall DoL Tabs shall also be included (see questions 16 and 18 above.
02	21	L.23	L-38	The final RFP was modified to allow subcontractors to submit price proposals directly to the Government. The RFP does not provide any instructions in terms of format and content of subcontractor's price proposal. Please confirm that the format and content of subcontractor's proposals shall be determined by the offeror as deemed necessary to develop the pricing for the Phase-in price, fully burdened labor rates and the transactional rates, and to determine price reasonableness	The format and content that the Prime uses for its subcontractor price proposals is acceptable to the Government.
02	22	Att. J-21	3.5.1	Please provide an average call time for each tier call.	For Tier 1, average call handle time is 9 minutes 30 seconds. Call handle time is not captured for Tier 2 or Tier 3 because a variety of methods may be used to resolve the ticket. Tier 3 is civil servant resolved tickets.
02	23	Att. J-30	Pg. 1 and Pg. 4	Offerors may include proposed Key Personnel salary within Volume III: Price Proposal in accordance with their established	The Government considered this request and determined that

Amendment	Tracking #	RFP Reference	RFP Page	Question/Comment	Response
				cost estimating practices. In addition it is generally the Government's intent to limit the Mission Suitability Volume proposal content to non-cost/price data. Therefore, would the Government consider removing the salary data requirement from the Key Personnel Resumes (in Vol I Mission Suitability)?	the salary data will remain in the Key Personnel Resumes. Salary history is a normal part of a resume review and is not being evaluated as a cost or price element.
02	24	L.21(a)	L-32	Must a significant subcontractor be represented at 10% to include their Past Performance? That is, is a subcontractor represented in the Cost Volume at 9% considered significant, and will their Past Performance citation be evaluated?	Section L.21(a) has been revised to state "The Offeror shall also have its proposed subcontractors submit up to two (2) past performance references when the subcontractor will be awarded over $3,000,000 of the annual contract value. If no subcontractors meet this threshold, then the two subcontractors (unless the contractor is only using a total of one subcontractor) receiving the most subcontracting dollars shall submit past performance references." **NOTE: This response has been**

Amendment	Tracking #	RFP Reference	RFP Page	Question/Comment	Response
					superceded by question #90 and Amendment 02.
02	25	L.21(a)	33	On page 33 of Section L, the PP instructions ask that the Offeror include any records of OSHA citations during the past 3 years, any environmental citations, and listing of safety and health insurance carriers. In addition, para. (b) states that we list any Govt contracts terminated within the past 3 years. Are we to assume that these items belong to the Prime alone, or do we need to also include those responses along with all submitted past performance citations including those from the subs?	Any subcontractor submitting past performance references in accordance with L.21(a) shall also submit any records of OSHA citations during the past 3 years, any environmental citations, listing of safety and health insurance carriers, and list any Government contracts terminated within the past three years.
03	26	Section L.22 (h), (k) and (l), and Attachment J-28	L-36 and L-37	RFP sections L.22(k). L.22(l), and Attachment J-28 require separate rates for the DoL SCA labor categories at Stennis (Tab "Stennis DoL Labor Rates") and Marshall (Tab "Marshall DoL Labor Rates"); however, the Attachment J-28 tab titled “LOE Labor Rates” only allows for a single rate for each labor category to include the DoL SCA categories. Should offerors populate the “LOE Labor Rates” tab with Stennis based rates given the vast majority of the work is done there or does	Attachment J-28 LOE Labor Rates shall be Stennis rates. Due to several very good questions received regarding the SCA regular and overtime rates between the two sites, the Government has included Attachment J-13 Labor and Transaction Rates template with the solicitation.

Amendment	Tracking #	RFP Reference	RFP Page	Question/Comment	Response
				the Government intend to modify that tab to reflect both Stennis and Marshall based rates?	Offerors shall complete Attachment J-13 and submit it with the proposal. Section L.23, Table L-5 has been revised accordingly. Previously answered questions #16 and #18 have also been revised to reflect this change.
03	27	G.7	G-7	Would the Government please confirm that the method to invoice will be to send original or electronic invoice to NSSC instead of through WAWF?	Invoicing will be as stated in section G.7 Submission of Invoices for Payment. The resulting contract will be modified when Wide Area Workflow (WAWF) invoicing capability is implemented. It is anticipated that all NASA contractors will invoice using WAWF at some point in the future.
03	28	Attachment J-29 Past Performance Questionnaire	N/A	Please confirm that Past Performance Questionnaires are to be distributed to each reference listed for a given Past Performance Citation (Contract Officer and Contract Officer Technical Representative)."	Yes, Past Performance Questionnaires are to be distributed to each reference listed for a given Past Performance Citation As stated in RFP Attachment J-29 Past Performance

Amendment	Tracking #	RFP Reference	RFP Page	Question/Comment	Response
					Questionnaire, the questionnaires can be sent to the Contracting Officer (CO), Contracting Officer's Representative (COR), Technical Monitor (TM), or other person responsible for monitoring the Contractor's compliance with the requirements of the contract.
03	29	Attachment J-5 DoL Wage Determinations	N/A	The DOL announced an increase in the SCA Health and Welfare Fringe Benefits rate (memo attached). It has increased to $4.02 per hour. The updated Health and Welfare Fringe Benefits rate is supposed to be used at the CO's direction on all open bids or awarded contracts after July 22, 2014. The Service Contract Act 2014 Health and Welfare Fringe Benefit Changes notification is attached for reference. Are bidders on this effort being directed to use the new rate cited in the DOL memo?"	In accordance with the U.S. Department of Labor All Agency Memorandum Number 216, dated July 22, 2014, the Wage Determinations under this contract are subject to the new $4.02 per hour health and welfare fringe benefit rate. Attachment J-5 DoL Wage Determinations has been modified accordingly.
03	30	L.19(b)	L-14-15	Does the 11 point TNR minimum font requirement apply to the cross reference matrix? Is 10 point TNR acceptable?	11 point Times New Roman applies to the cross-reference matrix.

Amendment	Tracking #	RFP Reference	RFP Page	Question/Comment	Response
03	31	L.19(b)	L-14-15	Should we create an individual cross reference matrix for each volume (which will be included in each particular volume), or one cross reference matrix that covers all volumes?	The Government requests one cross-reference matrix that covers all volumes with a copy of that matrix in volume I.
03	32	L.19(b)	L-14-15	Which volume should the cross reference matrix be inserted in?	See question 31 above.
03	33	L.19(b)	L-14-15	Should we indicate which parts of our proposal address all sections in the PWS? Or only include Sections L and M in the cross reference matrix?	The Government expects a cross-reference matrix detailed enough to efficiently evaluate the proposal in accordance with RFP sections L and M.
03	34	L.19(b)	L-15	Font size.	No question was submitted
03	35	L.19(b)	L-14	At which header level do the volumes need to be tabbed? Will it suffice to tab at the level of TA-1, TA-2, TA-3, and so on?	Volume I shall be tabbed in accordance with the sections identified in Table L-3. Volume III shall be tabbed in accordance with the sections identified in Table L-4.
03	36	Attachment J-1, PWS, 3.9	PWS pg. 97	Where in the technical volume is PWS section 3.9 – Agency Business Support to be addressed?	This service is primarily staffed by civil servants. Because of the very small amount of

Amendment	Tracking #	RFP Reference	RFP Page	Question/Comment	Response
					contractor support this service will receive, only the proposed staffing categories and price are being evaluated.
03	37	Table L-1, Proposal Arrangement	L-14, L-26	Table L-1 indicates that section MA-3 is to include the Employee Compensation Plan. But Table L-1 also indicates that the Employee Compensation Plan is to be included as Appendix 2 (APP-2), and that it is not page limited. Question 1: Should MA-3 Employee Compensation Plan and APP-2 Employee Compensation Plan contain exactly the same content? If so, what is the purpose of including them twice in the technical volume, once in the volume proper and once as an appendix? Question 2: Would the government consider removing the requirement of including the Employee Compensation Plan in two places (i.e. in MA-3 and APP-2), if they are exactly the same thing? Is it sufficient to include the Employee Compensation plan in one place in the technical volume?	The Government does not require Offerors to submit a compensation plan in each section. The Offeror can respond to evaluation criteria in MA-3 within its Employee Compensation Plan in Appendix 2 and the cross-reference matrix should reflect that. If the comprehensive compensation plan does not address specifics in MA-3, those would have to be addressed within MA-3.
03	38	Table L-1, Proposal Arrangement	L-14, L-27	Table L-1 indicates that section SB-1 and SB-2 are to include the Small Business Subcontracting Approach. But Table L-1 also	The Government does not require Offerors to submit a small business plan in each

Amendment	Tracking #	RFP Reference	RFP Page	Question/Comment	Response
				indicates that the Subcontractor Management Plan is to be included as Appendix 4 (APP-4). Question 1: What is the difference between SB-1/SB-2 and APP-4? Should they content exactly the same content? Question 2: Would the government consider removing the requirement of including the Small Business Subcontracting plan in two places (i.e. in SB-1/SB-2 and APP-4), if they are exactly the same thing? Is it sufficient to include the Small Business Subcontracting plan in one place in the technical volume?	section. The Offeror can respond to evaluation criteria in SB-1 and SB-2 within its small business plan in Appendix 4 and the cross-reference matrix should reflect that. If the small business plan does not address specifics in SB-1 and SB-2, those would have to be addressed within SB-1 and SB-2.
03	39	L.21(a), bullet 12 (OSHA)	L-33	In the past performance volume, should we include OSHA forms 300, 300A, 301, or any other OSHA forms, even if no citations have been received from OSHA?	Only forms associated with any OSHA citations should be included.
03	40	K.5 – Representations & Certifications	Pgs. K8 through K10	Page K-8 of the Reps & Certs says that "Note: This notice does not apply to small businesses …" referring to 52.230-1, Cost Accounting Standards Notices and Certification (May 2012). How is small business defined under this clause? Is it any business that considered small under NAICS 561110 (size standard $7M)?	13 CFR 121.410 states a concern is small for subcontracts which relate to government procurements if it does not exceed the size standard for the NAICS code that the prime contractor believes best describes the product or service being acquired by the

Amendment	Tracking #	RFP Reference	RFP Page	Question/Comment	Response
					subcontract. Exemptions from CAS requirements are specified in 48 CFR 9903.201-1.
03	41	L.22(c)	L-35	The requirement to include audited financial statements was not part of the draft RFP. This is a significant and substantial requirement for small businesses to meet, which typically do not have audited financial statements. We request that the Government wave this requirement for small businesses, as it is an undue burden on them.	Section L.22(c) has been revised to allow for reviewed annual financial statements from a licensed independent public accountant in lieu of audited financial statements for small businesses with gross annual receipts not exceeding $10,000,000.
03	42	PWS 2.10	PWS pg. 20	Does NSSC expect delivery of a QCP with the proposal, or shall the SP develop a QCP within 30 days after contract award?	No. In accordance with Attachment J-2, DRD 2.10-1, the Quality Control Plan is due within 90 days after award.
03	43	L.22(c)	L-35	The burden of providing audited financials for Small Businesses falling within NAIC 561110 can be cost prohibitive for a business under this sized standard. Would the government consider allowing the Offeror's Small Business teaming partners to submit prepared financials as opposed to	See answer to question #41.

Amendment	Tracking #	RFP Reference	RFP Page	Question/Comment	Response
				audited financials?	
03	44	3.8.3	93	Can you compare and contrast the call types that are received by the customer call center vs the customer contact center?	We assume that customer call center is referring to the Enterprise Service Desk (ESD). The ESD receives IT related calls with the majority associated with services provided by NASA's I3P contracts (see clause H.5). The Customer Contact Center (CCC) primarily receives calls related to the HR, PR and FM services that the NSSC provides.
03	45	ESD Service Delivery Guide	26&27	The call flow diagram shows SATERN request going to an off page (3) diagram. Diagram 3 is not available. IS there additional call flows for SATERN requests?	SATERN calls received by ESD are routed to the Customer Contact Center (CCC). While SATERN calls may have some IT issues, SATERN falls under HR Information Systems so problems associated with it are handled in the CCC. Please see the CCC Service Delivery Guide (SDG) in RFP Attachment J-22,

Amendment	Tracking #	RFP Reference	RFP Page	Question/Comment	Response
					References for a continuation from the ESD SDG.
03	46	3.8.3	93	How does the customer know if they should call the enterprise service desk or the customer contact center?	Customers call a single number to reach the NSSC and are prompted by automated questions into a selection for their problem. The Automated Call Distribution (ACD) routes the call accordingly.
03	47	3.8.3	93	What percentage of the calls to the enterprise service desk are password reset, SATERN, ACES, Web services, enterprise applications, network services, and IT Security, Other?	SATERN calls are handled by the Customer Contact Center (CCC). For FY 13, SATERN accounted for 31% of the calls received by the CCC. For the Enterprise Service Desk, FY 13 percentages are: ACES – These are incidents elevated to ACES Tier 2/3 – 33% Network – 6% of incidents are elevated to NICS Tier 2/3 Web Services – Less

Amendment	Tracking #	RFP Reference	RFP Page	Question/Comment	Response
					than 1% are elevated Enterprise Apps – EAST has its own helpdesk and does not use the NSSC ESD. Other – 2% Resolved at ESD Tier 1 – Approx 59% with most of these related to ACES
03	48	3.8.3	93	Can we get the average handle time for calls at the enterprise service desk?	Approximately 10 minutes.
03	49	3.5.1	91	Can we get the average handle time for calls at the customer contact center?	See question #22 above
03	50	3.5.1 – J3	10	The first call resolution rate at the customer contact center is 85% for routine request. What percentage of calls to the customer contact are routine?	For FY 13, 51% of calls were considered routine.
03	51	3.8.3	ESD	What is causing the ESD call increase of 30% a year?	The 19% increase from FY 12 to FY 13 was because FY 12 was a transition year and NASA centers transitioned in phases. The 28% increase from FY 13 to the FY 15 projection used for RFP purposes takes into account the

Amendment	Tracking #	RFP Reference	RFP Page	Question/Comment	Response
					possible migration to the NSSC of other NASA IT and non-IT helpdesks.
03	52	3.8.3	J18	The labor category customer assistant is available for the customer contact center but not the enterprise service desk. Can we utilize the labor category customer assistant for the customer contact center?	We assume that you are asking if the customer assistant category can be used for the Enterprise Service Desk (ESD). As stated in Attachment J-18, additional labor categories may be added from the Standard Labor Category list as appropriate and shall be addressed in the narrative section of the Mission Suitability (MA-2) volume. For Attachment J-28 Pricing Template, only the labor categories and hours prepopulated by the Government are acceptable.
03	53	L-22, para. (b)	L-35	What level of detail is required for subcontractor proposals as sealed bids to the Government? Are all subcontractors required to submit a proposal?	The format and content that the Prime uses for its subcontractor price proposals is acceptable to the Government.

Amendment	Tracking #	RFP Reference	RFP Page	Question/Comment	Response
					The Government is not asking for sealed bids, it is stating that subcontractors can submit their pricing with the Prime's proposal or directly to the Government if they desire.
03	54	L-22, para. (b)	L-35	For WYE, in the instances where the total annual hours are 2,088 or 2,096, can the total productive hours exceed 1,880? Or is it expected that the Offeror normalize the WYE for each year of the POP?	The Government used 1,880 for the pricing model to standardize productive hours for evaluation purposes. It, along with the general range of productive hours, was not meant to restrict Offerors. An Offeror's productive labor hours would equate to whatever its approved accounting system dictates.
03	55	Excel Pricing Model	J-28 - Stennis DoL Labor Rates and Marshall DoL Labor Rates tabs	The two DoL Labor Rate tabs request a separate cost for fringe benefits and other indirects [costs], but in the event that the Offeror's accounting system does not separate fringe cost elements, e.g., a Total Cost Input system using a combined fringe and overhead pool whose base is spread over more than one contract creating an applied average indirect rate; how	The Government's intent is to be able to verify that all DoL hourly wage and benefits rates are met. If the Offeror's accounting system does not allow the visibility needed to segregate these costs for verification

Amendment	Tracking #	RFP Reference	RFP Page	Question/Comment	Response
				should the Offeror present the individual cost elements and remain consistent with their accounting structure? Should Offerors provide additional information describing their accounting structure in order to support situations of potential variations from these average indirect rates?	purposes, it is not clear how an Offeror would know if it is complying with the DoL health and benefits requirements. If segregation is not possible, the Offeror shall ensure that it provides information that verifies compliance in the narrative section of the Mission Suitability Volume.
03	56	L-22, para. (c)	L-35	In the event that a subcontractor exceeding the 3M annual value does not submit a separate proposal, can audited financials be submitted separately?	See Question #10 above
03	57	L-22, para. (d)	L-35	Does the Government require copies of any reports to support acceptance of systems? Or is stating the information and providing contact information sufficient?	The Government only requires the information requested. If verification is required, the Government will obtain it from the contacts provided and other appropriate sources.
03	58	Attachment J-18	3.5 Cross Cutting	The Labor Categories in this tab omits Records Management Specialist 1-4 labor categories. Please confirm whether Records Management Specialist labor	As stated in Attachment J-18, additional labor categories may be added from the

Amendment	Tracking #	RFP Reference	RFP Page	Question/Comment	Response
				categories should be included.	Standard Labor Category list as appropriate and shall be addressed in the narrative section of the Mission Suitability (MA-2) volume. For Attachment J-28 Pricing Template, only the labor categories and hours prepopulated by the Government are acceptable.
03	59	PWS 2.20 Logistics	PWS pg. 22	In the PWS Section 2.20 Logistics, there is a requirement to provide "NSSC mail sorting, mail distribution and package shipping and receiving." Should these services be included under TA-6 Cross Cutting Services? If not, should these services be included as part of another task area within the PWS?	This support should be included under Shared Services Administration, PWS Section 2.0.
03	60	3.2.2.1	66	Who is responsible for resolving and making revisions to award documents to address issues from these reviews?	PWS 3.2.2.1 does not correspond to the page number and the question does not match PWS 3.2.2.1. We assume the question references PWS 3.3.2.1/2 for grant awards and administration. The Service Provider is

Amendment	Tracking #	RFP Reference	RFP Page	Question/Comment	Response
					responsible for all tasks that are not inherently governmental.
03	61	3.2.2.1	67	Is electronic means used for document distribution? Is this accomplished via email or some other pocess?	Yes, email and fax.
03	62	3.3 and 3.3.11 & 3.3.12 as well as 3.2.13	62	3.3 states the SP shall a formal training program of both classroom and OJT training. However subsections 3.3.11 and 3.3.12 are limited to mostly logistical support. In addition subsection 3.2.13 under HR lists purchasing training and it is unclear how these relate. Are there further details of the required SP training support or is it limited to what is listed under the subsections, including that under HR?	Question is somewhat confusing since incorrect PWS references are being used (there are no PWS sections for 3.3.11 and 3.3.12). We assume the question is asking about the training provided for in the Procurement section (PWS 3.3) and its applicability to the Training Purchase activities under HR (PWS 3.2) specifically 3.2.13. The level of training required for the HR Training Purchases personnel is not near as extensive as that required for the Procurement personnel as the HR roles are more administrative in

Amendment	Tracking #	RFP Reference	RFP Page	Question/Comment	Response
					nature.
03	63	PWS 2.27	PWS pg. 24	In the PWS Section 2.27 A/V Support, there is a requirement to provide "provide audio-visual (A/V) for NSSC equipment and users that are located within the NSSC physical sites at SSC Building 1111 in its entirety and several offices in Building 1100." Should these services be included under TA-6 Cross Cutting Services? If not, should these services be included as part of another task area within the PWS?	This support should be included under Shared Services Administration, PWS Section 2.0.
03	64	3.1	25	The requirements for each specific process (A/P, A/R, FBWT, Travel, etc.) under the Financial Management section requires the SP to complete a series of tasks and then to submit that completed portion of the work product to the Civil Servant for review. In many instances the civil servant will be required to complete additional steps before the process is actually considered as completed. When a specific process requires the SP to work in conjunction with the Civil Servant, does the agency have a protocol defined that would aid the SP in assuring that all phases of a process have been completed, once they have	In relation to documentation, the SP and the Civil Servants will need to collaborate to ensure the updates that are being made are reasonable and proper. Once the SP completes their portion of the task and hands it over to the Civil Servant, the Civil Servant will update any portion under their responsibility. The documentation is then submitted for review

Amendment	Tracking #	RFP Reference	RFP Page	Question/Comment	Response
				completed their portion of the process and turned it over to the Civil Servant? "reference Bullet 16 of this section"	and validation by both the SP and CS before finalizing.
03	65	3.1	25	Based on Bullet 3 I have a 3 part question. Part 1) Does the requirement for "periodic reconciliations" differ based on the process; i.e. A/P, A/R, Financial Reporting etc.? Part 2) How frequently would the SP be required to perform "periodic reconciliations", daily, weekly, bi-weekly, monthly, quarterly, yearly, or a combination of the above? Part 3) Will these reconciliations be utilized as part of the Consolidated Financial Reporting?	This bullet refers to the requirement for ad hoc reconciliations as requested, but related to the work performed by the SP. 1.The functional area will determine what type of reconciliation is needed as well as the frequency. These will likely differ between functional areas. 2.Based on historical data, these requests are not consistent enough to determine an estimated frequency. 3.The reconciliations are needed as part of the daily operations. Financial reporting reconciliations are conducted by Headquarters. It is estimated that these special

Amendment	Tracking #	RFP Reference	RFP Page	Question/Comment	Response
					reconciliations will be 1 a month or less for AP, AR, FBwT and Travel (each).
03	66	3.1	25	Bullet 6 states that the SP will perform "Fiscal Year End Close and Start Up Activities" yet there is no mention of performing "Month End Close" activities. Is there a defined "Month End Close" process and, if so, will the SP also be responsible for performing Month End Close activities?	Month end close activities are mainly performed by the Centers and Headquarters. The month end reporting tasks (for example the Continuous Monitoring Program, FIDO, International Transactions, and Treasury Report on Receivables (TROR)) related to month end reporting activities are included in the PWS. Operational activities that coincide with month end are also included in the PWS (for example AP Payment cutoffs, Fund Balance with Treasury, AR Billing Cycles).
03	67	3.1	25	On line 3 of the initial paragraph, the proposal request indicates that the SP will be responsible for providing Financial Management User IT Support, yet there is no specific section providing detail on	This is referring to the Treasury Systems Administrator (TSA) role described in PWS 3.1, 17th bullet. Specific requirements

Amendment	Tracking #	RFP Reference	RFP Page	Question/Comment	Response
				the level of effort required for Financial Management User It Support. Can you provide the specific level of effort requirements for this process?	are contained in Attachment J-22, References, in the TSA work instruction NSWI-9000-0003.
03	68	3.1	25	Bullet 3 specifies that the SP will prepare Financial Reports, can you define exactly, what the required Financial Reports are, how frequently they are required; daily, weekly, monthly, etc. and if they currently exist; i.e. (adhoc) or have to be created by the SP?	Reports mentioned in this section are covered under each functional area SDGs, DRDs, etc. Reports may be a result of internal or external audits, CMP reviews, quality assurance reviews, etc.
03	69	3.1.1.1	27	Bullet 9 states "Receive financial invoices and "outside buyer" transactions from NASA Centers and process payments. Is there a difference between a NASA Commercial Vendor and an Outside Buyer? If so, are their separate lists for Vendors and Outside Buyer? Will the SP be responsible for maintaining both lists?	Outside buyer transactions are generated from purchases that are not required to be competed and therefore go through the procurement process (for example, utility purchases or agreements with another federal agency). Separate lists will not need to be maintained.
03	70	3.1.2	29	Bullet 10 of this section requires the SP to liquidate the reimbursable advances monthly based on cost billed in the financial system, Will the SP be	The Agency process does not require this analysis to be performed on a reoccurring monthly

Amendment	Tracking #	RFP Reference	RFP Page	Question/Comment	Response
				required to provide the vendor with a monthly "spend down" cost analysis of the reimbursable advance (based on FAR Subset 32.110)?	basis for all transactions. However, this does not preclude this cost analysis to be performed on an as requested basis in support of audits, internal reviews, quality assessments.
03	71	3.1.4	30	This section requires the SP to perform FMS 224 Statement of Transactions reporting. However, the US. Department of Treasury issued a Federal mandate that will be effective October 1, 2014 (in Accordance with Government Wide Accounting (GWA) that all agencies provide Financial Reporting through the *Government wide Treasury Account Symbol Adjusted Trial Balance System* (GTAS). As of this date the SSF224 will no longer be acceptable as a reporting tool. Will the agency be compliant with the October 1, 2014 GTAS implementation date? Will the SP be responsible for processing payments through GTAS? "Site page 49, step 13 of the FBWT Service Delivery Guide"	The end of the comment asks whether payments will be processed through GTAS. Payments will continue to be processed through Treasury payment systems such as SPS and ITS. Regarding the FMS 224: NASA is transitioning to become a GWA reporter. Implementation is complete for IPACs and Collections. Implementation for payments is in process. The NSSC will continue to reconcile cash transactions between SAP and Treasury on

Amendment	Tracking #	RFP Reference	RFP Page	Question/Comment	Response
					a daily basis and submit the reclassifications in compliance with Treasury formats. Monthly cash reclassifications will continue to be performed through the Treasury web site that is currently used to transmit cash reclassifications to Treasury.
03	72	3.1.5	30	Is local travel performed in the travel system or manually entered into the financial system?	Local travel is processed through the Agency's electronic travel system and interfaced into the financial system.
03	73	3.1.5	30	Sponsored (i.e. Invitational Travel) is not listed. Is this type of travel not performed at NASA? If so, how is this currently handled?	Invitational travel is processed through the Agency's electronic travel system and treated like all other types of travel. For example, if it is invitational foreign travel, it is handled like foreign travel.
03	74	3.1.5.1	31	Unlike 3.1.5.2, there is no provision listed for handling payment rejections. Are rejections handled under a different mechanism? Is the SP responsible	Payment rejections are monitored by Civil Servants and worked with the Center POCs.

Amendment	Tracking #	RFP Reference	RFP Page	Question/Comment	Response
				for handling these type of payment rejections?	
03	75	3.1.5.3	33	Unlike 3.1.5.2, there is no provision listed for handling payment rejections. Are rejections handled under a different mechanism? Is the SP responsible for handling these type of payment rejections?	Payment rejections are monitored by Civil Servants and worked with the Center POCs
03	76	3.5.1	92	The PWS states: "The contact center shall maintain a history of all requests from customers for assistance, including resolution." What are the current data archiving requirements for customer requests?	Currently, there is no archive requirement. All requests since August 2010 are available through Remedy. August 2010 was when we completed the migration from Remedy 6.5 to 7.5. Archiving procedures may be implemented when the migration to ServiceNow is complete.
03	77	3.5.1	92	The PWS states: "The IVR and ACD technology currently in use for the CCC will be provided to the contractor." What is the current IVR system?	The ESD and CCC do not currently use IVR capabilities, but plan on using them under the new contract (see the associated ESD DRDs) with ServiceNow capabilities. The ACD is Cisco Unified

Amendment	Tracking #	RFP Reference	RFP Page	Question/Comment	Response
					Contact Center Express (UCCX).
03	78	K.5 I – 2-3 – Representations & Certifications	K8 – K10	Part c3 of clause 52.230-1 COST ACCOUNTING STANDARDS NOTICES AND CERTIFICATIONS (MAY 2012) seems to indicate that an offeror that has received less than $50 million in awards in the cost accounting period immediately preceding the period in which the proposal was submitted is exempt from submitting the Cost Accounting Practices and Certification Disclosure Statement. Is it a correct assumption that a prime offeror submitting a bid that has received less than $50 million in awards in the preceding cost accounting period is exempt from submitting the above referenced Disclosure Statement?	Yes. See Provision K.5(I)(3). This is the certificate of monetary exemption.
03	79	DRFP Q&A #83		In response to Q #83, the Government provided an estimate of the number of contractor personnel for the following areas; FM, HR, PR, IT, cross-cutting, and ESD. Will the Government also provide the estimate of the number of contractor personnel providing Agency Business Services under PWS 3.9?	Current support is 1 WYE for PWS 3.9.1. This could increase to two WYEs as used in the J-28 Pricing Template.

Amendment	Tracking #	RFP Reference	RFP Page	Question/Comment	Response
03	80	L.4(b) – L-2; DRFP Q&A #50		The RFP states that proposals envisioning compensation levels lower than those of predecessor contractors for the same work will be evaluated on the basis of maintaining program continuity, uninterrupted high-quality work, and availability of required competent professional service employees. As stated in DRFP Q. 50, non-incumbent offerors have no basis on which to determine if their proposed compensation levels are lower than those of the predecessor contractors. The Government's response to Q. 50, which indicates that proposed compensation levels "based on recognized national and regional compensation surveys, data and studies of professional, public and private organizations" are acceptable, offers a reasonable assurance that the compensation levels are in alignment with prevailing area market wages. However, the instruction still states that the Government will compare the offeror's compensation levels to the current levels of the predecessor contractors. We understand that the current compensation levels are proprietary to the incumbent contractors and should not be released.	Provision L.4, 52.222-46 Evaluation of Compensation for Professional Employees, is to be included in solicitations for negotiated contracts when the contract amount is expected to exceed $650,000 and services are to be provided which will require meaningful numbers of professional employees. This provision , as currently written, has been in effect since 1993 and while the Government understands the difficulty in attempting to price follow-on contracts of this nature, it is a challenge that has always existed. We cannot provide attrition rates or average years of performance by labor category because this information would be considered proprietary to the Prime and its

Amendment	Tracking #	RFP Reference	RFP Page	Question/Comment	Response
				Would the Government consider either removing this statement from the RFP, or as an alternative, providing other data that will assist non-incumbent offerors in characterizing the seniority of the current workforce, such as average years of performance on contract by labor category, or average attrition by contract year? Data such as these will help offerors estimate the appropriate compensation levels to support the Government's objective of maintaining program continuity, uninterrupted high-quality work, and availability of required competent professional service employees.	subcontractors.
03	81	L.6(f)	L-4	The referenced section requires offerors to include a copy of its policy addressing uncompensated overtime with its proposal. There is no indication in Table L-1 (pg L-14) of where in the proposal volume structure to place the offeror's policy. Please specify where the Government would like this policy to be included in the proposal, and clarify whether the policy is excluded from any page limitations associated with the volume.	The policy addressing uncompensated overtime shall be submitted as part of the compensation plan.

Amendment	Tracking #	RFP Reference	RFP Page	Question/Comment	Response
03	82	L.19(b)	L-14	Should offerors provide a single cross-reference matrix for all volumes, or a separate cross-reference matrix for each volume?	The Government requests one cross-reference matrix that covers all volumes with a copy of that matrix in volume I.
03	83	L.21(a)	L-33	Regarding records of OSHA citations during the past three years, is the Government requesting copies of the OSHA logs to be included in the Past Performance Volume, or is the Government requesting only relevant data from the OSHA logs? If the former, will the Government exclude the copies of the OSHA logs from the Volume II page count?	The Government only needs forms/logs associated with OSHA citations. These forms/logs would not count against the page limitation.
03	84	J-1 PWS 3.2.1.1	37	Does NSSC require that the Medical Review Officer vendor personnel (MRO, Assistant/Coordinator, etc) work on-site in NSSC facilities?	No. Providers of these activities are not required to work on-site at the NSSC facility.
03	85	J-1 PWS 3.2.1.1 and DRFP Q #36	38	In order to "oversee the specimen collection process at each NASA Center, including Headquarters, as needed" as stated in the PWS, will the MRO vendor be required to have personnel permanently located at each NASA Center and HQ or is it acceptable to accomplish this requirement via travel from NSSC or the MRO	The NSSC Service Provider staff providing the Drug Testing Program Administration services will reside at the NSSC facility. There is no requirement for SP or subcontract personnel (Drug Testing vendor,

Amendment	Tracking #	RFP Reference	RFP Page	Question/Comment	Response
				vendor's off-site location?	MRO, etc.) to be permanently located at HQs or any of the NASA centers.
03	86	J-1 PWS 3.2.1.1	37	Please confirm that the requirements of this PWS apply only to NASA employees and not contractors.	The Drug Testing Program only applies to civil servants.
03	87	DRFP Q#233		Please describe the services provided through the secondary subcontractors for Drug Testing which are included in the ODC dollar estimate provided in the RFP. Is this limited to the collection/testing vendors or does this include any of the activities expected to be performed by the SP as described in PWS 3.2.1.1?	The primary ODC costs are for specimen collection and testing services, MRO review services and travel.
04	88	L.20(n)(1)(vii)	L16 to L17	The instructions in Section L.20(n)(1)(vii) state that "Offerors shall show the proposed subcontracting goals for the basic contract requirement and each option separately." Does the Government wish to see separate goals for each Option and each Award Term Option (total of 7 individual subcontracting goal tables, including the Base period) or just for the Base period and Options 1 – 3?	Offerors shall show the proposed subcontracting goals for the basic contract requirement and each option separately (basic and award term options).
04	89	L.19(b), L.21(a)	L-15, L-32	Page L-15 indicates that font within tables and graphics can be 10 point Times New Roman. Is it	No. Several of these bullets could require explanations rather

Amendment	Tracking #	RFP Reference	RFP Page	Question/Comment	Response
				acceptable to place the information required for the past performance references listed in the first 11 bullets on pages L32 to L33 within tables using 10 point font?	than just data entry. A table format using 10 point font would not be acceptable.
04	90	Amendment 2, L.21		The updated Past Performance Proposal instructions instruct that "The Offeror shall also have its proposed subcontractors submit two (2) past performance references when the subcontractor will be awarded over $3,000,000 of the annual contract value." Does this mean that it's unacceptable to submit only one past performance reference for a subcontractor, if that subcontractor will be awarded over $3,000,000 of the contract value?	The Government is requesting two (2) past performance references for subcontractors that will be awarded over $3,000,000 of the annual contract value. If no subcontractors meet this threshold, then the two subcontractors (unless the contractor is only using a total of one subcontractor) receiving the most subcontracting dollars shall submit past performance references. As stated in RFP section M.4(C) on page M-11, "As described in FAR 15.305(a)(2)(iv), an Offeror without a record of relevant past performance or for whom information on past performance is not available will receive a neutral rating

Amendment	Tracking #	RFP Reference	RFP Page	Question/Comment	Response
					on past performance."
04	91	L.21(a), 12th bullet	L-33	The Past Performance instructions state to include "Any records of Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA) citations during the past three years" Is it possible for the Government to exclude the forms provided by Offerors to show records of OSHA citations from the page count of the Past Performance volume?	See question #83 above.
04	92	L.21(a), 12th bullet	L-33	Should the records of OSHA citations mentioned on page L-33 contain all of a company's OSHA citations across all contracts, or should only citations on contracts referenced as past performances be included in the proposal?	Offerors shall disclose records of any OSHA citation received by their firm during the past three years.
04	93	L.21(a), 12th bullet	L-33	For purposes of this proposal, can the OSHA citations referenced on page L-33 be defined as incidents where OSHA has assessed a penalty or write-up to an organization for non-safety procedures?	OSHA citations inform the employer and employees of the regulations and standards alleged to have been violated and of the proposed length of time set for their abatement (see www.osha.gov for more information).
04	94	PWS 3.2.3.4 – Civilian and Military	PWS pg. 49	We are unable to locate a corresponding service delivery guide for Civilian and Military	Civilian and Military Deposit Processing is included in NSSC-

Amendment	Tracking #	RFP Reference	RFP Page	Question/Comment	Response
		Deposit Processing		Deposit processing, which is a transactional service and listed in the PWS under section 3.2.3.4. There is also not an accompany reference in Attachment J-22, References. Please indicate which service delivery guide applies to Civilian and Military Deposit Processing.	HR-SDG-0035, Benefits Counseling and Processing which is in Attachment J-22, References. As stated in Attachment J-22, SDGs are routinely updated. The links in J-22 will redirect if an update has occurred and an SDG update tracking log is available in the NSSC NEX-GEN Document Library.
04	95	B.6 (e) and B.7(e)	B-6, B-7	In order to minimize the magnitude of actual utilization adjustments to contract CLINS, will the Government consider revising the terms to include adjustments on a quarterly basis as opposed to an annual basis?	We must perform the utilization adjustments one time after the close of the fiscal year based on actual utilization. If would not be possible to determine the exact utilization that would occur in any given quarter to make an adjustment against.
04	96	B.7 (c)	B-7	As the technical effort is performed, the actual distribution of hours between labor categories may deviate from original estimate. However, in general contracts will allow for the interchange of hours within labor categories as long as the contractor	No. The terms of Clause B.7, Level of Effort Services remains unchanged.

Amendment	Tracking #	RFP Reference	RFP Page	Question/Comment	Response
				manages to the total authorized value and does not exceed obligated funding. Will the gov't consider revising terms to allow for the interchange of labor hours within labor categories, without advance consent from the Government, as long as the contractor manages to the total bottom-line?	
04	97	L.4 (b) 52.222-46 Evaluation of Compensation for Professional Employees	L-2	Please clarify how the Government will evaluate offers from non-incumbent contractors pursuant to the requirements of L.4(b) in consideration of the fact that incumbent personnel compensation data has not been made publicly available.	See question #80 above
04	98	Att. J-28	3.2 Summary Tab	It appears as if the correction to J-28 offered in Amendment 02 only corrected the1.02 WYE variance for Contract Year 1. Please apply the corrected formula to CY2-CY8 to confirm 87.05 WYE for all contract periods.	A revised Attachment J-28 is provided with this amendment.
04	99	Att. J-2 (DRL/DRD #013)	Page 21	The current due date would require the awardee to incur pre-contract costs given deadline is prior to phase-in start. Will the Government consider making the due date 30 days prior to contract start?	The mistake has been corrected to read 30 days after phase-in begins. A replacement DRD is included with this amendment.

Amendment	Tracking #	RFP Reference	RFP Page	Question/Comment	Response
04	100	L.12 L.19 Table L-1 L.20(j)	L-7 L-14 L-26	Table L-1 shows that APP-2 Employee Compensation Plan is out of page count for the Mission Suitability volume and has no page limit. Additionally, Table L-1 shows Section MA-3 of the same name (Employee Compensation Plan) with associated proposal instructions on pg L-26. It is our interpretation that the response to APP-2, which is not page counted or page limited, should answer the requirements of the Total Compensation Plan required by L.12, while MA-3, which is page counted within the 125 page Mission Suitability volume page limit, should address the proposal instructions of L.20(j). Will the Government confirm whether our interpretation of these two very similar requirements is correct? If not, please clarify the page limit, page count exclusions, and specific Section L references that the offer should address for each requirement (MA-3 and APP-2).	See question #37 above
04	101	L.20(b) L.20(c) L.20(d)	L-19 L-20 L-21	The Proposal Instructions for TA-2, TA-3, and TA-4 each request information regarding the offeror's knowledge of and capability to use various existing systems and understanding of and capability to	The Government agrees that the evaluation element addressing systems is too broadly worded.

Amendment	Tracking #	RFP Reference	RFP Page	Question/Comment	Response
				implement processes currently in use at NSSC to provide FM, HR and PR services. This level of detail, such as the interrelationships between systems, can only be known by the incumbent contractor, who appears to have developed some of the non-COTS systems and applications currently in use at NSSC. Although the NSSC has provided information about systems and processes through the RFP attachments and technical documents posted on its website, this RFP requirement provides an advantage to the incumbent contractor, as other offerors do not have access to these systems or processes at a working level. In addition, requiring offerors to describe their understanding and capability to continue the use of existing systems and processes is not the best method of differentiating between bidders. Simply having bidders re-constitute the information provided in the RFP does not provide the Government with insight into the offerors' ability to successfully perform NSSC functions or support the NSSC's objective to implementing business process improvements and innovations. Further, where there are existing contractor	To clarify the evaluation elements, the following RFP sections have been revised: L.20(b)(1) L.20(c)(1) L.20(d)(1) L.20(f)(3) M.4(B)(1)(b)(1) M.4(B)(1)(c)(1) M.4(B)(1)(d)(1) M.4(B)(1)(f)(3) The evaluation language for current processes remains unchanged. A revised Section L and Section M are provided with this amendment.

Amendment	Tracking #	RFP Reference	RFP Page	Question/Comment	Response
				personnel using the in-place processes and systems to perform the PWS activities, fundamentally there is minimal risk that the successful contractor team will be able to transition a high percentage of the existing workforce who will continue to accomplish the PWS using the NSSC systems and processes. We request that the Government remove requirements from each of TA-2, TA-3 and TA-4 which pertain to knowledge of and understanding of existing systems and processes and focus the evaluation of these elements on how the Offeror will ensure that existing systems, processes and procedures are consistently followed, well documented and updated, and baselined for continuous improvement.	
04	102	Attachment J-14 –WBS 3.2.7 Attachment J-18 – PWS 3.2.7.1 and 3.2.7.2 Attachment J-21 – PWS 3.2.7		J-14 requests FFP transactional rates for SES Case Documentation activities at the PWS 3.2.7 level; similarly, J-21 describes 3.2.7 as the billable transaction, with 3.2.7.1 and 3.2.7.2 listed as component activities. However, J-18 requests staffing at the component level (3.2.7.1and 3.2.7.2), which is unlike other PWS areas which request staffing	Please break out staffing at 3.2.7.1 and 3.2.7.2.

Amendment	Tracking #	RFP Reference	RFP Page	Question/Comment	Response
				at the Transaction level . Please confirm that the Government is requesting staffing in J-18 to be broken down into the component levels for the 3.2.7 PWS area.	
05	103	L.17(b)	L-12	Would the government reconsider moving the due date for questions back (see question 3) so that offerors can finalize proposals without concern over more changes?	No, the due date for receipt of questions remains unchanged. The Government highly recommends offerors to submit questions as early as possible to limit the potential impact on proposal preparation.
05	104	Amendment 002 Q&A: Tracking # 24, RFP Reference L.21.(a) Amendment 002-005-L: Section L.21(a)	L-32 L-32	The answer to the question states "Section L21(a) has been revised to state "The Offeror shall also have its proposed subcontractors <u>submit up to two (2)</u> past performance references when the subcontractor will be awarded over $3,000,000 of the annual contract value. States: "The Offeror shall also have its proposed subcontractors <u>submit two (2)</u> past performance references when the subcontractor will be awarded over $3,000,000 of the annual contract value Is it the government's intent for each subcontractor to submit two	A note has been added to question #24 directing Offerors to question #90 and Amendment 02 Section L. The Government made a mistake in the response to question #24 in not removing "up to" from the revised language. Section L.21(a), provided with Amendment 02, had the correct language in it which required two (2) references.

Amendment	Tracking #	RFP Reference	RFP Page	Question/Comment	Response
				past performance references when the subcontractor will be awarded over $3,000,000.00 of the annual contract value? If it is the intent to require 2 subcontractor past performance references, which is a change, please increase the page limit and extend the due date for past performance submission by one week. If the government intends to keep the page limit at 35; please retain the "up to two (2)" language in Section L.	Yes. Please see question #90 above. The Government considered the request, reviewed several similar RFPs for Past Performance page limitations and determined that 35 pages is a reasonable limit. The due date for Past Performance submissions remains unchanged.
05	105	Amendment 03 Q&A: Tracking # 28, RFP Reference J-29	N/A	Please confirm that Past Performance Questionnaires are to be distributed to <u>each reference listed for a given</u> Past Performance Citation (Contract Officer and Contract Officer Technical Representative)."	Yes. See question #28 above
05	106	Attachment J-29: Past Performance Questionnaire		States: This evaluation should be completed by the Contracting Officer (CO), Contracting Officer's Representative (COR), Technical Monitor (TM), or other person responsible for monitoring the Contractor's compliance with the requirements of the contract." Please confirm that only 1 Past Performance Questionnaire is to	Yes. See question #28 above.

Amendment	Tracking #	RFP Reference	RFP Page	Question/Comment	Response
				be distributed per each Past Performance Citation to the person responsible for monitoring the Contractor's compliance with the requirements.	
05	107	RFP section L, Instructions for responding to TA-2 through TA-4 and RFP Section M, Evaluation criteria for TA-2 through TA-4:	L-19 thru L-21 M-5 Thru M-6	In the TA-2 through TA-4 Section L instructions, Offerors are requested to respond to the following question, "If the Offeror is proposing different processes or variants to current processes, what are they, why are they necessary and how will they be implemented?" Section M does not appear to include criterion for evaluating the merits of the Offerors proposed rationale for innovative revised or substitute processes and an accompanying well-defined implementation approach. Will the Government consider adding the following sentence (4) to the TA-2 through TA-4 paragraphs in Section M, "Extent to which the Offeror provides innovative revised or substitute processes along with an accompanying well-defined implementation approach."?	The Government considered this request and determined that RFP Sections M.4(B)(1)(a)(5) and L.20(a)(5) capture this information. The bullet contained in TA-2 through TA-4 that states "If the Offeror is proposing different processes or variants to current processes, what are they, why are they necessary and how will they be implemented?" has been deleted from Section L. A change made to RFP Section L.20(a)(5) as a result of DRAFT RFP comments has made this evaluation element redundant. A revised Section L is provided with this

Amendment	Tracking #	RFP Reference	RFP Page	Question/Comment	Response
					Amendment.
05	108	Table L.1, Proposal Arrangement: Placement of Compensation Plan	L-14	Table L.1 indicates that an extensive Compensation Plan is to be included (as an Appendix) under Section MA-3 of the Technical Volume I; however it is not typical for any salary-type information to be identified or referenced in a Technical Volume. As this plan is inclusive of such information, please confirm if it is the Government's intent for this plan to remain within the Technical Volume or to have it moved Volume III.	The Total Compensation Plan is being evaluated as part of Mission Suitability and shall be included in Volume I.
06	109	Attachment J-28	3.2 Summary Tab	The 3.2 summary tab appears to exclude the pricing from the Summary Tab 3.2.5 (3.2.5.1 & 3.2.5.2). Was this exclusion intentional?	The 3.2 Summary Tab formula error has been corrected in the revised Attachment J-28 included with this Amendment.
06	110	Attachment J-1 PWS 3.2.1.1	38	"Secure and maintain an MRO Vendor" Q.Please confirm that the MRO vendor should be identified as an ODC charges	Yes. See question #87 above. MRO ODCs are included in the ODC estimate numbers for 3.2.1.1 in Attachment J-28.

Amendment	Tracking #	RFP Reference	RFP Page	Question/Comment	Response
06	111	Attachment J-1 PWS 3.2.1.4	40	"Support the purchase and maintenance of an appropriate inventory of awards and material." Q. Please clarify the level of "support" the government requires. Will the SP to maintain the inventory, as well as replenish the inventory? Q. If the SP replenishes the inventory on behalf of the government, please confirm whether the cost of inventory is an ODC, or whether documentation is submitted through the HR CS to procure through NSSC procurement division.	The SP maintains and replenishes the inventory. The award and recognition items are ODCs that are included in the ODC estimate numbers for 3.2.1.4 in Attachment J-28.
06	112	Attachment J-1 PWS 3.2.1.6	42	"Obtain bids to produce, develop and deliver information materials." Q. Who provides the ultimate deliverable (info materials) to the government? Please clarify whether the government desires the SP to manage the design and delivery of the materials, pending govt approval.	This sentence, as written, is not contained in PWS section 3.2.1.6. The SP delivers the material after Government approval. The 5th bullet under PWS section 3.2.1.6 states "Obtain approval for all informational material content from the appropriate NSSC CS HR Specialist staff and the requestor prior to release to any NASA and/or customer parties."

Amendment	Tracking #	RFP Reference	RFP Page	Question/Comment	Response
06	113	Attachment J-1 PWS 3.2.12	56	"Use automated conversion tools where possible to support NASA customers in conversion and uploading of training materials." Q. Will NSSC have automated conversion tools on hand as GFP to support training system uploads or should the SP provide as part of the solution?	The NSSC currently uses Lectora. The approach and extent to which this requirement is addressed in an offeror's proposal is a business decision of the offeror.
06	114	Attachment J-5 Wage Determination	N/A	Q. The Department of Labor modified the Service Contract Act Wage Determinations effective July 22, 2014. Is the Government's intent to incorporate this new wage determination into this solicitation?	Yes. The revised DoL Health and Welfare rate was incorporated in RFP Amendment 04. The revised DoL Wage Determinations are now available and are included with this Amendment.
06	115	L.23, Table L-5: Model Contract Instructions	L-37	The instructions for Volume IV indicate that offerors shall complete all the items listed in Table L-5 as part of the model contract. Should the complete Representations & Certification sections be included in Volume IV, or only the clauses that Table L-5 indicates must be included?	Sections A through K and the Attachments cited in Table L-5 are to be submitted in their entirety. The Clauses and Provisions cited in Table L-5 are to inform Offerors where the entry of information within the sections is required, if applicable.

Amendment	Tracking #	RFP Reference	RFP Page	Question/Comment	Response
06	116	L-5: Model Contract Instructions	L-37	The instructions for Volume IV indicate that offerors shall complete all the items listed in Table L-5 as part of the model contract. Should the full Section B be included in Volume IV, or only the section that Table L-5 indicates is to be filled in and included, B.8 Other Direct Costs?	See question #115 above.
06	117	L.23 – Model Contract Instructions	Page L.37	The instructions for Volume IV state that "The Offeror shall sign and submit one original and one copy of signed SF 33 along with two (2) copies of the completed model contract." Does this mean that within each copy of Volume IV that is submitted (One Original + Two Copies), two complete model contract documents should be contained? In other words, should the 3 Volume IV binders contain six completed copies of the model contract?	In accordance with L.23, Offerors shall submit: one (1) original, signed SF 33/model contract, two (2) copies of the signed SF 33, and two (2) copies of the completed model contract. **Answer revised via Amendment 08.**
06	118	L.19 – Proposal Preparation Instructions	L13 to L15	Would it be acceptable to use 10 point Times New Roman font within all volumes' headers and footers, strictly for volume identification, page number identification, solicitation number identification, and FAR disclosure statement?	No.

Amendment	Tracking #	RFP Reference	RFP Page	Question/Comment	Response
06	119	L.19 – Proposal Preparation Instructions	L13 to L15	Regarding formatting of the required contract data such as contract #, period of performance, etc, contained within past performance references cited within the Past Performance volume, exactly what information is it acceptable to put within tables using 10-point TNR font?	No. See question #89 above.
06	120	L.19(b)	L14 to L15	Section L.19(b) states that "The font size for text within charts and graphs shall be proportional to the chart or graph. If the Offeror intends for the information within charts and graphs to be legible, single spacing shall be used and the font size shall be no smaller than 10 point." In the response to question #30, the Government indicated that the font size for the compliance matrix should be 11-point, and in the response to question #89,the Government indicated that the font size for Past Performance information should remain at 11 point. However, the RFP does not specifically address the acceptable font size for other tables. Generally proposal instructions allow for a slightly smaller font for tables to support formatting and inclusion of detailed information as long as it is legible. Is it acceptable for tables other	Tables are not considered charts or graphs and are subject to the 11 point minimum Times New Roman font size.

Amendment	Tracking #	RFP Reference	RFP Page	Question/Comment	Response
				than those already specified in response to questions 30 and 89 to use 10-point font?	
06	121	L.19(b)	L14 to L15	Section L.19(b) states that "The font size for text within charts and graphs shall be proportional to the chart or graph. If the Offeror intends for the information within charts and graphs to be legible, single spacing shall be used and the font size shall be no smaller than 10 point." Does this instruction include use of 10-point font for tables other than those identified in response to questions 30 and 89?	See question #120 above.
06	122	L.20(d)(1) bullet point 1	L-21	Section L.20(d)(1) bullet point 1 includes the instruction "and how the functionality of these systems can be used to improve the delivery of Procurement Services?" This aspect of the instruction is not included in the evaluation criteria outlined in Section M.4.B(b)(1)(d). Does the Government wish Contractors to address improvement of service delivery as part of its response to the technical approach for Procurement Services? If so, how will this element of the response be evaluated?	RFP sections L.20(b)(1), L.20(c)(1), L.20(d)(1) and L.20(f)(3) have been revised to remove the "improve the delivery" sentence and are now incorporated into the continuous improvement requirements covered in RFP section L.20(a)(5). A revised section L is provided with this Amendment.

Amendment	Tracking #	RFP Reference	RFP Page	Question/Comment	Response
06	123	N/A	N/A	Does NSSC currently have and make use of a portal where its standard processes can be accessed by Civil Servants and Service Provider personnel?	Yes. The NSSC has an internal web site for information access.
06	124	L.20(a)(1)	L-17	RFP Section L.20(a)(1) references PWS Section 2.0 which identifies a number of shared services administration functions. Does the Government expect Contractors to write a specific approach for Resource Management or shall we acknowledge the requirement and that we will provide the required support?	Offerors shall address the Shared Services Administration M.4 Evaluation Factors for Award, M.4(B)(1)(a) and L.20 Volume I: Mission Suitability Proposal Instructions, L.20(a). The approach and extent to which these requirements are addressed in an offeror's proposal is a business decision of the offeror.
06	125	L.20(a)(1)		RFP Section L.20(a)(1) references PWS Section 2.0 which identifies a number of shared services administration functions. Does the Government expect Contractors to write a specific approach for scheduling or shall we acknowledge the requirement and that we will provide the required support?	See question #124 above.
06	126	L.20(a)(1)		RFP Section L.20(a)(1) references PWS Section 2.0 which identifies a number of shared services	See question #124 above.

Amendment	Tracking #	RFP Reference	RFP Page	Question/Comment	Response
				administration functions. Does the Government expect Contractors to write a specific approach for subcontract management or shall we acknowledge the requirement and that we will provide the required support?	
06	127	L.20(a)(1)		RFP Section L.20(a)(1) references PWS Section 2.0 which identifies a number of shared services administration functions. Does the Government expect Contractors to write a specific approach for business management or shall we acknowledge the requirement and that we will provide the required support?	See question #124 above.
06	128	L.20(a)(1)		RFP Section L.20(a)(1) references PWS Section 2.0 which identifies a number of shared services administration functions. Does the Government expect Contractors to write a specific approach for risk management or shall we acknowledge the requirement and that we will provide the required support?	See question #124 above.
06	129	L.20(a)(1)		RFP Section L.20(a)(1) references PWS Section 2.0 which identifies a number of shared services administration functions.	PWS Section 2.22 Facilities and Space Management Support states, “During contract performance,

Amendment	Tracking #	RFP Reference	RFP Page	Question/Comment	Response
				Does the Government expect Contractors to write a specific approach for facilities support or shall we acknowledge the requirement and that we will provide the required support?	the NSSC may elect to issue a task order for some or all facility and space management responsibilities to the SP." Offerors would only need to address this requirement with a specific approach or plan when/if the Government decides to issue a future task order for this support.
06	130	L.20(a)(1)		RFP Section L.20(a)(1) references PWS Section 2.0 which identifies a number of shared services administration functions. Does the Government expect Contractors to write a specific approach for safety and occupational health management or shall we acknowledge the requirement and that we will provide the required support?	See question #124 above.
06	131	L.20(a)(1)		RFP Section L.20(a)(1) references PWS Section 2.0 which identifies a number of shared services administration functions. Does the Government expect Contractors to write a specific approach for records management or shall we acknowledge the requirement and that we will	See question #124 above.

Amendment	Tracking #	RFP Reference	RFP Page	Question/Comment	Response
				provide the required support?	
06	132	L.20(a)(1)		RFP Section L.20(a)(1) references PWS Section 2.0 which identifies a number of shared services administration functions. Does the Government expect Contractors to write a specific approach for security support or shall we acknowledge the requirement and that we will provide the required support?	See question #124 above.
06	133	L.20(a)(1)		RFP Section L.20(a)(1) references PWS Section 2.0 which identifies a number of shared services administration functions. Does the Government expect Contractors to write a specific approach for business continuity planning and execution or shall we acknowledge the requirement and that we will provide the required support?	See question #124 above.
06	134	L.20(a)(1)		RFP Section L.20(a)(1) references PWS Section 2.0 which identifies a number of shared services administration functions. Does the Government expect Contractors to write a specific approach for logistics support or shall we acknowledge the requirement and that we will	See question #124 above.

Amendment	Tracking #	RFP Reference	RFP Page	Question/Comment	Response
				provide the required support?	
06	135	L.20(a)(1)		RFP Section L.20(a)(1) references PWS Section 2.0 which identifies a number of shared services administration functions. Does the Government expect Contractors to write a specific approach for support to stakeholder/employee communications or shall we acknowledge the requirement and that we will provide the required support?	PWS Section 2.21 Design, Production and Delivery of Communication Materials states, "During contract performance, the NSSC may elect to issue a task order for some or all of the design, production, and delivery of communication materials." Offerors would only need to address this requirement with a specific approach or plan when/if the Government decides to issue a future task order for this support.
06	136	L.20(a)(1)		RFP Section L.20(a)(1) references PWS Section 2.0 which identifies a number of shared services administration functions. Does the Government expect Contractors to write a specific approach for business operations or shall we acknowledge the requirement and that we will provide the required support?	PWS Section 2.23 Business and Administration Operations Support states, "During contract performance, the NSSC may elect to issue a task order for support to some Business and Administration

Amendment	Tracking #	RFP Reference	RFP Page	Question/Comment	Response
					activities to the SP." Offerors would only need to address this requirement with a specific approach or plan when/if the Government decides to issue a future task order for this support.
06	137	Attachment J-1 PWS Section 3.5.2 vs 3.4.2.10	80/90	The government states in section 3.5.2 that the SP should provide the technology to support the document management function; however section 3.4.2.10 states that the government will purchase all hardware, software, etc. Please confirm that the unit rates for document management are intended to be labor-only pricing.	Unit rates are labor/indirect pricing only.
06	138	Attachment J-24 GFE	N/A	Please provide the volume of physical server instance by operating system type, e.g., Windows Server, Red Hat Linux, etc.	104 - Windows Servers 17 - HyperV /VMWare 5.0 (old standalone VM servers) 10 - VMWare 5.5 (New VM environment)
06	139	Attachment J-24 GFE	N/A	Please provide the volume of virtual server instance by operating system type, e.g., Windows Server, Red Hat Linux, etc.	45 - Windows Server

Amendment	Tracking #	RFP Reference	RFP Page	Question/Comment	Response
06	140	Attachment J-24 GFE	N/A	Please provide the usable storage volume for each storage array.	Total Usable storage on SAN - 115TB Currently in use - 93TB
06	141	Attachment J-24 GFE	N/A	Please provide an application to server map.	The server map is being reviewed and will be made available in the NSSC NEX-GEN document library as soon as a releasable version has been approved.
06	142	Attachment J-24 GFE	N/A	What server virtualization platform is being used, e.g., VMWare v-Sphere, Microsoft Hyper-V, etc	VMWare (main virtual platform) and Microsoft Hyper-V (to be converted to VMWare)
06	143	Attachment J-1 PWS 3.4.3.2.2	83	Please provide the volume of database instances by database type, e.g., MS SQL, Oracle, etc.	SQL Total = 212 (Dev = 74, Test = 84, Prod = 54) Oracle Total = 34 (Dev = 10, Test = 11, Prod =13)
06	144	Attachment J-1 PWS 3.4.2.10	80	Please provide the volume of middleware instances by product type, e.g., Websphere, etc, if in fact, middleware is in use (no middleware was apparent in Attachment J-25)	No middleware.

Amendment	Tracking #	RFP Reference	RFP Page	Question/Comment	Response
06	145	Attachment J-1 PWS 3.4.3.2.3	83	Is the patching of servers currently automated? What product is used?	Microsoft Patches (Automated using WSUS). VMWare Patches (Automated using VMWare Update Manager) All other application patches (e.g. - TomCat, Cold Fusion, Java, etc) are manual
06	146	Attachment J-1 PWS 3.4.3.2	82	What tool is used to monitor servers and applications?	NetIQ
06	147	Attachment J-28, Amendment 4, Attachment 5	3.2 Summary Tab	Regarding Attachment J-28, Amendment 4, Attachment 5, It appears as if the '3.2 Summary' tab is not collecting FTEs or ODC costs from 3.2.5.	See question #109 above.
06	148	Attachment J-30 Key Personnel Resume	N/A	In the Resume Template for Key Personnel, Key Personnel candidates have many years of experience encompassing numerous contracts. While the Key Personnel Candidates will be able to provide, at most, the exact name of the contract on which they worked, it may be impossible to provide the specific contract information including Government CO Name(s) Telephone Number(s), Customer Name, Customer Address, Position/Title	Page 4 of Attachment J-30 states “Do not submit work experience for time periods prior to 2004.” Attachment J-30 remains unchanged.

Amendment	Tracking #	RFP Reference	RFP Page	Question/Comment	Response
				Customer & Telephone Number. Also, given the span if time it is probable that point of contacts are no longer available. In substitution of this requirement, suggest providing up to three professional references.	
06	149	Attachment J-28, Price Template		Tab "3.2 Summary" is not including the totals (WYE and price) from tab "3.2.5 Summary". We respectfully request an update to the template so the "Contract Summary" tab can reflect the correct totals	See question #109 above.
07	150	L.22(c)	L-35	My question relates to the requirement for financial statements. We are a small business (under 15 employees), and our accountant has provided a quote of $5,000 to complete these financials. This is an undue financial burden that we cannot justify in a proposal effort. Is there a lower-cost alternative that you would accept? Or, can we provide non-reviewed financials for the proposal, and upon any potential award, then provide the official reviewed financials?	The Government considered the request and determined that the current RFP requirements are reasonable. RFP section L.22(c) remains unchanged.
07	151	Amendment 03, Question #79	N/A	Question: In response to question #79, will the Government also provide the estimate of the number of contractor personnel providing Shared Services Administration under PWS 2.0?	No. Unlike question #79 for I3P Business Office Support where the Government pre-populated its best estimate of the number of personnel, PWS

Amendment	Tracking #	RFP Reference	RFP Page	Question/Comment	Response
					Section 2.0 concerns the Offeror's approach to providing Shared Service Administration support. Attachment J-28 requires each Offeror to populate Section 2.0 with its approach (labor categories and hours) for Shared Services Administration functions. The number of personnel currently conducting this work should have no bearing on what approach an Offeror takes or business decision an Offeror makes regarding this requirement.
07	152	L.20, Attachment J-1, M(1)(a)(7)	M-5	The required tabs in Section L.20, Table L-3, and subsequent instructions to offerors, do not seem to address PWS Areas 3.6 (Agency-Wide and Federal IT Initiative), 3.7 (New Business and Special Projects) and 3.9 (Agency Business Support Services). Given the importance of growth and new business implied by NSSC Industry Briefing, published Strategic Goals and	The section referenced is incorrect. We assume that the reference is M.4(B)(1)(a)(7). Two of PWS sections cited (3.6 and 3.7) do not have existing work associated with them and are not being evaluated. PWS section 3.9 is only being evaluated under

Amendment	Tracking #	RFP Reference	RFP Page	Question/Comment	Response
				Section M.1.a.7, please confirm that these three PWS areas ought to be addressed in this proposal. We recommend addressing this in TA-6, Cross-Cutting Support	L.20(i) MA-2 Staffing as the support is minimal. New business is to be addressed under M.4(B)(1)(a)(7) and L.20(a)(7) which are part of TA-1 Shared Services Administration.
07	153	N/A	N/A	Can you update me on the status of the question we submitted on 7/31? We are requesting status as it was not answered under that last RFP Q&A/Amendment. Thank you for your consideration in this Matter.	The Government received the question and is developing a very detailed response for publication via a future Amendment.
07	154	M.4(D) L.22	M-12 L-34	Because the Government expressed its preference to maintain a highly motivated workforce, can offerors propose a year-to-year escalation of the SCA rates?	The approach and extent to which the Offeror applies escalation in its proposal is a business decision of the Offeror.
07	155	L.22(c)	L-35	Currently on the above solicitation, NASA is requiring all small business to submit reviewed financials, which obviously is a burden. I would like to request a waiver of requirement to submit reviewed financials as this is an enormous burden for hub zone and service-disabled veteran-owned companies	To clarify, not all subcontractors are required to submit reviewed financials (please reference L.22(c)). See question #150 above.

Amendment	Tracking #	RFP Reference	RFP Page	Question/Comment	Response
08	156	L.19	L-14	We are finding it difficult to properly and completely address all of the Government's section L requirements for TA 1-7, MA 1-6, and SB 1-2 within the limitation of 125 pages (not including appendices). Would the Government consider increasing the page limit from 125 to 150?	The Government considered the request and determined that the current RFP requirements are reasonable. Section L.19 remains unchanged.
08	157	L.19(b)	L-15	L.19(b), paragraph 3 states "The font size for text within charts and graphs shall be proportional to the chart or graph. If the Offeror intends for the information within charts and graphs to be legible, single spacing shall be used and the font size shall be no smaller than 10 point." In the case of some complicated graphics such as organization charts, 10 point font is too large of a font size to be in proportion to the graphic. Should text within graphics be in proportion to the rest of the graphic, or should it be 10 point even when 10 point is too large to be proportionate with the rest of the graphic?	As stated in RFP section L.10(b), the font size in charts and graphs shall be no smaller than 10 point.
08	158	L.22 (C)	L-35	L.22(c) states that subcontractors that will be awarded over $3,000,000 of the annual contract value must submit audited financial statements for the past 2 fiscal years (or, in the case of small businesses under $10M	Financial statements shall be provided for any subcontractor to be awarded over $3,000,000 of the annual contract value. If no subcontractors

Amendment	Tracking #	RFP Reference	RFP Page	Question/Comment	Response
				revenue, reviewed financial statements). If a subcontractor will be awarded less than $3M of the annual contract value, is that subcontractor required to submit any form of audited, reviewed, or any other type of financial statements?	meet this threshold, the two (2) subcontractors (unless the contractor is only using a total of one subcontractor) receiving the most subcontracting dollars shall submit the same information as the Offeror is required to submit. Reviewed annual financial statements from a licensed independent public accountant will be accepted in lieu of audited financial statements for small businesses with gross annual receipts not exceeding $10,000,000.
08	159	Attachment J-28 Pricing Template	Phase-in Tab	The tab for "Phase-in Price" is lock such that the offeror can only specify labor hours against the contract labor categories, with corresponding labor rates which are automatically populated from the LOE Labor Rates tab. Thus, if the offeror intends to use other employees, such as corporate functional support, to conduct phase-in activities, that do not map directly to the listed labor categories, the only place in the current spreadsheet to record the additional labor expense is in the	The Government determined that the labor categories developed for this Procurement are adequate for contract performance, including Phase-in. If an Offeror cannot map the Corporate Functional Support to the required labor categories, it should

Amendment	Tracking #	RFP Reference	RFP Page	Question/Comment	Response
				ODC line. Will the government consider inserting a block of rows for other specified labor categories and a column for the associated rates of those additional labor categories in order to expressly identify transferred-in labor for the phase-in period?	include the costs in the ODC total as an Intercompany Transfer and explain the basis and rationale under L.22(b) Pricing Assumption & Estimating Techniques.
08	160	Att. J--13 Labor and Transaction Rates Att. J--18 Staffing Profile Att. J--28 Price Template	L-38	Please confirm that these three references should not to be included in Volume IV – Model Contract? Please advise how to address these attachments in the body of the Model Contract.	Attachments J-13 and J-18 are required as part of the model contract. Attachment J-28 should be submitted as part of Volume III Pricing Information. Section L.23 Table L-5 has been revised to provide clearer instructions.
08	161	Att. J--29 Past Performance Questionnaire Att. J--30 Key Personnel Resume	L-38	An earlier amendment indicated that a blank copy of the Past Performance Questionnaire be included in the Model Contract. Will a blank copy of the Key Personnel Resume also be acceptable for inclusion in the Model Contract?	As stated in the response to Question #19, The Government does not expect any information to be submitted as Attachment J-29. Likewise, no information is required for Attachment J-30. Section L.23 Table L-5 has been revised to provide clearer

Amendment	Tracking #	RFP Reference	RFP Page	Question/Comment	Response
					instructions.
08	162	Att. J-30 Key Personnel Resume	N/A	Attachment J-30 Key Personnel Resume indicates that contact information is required for both the Supervisor and Government CO and COR. If the person being bid as Key has been employed directly by the Federal Government what specific contact information must be included in the Key Personnel Resume?	The individual's manager that was responsible for his or her performance reviews.
08	163	DRFP Q&A 26 and 49; Section H.5(g)	H-5 to H-7	We hereby request the Government re-consider its position as expressed in its response to DRFP Question 49 by precluding the EAST contractor from participation in the NSSC Nexgen procurement. Our analysis shows that the EAST contractor has organizational conflicts of interest on two counts: (1) unequal access to information and (2) impaired objectivity. As the Government is aware, many of the underlying applications used by NSSC personnel to perform the required transactional services, are maintained and upgraded, as necessary, under the EAST contract. The Government's response to DRFP question 26 from industry day implies that there is a plan generated by the NEACC and its EAST contractor to upgrade, over time, applications used by the NSSC for which performance of	The Government has considered the request and has determined that the EAST contractor shall not be precluded from participating in the NSSC Nex-Gen procurement. For a detailed memo on the basis of which the Government made this determination, please go to the NSSC Nex-Gen Service Provider Contract Recompete - Document e-Library Webpage at https://answers.nssc.nasa.gov/app/answers/detail/a_id/6666/

Amendment	Tracking #	RFP Reference	RFP Page	Question/Comment	Response
				those upgrades is accomplished by the EAST contractor. The details of this plan remain unknown to all NSSC Nexgen bidders except for the EAST contractor. Performance of upgrades to the underlying applications managed by the NEACC could create efficiencies in the NSSC Nexgen transactional services that could only be properly reflected in the Government's requested time-phased transactional pricing, if known by the bidder. Understanding this upgrade schedule gives the EAST contractor an unfair advantage on the NSSC Nexgen bid in that they can price in the positive impact of an upgrade schedule known only to them amongst the NSSC Nexgen bidders. Furthermore, in the event the EAST contractor is awarded NSSC Nexgen, this creates a conflict of interest in that the EAST contractor can use its position on that cost-type contract to advocate for and/or prioritize those upgrades that create maximum financial benefit for it under NSSC Nexgen which will be a fixed price contract. Review of FAR 9.5 and NASA's own guide on organizational conflicts of interest would dictate for the following reasons that the EAST contractor should be precluded from the NSSC Nexgen	

Amendment	Tracking #	RFP Reference	RFP Page	Question/Comment	Response
				competition: 1. An OCI due to ―unequal access to information is created when a contractor has access to nonpublic information which may provide the firm an unfair competitive advantage in a later competition for a government contract. In these ―unequal access to information‖ cases, the concern is the risk of the firm gaining a competitive advantage. 2. An OCI due to ―impaired objectivity is created when ―a contractor‘s judgment and objectivity in performing the contract requirements may be impaired due to the fact that the substance of the contractor‘s performance has the potential to affect other interests of the contractor.	
09	164	Attachment J-21 Workload Data	3.8.1 ESD	Can you provide any information on the cyclical nature of the contacts at the ESD?	The busiest days are typically Mondays followed by Tuesdays (mornings) and the first day or two after a holiday. Contacts can also be driven by software changes/updates, policy changes, etc.

Amendment	Tracking #	RFP Reference	RFP Page	Question/Comment	Response
09	165	Attachment J-21 Workload Data	3.8.1 ESD	Contacts per month for Jan, Feb, etc.?	This information is provided in Attachment J-21 Workload Data, FY13 Monthly Tab.
09	166	Attachment J-21 Workload Data	3.8.1 ESD	Contacts per day of week for Monday, Tuesday thru Sunday?	Sunday – 39 Monday – 1450 Tuesday – 1269 Wednesday – 1261 Thursday – 1027 Friday – 839 Saturday – 38 Representative sample from June 2014 for the 24x7 hours of ESD
09	167	Attachment J-21 Workload Data	3.8.1 ESD	Contacts per hour from by the hour 12:00 am, 1:00 am etc?	ESD data from June 2014 has been posted to the NSSC Nex-Gen Document Library.
09	168	Attachment J-21 Workload Data	3.5.1 CCC	Can you provide any information on the cyclical nature of the contacts at the CCC?	See question #164 above.
09	169	Attachment J-21 Workload Data	3.5.1 CCC	Contacts per month for Jan, Feb, etc.?	This information is provided in Attachment J-21 Workload Data, FY13 monthly tab.

Amendment	Tracking #	RFP Reference	RFP Page	Question/Comment	Response
09	170	Attachment J-21 Workload Data	3.5.1 CCC	Contacts per day of week for Monday, Tuesday thru Friday?	Monday – 199 Tuesday – 194 Wednesday – 182 Thursday – 211 Friday – 149 Representative sample from June 2014 for the M-F hours of CCC.
09	171	Attachment J-21 Workload Data	3.5.1 CCC	Contacts per hour from by the hour 7:00 am, 8:00 am thru 7:00 PM?	CCC data from June 2014 has been posted to the NSSC Nex-Gen Document Library.
09	172	Attachment J-21 Workload Data	3.8.1 ESD	The percentage of routine request at the customer contact center is about 51% according to question 50. Can you provide the percentage of routine requests at the Enterprise Service Desk?	Approximately 51%
09	173	Attachment J-21 Workload Data	3.8.1 ESD	What percentage of contacts are currently utilizing Tier 0 (self-service) for the enterprise service desk?	13%. This is for ticket creation, not resolution of the problem.
09	174	Attachment J-21 Workload Data	3.5.1 CCC	What percentage of contacts are currently utilizing Tie 0 (self-service) for the customer contact center?	<10%. This is for ticket creation, not resolution of the problem.
09	175	Attachment J-21 Workload Data		Are Tier 0 (self-service) counted in the first call resolution statistic and/or transaction counts?	No.

Amendment	Tracking #	RFP Reference	RFP Page	Question/Comment	Response
09	176	Attachment J-1 PWS	3.8.1	Is the late shift support for the Enterprise Service Desk required to be onsite?	Yes. Either the NSSC or MSFC Satellite office.
09	177	L.22(c)	L-35	If a small business subcontractor (under $10m revenue) merged with another company in 2013, and as a result can only provide reviewed financial statements for 2013, is that acceptable? Or would reviewed financial statements need to be included for the last two years for both of the pre-merger companies separately?	Reviewed financial statements for the last 3 years should be submitted for the company being proposed to work under the contract.
09	178	Attachment J-1 PWS Section 2.20	22	Can the Government provide an estimate of the volume of incoming and outgoing mail to be processed by the SP as described under PWS section 2.0 as part of logistics support?	No. The Government does not track the number of incoming or outgoing packages or pieces of mail.
09	179	L.23	L-37	The Volume IV: Model contract instructions state: "The Offeror shall sign and submit one original and one copy of signed SF 33 along with two (2) copies of the completed model contract." This statement seems to indicate that either (a) the “Original” model contract must contain both the original and a copy of the SF33, along two full copies of the model contract, or (b) that one of the 3 Model Contract volumes to be submitted will be missing an SF 33 (one original SF 33 + one copy	See revised Question #117 and Amendment 08 which clarified the language contained in RFP section L.23.

Amendment	Tracking #	RFP Reference	RFP Page	Question/Comment	Response
				= 2 SF 33 forms). This contradicts Table L-2 which indicates that three total Model Contract volumes (each containing an SF 33) are to be submitted. **Question:** Can the Government please clarify the instructions for the number of copies of the SF 33 and the model contract that must be submitted?	
09	180	L.23	L-37	Must all copies of the Model Contract volume submitted contain either an original or copy of the SF 33?	Yes. See revised Question #117 and Amendment 08 which clarified the language contained in RFP section L.23.
09	181			Do signed copies of the SF 1449s for all amendments need to be included anywhere in the proposal submission?	Acknowledgement of Amendments issued via an SF 30 (Not SF 1449) is accomplished in Block 14 of the SF 33.