

1. Is a Top Secret (TS) Security clearance needed?

**A: No. The RFP will not contain a requirement for processing Classified National Security Information (CNSI); however, personnel performing work under the contract will be subject to standard Federal background investigation, see FAR 52.204-9 "Personal Identity Verification of Contractor Personnel."**

2. Are there any types of cutting edge technologies desired?

**A: Yes. GSFC's diverse mission requirements, including extensive scientific and engineering needs, require routine consideration and appropriate adoption of cutting edge technologies. Our innovations program works to assess emerging technologies, identify promising approaches of benefit to NASA, and integrate them into reliable and effective operation.**

7. Does NASA intend to move everything as a service?

**A: Yes.**

8. How important are quality certifications?

**A: Formal certification is not required.**

11. Given this is an 8(a) set-aside, why does the Government require a SB participation plan?

**A: A Small Business participation plan is not required.**

12. Is teaming allowed? If so, will all partners need to be 8(a)?

**A: Teaming is allowed and the Prime has to be an 8(a) performing 51% of the work.**

13. If teaming is allowed will it be 51:49.

**A: Please see previous response to question 12.**

14. Is the incumbent going to be competing?

**A: The government cannot comment on the incumbent's decision to compete on this requirement. The decision to compete is at the discretion of the incumbent.**

15. Can non-NASA and NASA Goddard technical experience and knowledge receive an exceptional score in the Mission Suitability criteria?

**A: All proposals will be evaluated as specified in Section M of the Request for Proposal.**

16. Will NASA Goddard past performance be graded higher than non-NASA Goddard past performance?

**A: No. All proposals will be evaluated as specified in Section M of the Request for Proposal.**

17. Will the Government consider dropping the past performance requirement to \$2M?

**A: No. The \$4M threshold for past performance references is appropriate for the size of this procurement.**

18. How many (Full Time Employee) FTE's are currently supporting the GUEST contract?

**A: Under the current GUEST Contract there are 94 Work Year Equivalents (WYE). The skill mix and labor categories for GITISS are provided in the GPM and are essentially the same as the current GUEST Contract.**

19. Will this contract be single award?

**A: Yes. This is a single award, Cost Plus Fixed-Fee (CPFF) IDIQ contract.**

20. How do I relate our responses from Section 1.0 to Section 2.0? The DRFP asks us to respond to Section 1.0 but doesn't mention Section 2.0.

**A: The Offeror's response under Subfactor A is to address only Section 1.3-1.7 of the SOW, along with the Representative Task Orders (RTOs); whereas an Offeror shall describe its management approach (Subfactor B) towards accomplishing ALL of the requirements of the SOW. The Offerors response to Representative Task Orders will address Section 2.**

21. Will there be Government Furnished Equipment (GFE) or just Installation-Accountable Government Property (IAGP)?

**A: The contract will contain an Installation-Accountable Property under Section J in Attachment I.**

22. May an 8(a) prime use the property management system of a significant subcontractor?

**A: Yes use of a Property Management System by a Significant Subcontractor is acceptable.**

23. Who is the incumbent?

**A: The incumbent is Arctic Slope Regional Corporation (ASRC) Primus.**

24. Will the Government consider extending the phase-in period to 45 days?

**A: The phase-in period will be extended from 30 days to 45 days in the Final RFP.**

25. Will the Government consider increasing the due date of the proposal to 45 days after the Final RFP release?

**A: The government does not intend on extending the proposal due date at this time.**

26. How do vendors access the website? Where do we go?

**A: The requirement is located on NASA's NASA Acquisition Internet Service (NAIS) at the following address: <https://prod.nais.nasa.gov/cgibin/eps/bizops.cgi?gr=D&pin=51#160411>.**

27. No past performance will be assessed at a neutral rate. What does that mean?

**A: If an offeror has no record of past performance, it will be scored a neutral rating.**

28. Why is this not a multi-award IDIQ?

**A: The government determined that based on the requirement that the task orders as so integrally related that only one Contractor could perform the work. Therefore, GSFC Procurement sought approval to allow a single award IDIQ contract from the Associate Administrator for Procurement through a Determination and Findings, which was approved on 4/16/2014.**

29. Any restrictions on Joint Ventures?

**A: Joint Ventures may propose on this requirement.**

31. Is there a separate small business track?

**A: No. This procurement is a total competitive 8(a) set-aside.**

32. Will the Government accept proposal files submitted in MS Word and Excel (Windows 7) and backward compatible Excel 2010 or later?

**A: All Volumes should be prepared using either Microsoft Word (version 2003 or newer) or a searchable Portable Document Format (PDF) compatible with Adobe Reader (version 8 or greater). Cost proposal charts shall use Microsoft Excel (with backwards compatibility for Microsoft Excel 2003). Formulas, not values should be used in Excel spreadsheets, unless otherwise directed in the cost model instructions, where amounts are calculated in electronic versions. The Final RFP will be revised.**

33. What other contracts (stand-alone contracts or tasks on other vehicles) are envisioned to be consolidated, in addition to GUEST?

**This procurement is mostly comprised of the GUEST contract however current small dollar contracts for Capital Planning and Investment Control (CPIC) and IT innovation will be folded into the GITISS requirement.**

34. Past Performance – is there a minimum annual value of past performance we can submit? The Draft RFP stated \$4M per year does that still hold?

**A: As stated in the RFP Section L.26 GSFC 52.215-230 Past Performance, page 82: “Prime Offerors shall furnish the information requested below for all of your most recent contracts (completed and ongoing) for similar efforts with a minimum average annual cost/fee incurred of \$4M that your company has had within the last 3 years of the RFP release date.**

**For the purposes of the Past Performance Volume, a proposed significant subcontractor is defined as any proposed subcontractor that is estimated to meet/exceed an average annual cost/fee of \$4M.” See Previous Response at Question #17.**

35. What exact time are questions due on September 2<sup>nd</sup>?

**A: All comments and questions regarding this DRFP should have been submitted in writing no later than 2:00pm EST, September 7, 2014.**

36. Is there any Top Secret work performed on the current contract?

**A: Please see previous response at Question #1.**

37. Do you anticipate the Top Secret Security clearance remaining?

**A: Please see previous answer at Questions #1.**

41. Can a Joint Venture be bigger than 25.5 mil capability?

**A: Please refer to 13 CFR 121.103(h) SBA affiliation rules and the determination as to whether a JV is compliant with the size standard. Potential offerors should be working with their SBA Business Development Specialist.**

**Also, as referenced in the 13 CFR 124.513,**

**(b) Size of concerns to an 8(a) joint venture. (1) A joint venture of at least one 8(a) Participant and one or more other business concerns may submit an offer as a small business for a competitive 8(a)**

procurement so long as each concern is small under the size standard corresponding to the NAICS code assigned to the contract, provided:

(i) The size of at least one 8(a) Participant to the joint venture is less than one half the size standard corresponding to the NAICS code assigned to the contract; and

(ii)(A) For a procurement having a revenue-based size standard, the procurement exceeds half the size standard corresponding to the NAICS code assigned to the contract; or

(B) For a procurement having an employee-based size standard, the procurement exceeds \$10 million;

(3) Notwithstanding the provisions of paragraphs (b)(1) and (b)(2) of this section, a joint venture between a protégé firm and its approved mentor (see §124.520) will be deemed small provided the protégé qualifies as small for the size standard corresponding to the NAICS code assigned to the procurement and has not reached the dollar limit set forth in §124.519.

42. What is the limitation of JV to pursue this project?

**A: SBA determines whether an entity qualifies as an 8(a) Joint Venture and SBA is the approval authority for these business arrangements. Please refer to the Code of Federal Regulations 13 (CFR) 124.513 entitled, *Under what circumstances can a joint venture be awarded an 8(a) contract?* Companies are to work with their SBA Business Development Specialist for assistance.**

46. The incumbent team for GUEST represents a workforce of over 50,000 people (ASRC, SAIC, Booz Allen and Hamilton and a few more). What is the expected size, in terms of workforce, for the GITISS winning team?

**A: The Government Pricing Model (GPM), Cost Exhibit 1A specifically, has provided the estimated labor categories to complete the GITISS requirements. It is each offeror's discretion to determine the appropriate technical approach and skill mix in response to this requirement. All offerors will be evaluated based on Sections L and M in the Request for Proposal. Please see previous response at Question #18.**

47. Will the past performance size of \$4M be reduced?

**A: Please see previous responses at Questions #17 and #34.**

48. Will NASA Goddard prime past performance be graded higher than subcontractor past performance?

**A: As stated in the RFP Section M GSFC52.215-330 Past Performance Evaluation Factor page 91: *"The past performance of the prime contractor will be weighted more heavily than any significant subcontractor or combination of significant subcontractors in the overall past performance evaluation."***

49. Can you define Innovation vs. Innovation Support?

**A: Please refer to the "Innovation Environment" document listed in the GITISS e-Library.**

50. How long does it take NASA to implement new technologies or add existing technologies to the enterprise?

**A: The implementation time varies, and is based upon testing of the new technologies to determine the impact to the enterprise environment.**

51. What is the current recovery time in the event of planned downtime?

**A: This depends on many variables and the criticality of the operation; however, generally, the recovery time cannot exceed 8 hours.**

52. What is the recovery time in mocks runs for outages?

**A: The recovery time in mocks run is 4 hours.**

53. Where does NASA stand today on the upgrade path to 40/100 gb standards?

**A: The Communication Services Office continually assess NASA's communications architecture to identify opportunities for new technology and process insertions that improve capabilities, reduce cost, and better enable NASA's mission. In April 2014, the Backbone Equipment Refresh project was completed providing the ability to upgrade WAN links to 100GB and eliminate single points of failure, where applicable. Currently, each center determines bandwidth upgrades to their LAN as required to support center specific science and mission requirements.**

54. Where does NASA stand today on the upgrade path to 16gb standard's?

**A: There is currently no upgrade path to 16gb standards.**

55. How would NASA rate the incumbent's current performance?

**A: The government can't comment on the incumbent's performance.**

56. Ref L.21, p. 64: The Draft RFP indicates that the Management Plan, is excluded from the page Limitation. Is it the Governments intent that the required management approach (Subfactor B – Management Approach) be submitted as a separate Management Plan? If Subfactor B – Management Approach is intended to be included in the page limitation for Volume II, Mission Suitability, then what information is the Government requiring in the Management Plan?

**A: There is not a requirement for a separate management plan. The final RFP will include revisions to L.21.b Proposal Content and Page Limitations.**

57. Ref L.21, p. 70: The Draft RFP indicates that the Work Breakdown Structure (WBS) contained in Enclosure C of the solicitation shall be used to structure the Mission Suitability Volume. Page 71 of the RFP, states that the technical approach shall address Sections 1.3 – 1.7 of the SOW. Can the Government confirm that the technical approach, addressing Sections 1.0 – 1.2 and 2.0 – 2.8 will be evaluated? Is it the Government's intent to have offerors address Sections 1.0 – 1.2 and 2.0 – 2.8, within Volume II, Mission Suitability, as subsections to the technical approach addressing PWS 1.3 – 1.7?

**A: The Offeror's response under Subfactor A is to address only Section 1.3-1.7 of the SOW, along with the Representative Task Orders (RTOs); whereas an Offeror shall describe its management approach (Subfactor B) towards accomplishing ALL of the requirements of the SOW. See previous response at question #20.**

58. Ref. L.21 (b)(1), p. 64: The Draft RFP references a "Management Plan" that does not appear elsewhere in the entire document. Does this refer to the "IT Security Management Plan" referenced in Section B.3, p. 3? If so, then there is an apparent conflicting requirement given that the IT Management Plan is due to the Government 30 days after contract effective date & annual updates as required. Please clarify.

**A: Please see previous response at Question #56.**

59. Ref L.26, p. 83: The Draft RFP states "The Offeror shall provide the following information on all past/current contract references that meet the above criteria for the Prime Offeror and each significant subcontractor". Will the Government evaluate past performance references from subcontractors that

may perform important areas of the work, but whose work share will not equal to the significant threshold as indicated in this section”?

**A: The government will only evaluate past performance submitted by the Prime Offeror and Significant Subcontractor as indicated in Draft RFP Section M.5 GSFC 52.215-330 Past Performance Evaluation Factor, page 91.**

60. Ref L.26, p. 82: The Draft RFP states that “a proposed significant subcontractor is defined as any proposed subcontractor that is estimated to meet/exceed an average annual cost/fee of \$4M”. We respectfully request that the Government change the Past Performance qualifying criteria for proposed significant subcontractor to an estimated annual average cost/fee of \$2M instead of the current requirement of \$4M.

**A: The average annual cost/fee requirement is applicable to both the Prime Offeror and any Significant Subcontractors, as stated in the Draft RFP Section L.26 GSFC 52.215-230 Past Performance Volume, page 82. Please see previous response at Questions #17 and #34.**

61. Ref L.26, p. 84: The Draft RFP states “The Offeror shall instruct each of its references to return the questionnaire directly to the Government in a sealed envelope.” Will the Government consider changing this requirement to allow references to return the questionnaire via e-mail as an alternative to the sealed envelope?

**A: The Final RFP will be revised; questionnaires may be mailed, emailed or faxed.**

62. The Government’s proposed past performance threshold of annual cost/fee incurred of \$4M annually unjustifiably restricts competition. We respectfully request that the Government reconsider the threshold level. We suggest that an average level of \$2M is more reasonable and allows for greater competition and inclusion of qualified companies.

**A: Additional consideration has been given to the annual cost/fee requirement of \$4M, however it has been determined that the past performance threshold is consistent with the magnitude of the proposed contract. Please see previous response at Questions #17 and #34.**

63. Can the Government please provide a Microsoft Word version of Exhibit 12 - Past Performance Questionnaire?

**A: The past performance questionnaire is only available in Portable Document Format (PDF).**

64. How many staff (Full Time and Part Time) are working on the current contract? Can the government please provide the breakdown of the labor categories and the number of personnel working on the current GUEST contract?

**A: Please see previous response at Question #18.**

65. Exhibit 1A- Government Pricing Model (GPM) – Offerors Management and Administrative Costs. What are the different “Program Management and Administrative Support activities” anticipated by the Government for this contract?

**A: It is at each offeror’s discretion to determine its technical and management approach to the requirements of this solicitation.**

66. Can the Government provide the historical data for “Offeror Management and Administrative Labor Categories and/or Labor-oriented Recurring Other Direct Costs (ODCs)/Cost Estimating Relationships (CERs)” on the current GUEST contract? Can the Government also provide the historical data for

“Offeror Non-Labor Recurring Other Direct Costs (ODCs)/Cost Estimating Relationships (CERs) Costs” on the current GUEST contract?

**A: Historical data for the current GUEST contract is not available.**

67. Can the government clarify the “Portion %” column in Exhibit 2A OFFEROR TO GOVERNMENT CONTRACT NON-MANAGEMENT DIRECT LABOR CONVERSION spreadsheet?

**A: If an offeror is using a composite rate (of no more than 3 labor categories), an offeror will show in the ‘Portion %’ column what percentage of that composite rate each labor category represents.**

68. The Government issued an IT Security Plan Cover page with the draft RFP (160411-DRAFT-002-010\_Attachment G.pdf). Is it the Government’s intention that an IT Security Plan be submitted with the proposal response?

**A: The Information Technology (IT) Security Plan and Assessment Plan, Attachment G, shall be submitted 30 days after contract award as stated in Draft RFP, Section J.1 GSFC 52.211-101 List of Attachments, page 48.**

69. Will there be a specific labor category for Program Manager and Deputy Program Manager for the GITISS contract? If so, can the Government provide a position description and corresponding minimum education and experience for the Program Manager and Deputy Program Manager?

**A: Labor categories and corresponding minimum education and experience were provided in the Government Position Descriptions were provided in the Draft RFP Enclosure A. Each Offeror shall submit a Management Approach and Staffing Plan as indicated in Draft RFP Section L.24 GSFC 52.215-210 Mission Suitability Volume Instructions (Competitive), Subfactor B –Management Approach, page 71.**

70. Ref L.24, p. 71, Subfactor A 4th paragraph: References a Task Ordering References a Task Ordering Procedure clause in Section H. Section H does not have a Task Ordering Procedure clause, however there is a Task Ordering Procedure (Oct 1996) on page 44 of the RFP. Did the Government intend to reference the Task Ordering Procedures on page 44 (Section I.108)?

**A: Section L.24, p.71 will be corrected in the Final RFP to read Section I.**

71. Ref L.21, p. 64: The Past Performance Volume page limitation is 25 pages with the note “Prime Offeror individually and each individual significant subcontractor individually”. Is it the Governments intent that: The Prime Offeror have a 25 page “Information from the Offeror” and each individual subcontractor have an additional 25 page “Information from the Offeror”? Is there a 25 page limitation TOTAL for the prime and significant subcontractors.

**A: The Past Performance Volume page limitation includes both the Prime Offeror and any Significant Subcontractors.**

72. Ref. L.21 (b)(2), p. 64: “Text in Diagrams, schedules, charts, tables, artwork, and photographs shall be no smaller than 10 point.” Please confirm that 10 point Arial Narrow font is acceptable to the Government for all diagrams, schedules, charts, tables, artwork, and photographs.

**A: The offeror shall use text no smaller than 10 point type Times New Roman font.**

73. Ref. L.21 (a)(4), p. 63: “Two electronic copies of the offeror’s proposal, designating one as “back-up,” shall be submitted (in addition to the hardcopies specified above) in Microsoft Word and Excel (Windows XP) or Portable Document Format (PDF) (version 8.0 or greater).” Given that security support

for Microsoft XP ended in April 2014, please confirm that the Government will accept electronic files generated under Microsoft Windows 7.0 or 8.0/8.1.

**A: Please see previous response to Question #32.**

74. There appears to be inconsistency in terminology involving “Performance Work Statement” and “Statement of Work” across the Draft RFP, Attachment A—Statement of Work, and Enclosure C—PWS Work Breakdown Structure (WBS) for GITISS. For example, on page 70 of the Draft RFP, there is the following language: “in accordance with the PWS instructions in Attachment A.” However, Attachment A does not reference “Performance Work Statement” or “PWS.” Please clarify.

**A: Draft RFP Section L.24 GSFC 52.215-210 Mission Suitability Volume Instructions, page 70 and Enclosure C will be corrected to read ‘Statement of Work’.**

75. Ref. L.24 2, p. 70: “The Work Breakdown Structure (WBS) contained in Enclosure C of this solicitation shall be used to structure the Mission Suitability Volume.” Ref. L.24 3., p. 71: “The technical approach shall address Sections 1.3 – 1.7 of the SOW in enough detail to clearly and fully demonstrate that the offeror understands the requirements and the inherent problems associated with the objectives of this procurement.” Ref. L.24 3, p. 71: “The Offeror shall describe its management approach towards accomplishing ALL of the requirements of the SOW.” Please confirm that an offeror’s response under Subfactor A is to address only Sections 1.3 – 1.7 of the SOW, along with the Representative Task Orders (RTOs); whereas an offeror’s response under Subfactor B must address SOW 1.3 1.7 as well as SOW 2.1 – 2.8.

**A: The Offeror’s response under Subfactor A is to address only Section 1.3-1.7 of the SOW, along with the Representative Task Orders (RTOs); whereas an Offeror shall describe its management approach (Subfactor B) towards accomplishing ALL sections of the SOW. For additional reference please see L.24 GSFC 52.215-210 Mission Suitability Instructions.**

76. Ref. M.2, p. 86: To further underline the importance of FAR Subpart 15.3, we respectfully request that the Government add the words “best value” to the narrative.

**A: The language in Draft RFP Section M.2, page 86 remains unchanged.**

77. Ref H.13 p.24: This section states that the Government will share historical data with regard to labor category descriptions, full time equivalents, average direct labor rates and other related contract information. The costing sheets available as attachments to the RFP provides most of this information except average direct labor rates. We respectfully request that the Government provide industry with average labor rates to help us develop final costing estimates.

**A: Please see previous response to Question #66.**

78. The DRFP currently is issued with a DD254 for “Top Secret”. At the industry day it was mentioned that the security clearance will be dropped. Is the intention to drop security clearance in its entirety or will the Government downgrade the clearance requirement to “Secret”. Please clarify.

**A. Please see previous response to Question #1.**

79. RTO #3 requires contractor support to perform activities related to running GSFC, Code 700 data centers. We respectfully request the following information to help us develop system administration strategies:

Indicate the number of data centers that are in scope for this contract.

Please also name the data centers that are in scope for this contract.

Please also provide details on the software and hardware installed at the datacenters

**A: There is one data center within the scope of this contract. The data center name is the Code 700 Data Center. Details regarding software and hardware installed in the Data Center is located in the GITISS e-Library.**

80. In cases where a bidder's (prime or subcontractor) past performance reference would normally be provided by another contractor that is also bidding on the GITISS contract, there is a concern that the contractor may have a conflict of interest in terms of completing the past performance questionnaire and may choose not to complete the questionnaire or choose to provide neutral or Not Rated responses on the questionnaire. In such cases, in addition to the references provided through the customer questionnaires, would the Government consider also contacting Government references that the bidder has identified as being clearly aware of the quality of the work provided on the referenced contract?

**A: As stated in the Draft RFP Clause M.5 GSFC 52.215-330 Past Performance Evaluation, page 92 –the Government may review and consider past performance information on other contracts that it is award of or that are made available from other sources and inquiries from previous customers. This will include references provided by the Offeror.**

81. Is there a requirement to submit pricing on RTOs?

**A. No. There is not a requirement to provide pricing on RTOs.**

82. Are there any union employees on the current contract and will this information be provided?

**A. There are not any union employees on the current contract.**

83. May bidders submit multiple consolidated lists as questions arise in preparing the proposal or is September 2nd the only time the government will accept questions?

**A. The due date to submit questions with respect to the Draft RFP was September 2<sup>nd</sup>, 2014. There will be another due date for questions to be submitted for the Final RFP.**

84. Will the government consider extending the RFP response timeframe from 30 days to 45 days?

**A. Please see the response to Question #25.**

85. Will Goddard consider having a site visit for a tour of the working locations?

**A. The government does not plan to hold a site-visit for this requirement.**

86. With security being an important component of the GITISS services, will the government consider having an open forum discussion on the security environment within GSFC?

**A: The Government will not have an open forum discussion at this time.**

87. Page 74, "An important prerequisite for the award of the contract is the Prime Offerors must have an accounting system that has been determined adequate by the cognizant administrative office for accumulating and reporting incurred costs prior to contract award." Please define adequate accounting system.

**A. An adequate accounting system means that an offerors accounting system has gone through an Audit from DCAA and DCAA has found that its accounting system is adequate.**

88. L.21(a)(4) states that pricing files are to be submitted in Microsoft Excel 2003 format. Is this version correct or may the Excel files be submitted in a newer version (i.e., 2007 or 2010)?

**A. Please see previous response to Question #32.**

89. Would NASA consider allowing 8pt. Arial Narrow font just for graphics (keeping tables at 10pt.)? 8pt Arial Narrow is commonly accepted in graphics and allows for a cleaner, less "bulky" looking graphic.

**A: Please see previous response at Question #72.**

90. Does the accounting system of the Prime have to be DCAA approved? Do the accounting systems of subcontractors have to be DCAA approved?

**A. Yes the accounting systems of both the primes and significant subcontractors have to be DCAA Approved.**

91. Section M.5, paragraph 5 states that "For a prime contractor's contract reference(s) to be considered at least minimally "relevant", it must meet/exceed an average annual cost/fee incurred of at least 4M". We respectfully request that this requirement be removed. We believe that relevance of the same or very similar work should not necessarily be based on dollar amount received for the work.

**A. The government will not remove this requirement.**

92. If we were to form a JV with a Mid-size company, would we qualify as an 8(a)-approved JV as long as we (SBA 8(a) firm) own 51% of the JV?

**A. SBA determines whether an entity qualifies as an 8(a) Joint Venture and SBA is the approval authority for these business arrangements. Please refer to the Code of Federal Regulations 13 (CFR) 124.513 entitled, Under what circumstances can a joint venture be awarded an 8(a) contract? Companies are to work with their SBA Business Development Specialist for assistance.**

93. Would we need to get SBA approval for a JV or would it be permissible to not go through the SBA process?

**A. SBA approval is required for an 8(a) Joint Venture.**

94. Are there a limitation on the number of companies that can be combined in the creation of a Joint Venture?

**A: A Joint Venture is considered a contractor team arrangement, which (Per FAR 9.601 -- Definition. "Contractor team arrangement,"), means an arrangement in which --two or more companies form a partnership or joint venture to act as a potential prime contractor. Also, as referenced in the Code of Federal Regulations 13 (CFR) §124.513, If approved by SBA, a Participant may enter into a joint venture agreement with one or more other small business concerns, whether or not 8(a) Participants, for the purpose of performing one or more specific 8(a) contracts.**

95. Under NAICS code 541513, the size limitation is 25.5M. If a JV where one or more of the participating companies is larger than 25.5M, yet, the JV itself is less than 25.5M, is this permissible?

**A: Please refer to 13 CFR 121.103(h) SBA affiliation rules and the determination as to whether a JV is compliant with the size standard. Potential offerors should be working with their SBA Business Development Specialist.**

**Also, as referenced in the 13 CFR 124.513,**

**(b) Size of concerns to an 8(a) joint venture. (1) A joint venture of at least one 8(a) Participant and one or more other business concerns may submit an offer as a small business for a competitive 8(a)**

procurement so long as each concern is small under the size standard corresponding to the NAICS code assigned to the contract, provided:

(i) The size of at least one 8(a) Participant to the joint venture is less than one half the size standard corresponding to the NAICS code assigned to the contract; and

(ii)(A) For a procurement having a revenue-based size standard, the procurement exceeds half the size standard corresponding to the NAICS code assigned to the contract; or

(B) For a procurement having an employee-based size standard, the procurement exceeds \$10 million;

(3) Notwithstanding the provisions of paragraphs (b)(1) and (b)(2) of this section, a joint venture between a protégé firm and its approved mentor (see §124.520) will be deemed small provided the protégé qualifies as small for the size standard corresponding to the NAICS code assigned to the procurement and has not reached the dollar limit set forth in §124.519.

96. How is the past performance evaluated in the case of a JV? Would the participating companies' past performance roll up to the JV, and is it considered at 100% of evaluation criteria or less?

**A. The past individual contracts from any/all individual JV prime partner companies will be considered as part of the prime contractor evaluation for any proposed JV, assuming the individual contract references meet the minimum solicitation requirements, including recency and minimum size for past performance contract references.**

97. What is NASA's expectation in terms of the number of personnel meeting the requirements of the proposal? In the past one, it was fixed price and going aggressive on the number of personnel was almost a requirement, but with the current one being cost plus fixed fee, does NASA envision requiring the same, less or additional personnel?

**A. Please see previous response to Question #18.**

98. Solicitation, Section L - Mission Suitability: Will Goddard allow offerors to include an Executive Summary in Volume - II, Mission Suitability Volume?

**A. Executive Summary is allowable under Mission Suitability however the page limitation is applicable.**

99. Reference is made to "Management Plan" under Proposal Components excluded from page limitations in the Mission Suitability Volume. Are we correct in assuming that "Management Plan" refers to ALL of the contents under "Sub-factor B - Management Approach" (p. 71)?

**A: Please see previous response at Question #56.**

100. At Section, Section L p. 64 of the Solicitation it states, "Text in Diagrams, schedules, charts, tables, artwork, and photographs shall be no smaller than 10 point." Will Goddard also allow offers to utilize 10 pt Font for the Page Header/Footers?

**A: Text shall no smaller than 10 point type Times New Roman font may be used for diagrams, schedules, charts, tables artwork, and photographs. All other text shall be no smaller than 12 point type Times New Roman font. Please see previous answer at Question #72.**

101. At Section L.24 of the Solicitation, References are made both to the offeror's Program Manager and essential critical positions. Will Goddard be requiring resumes to be submitted? Recommend that Goddard allow and/or require resumes to be submitted for essential critical positions.

**A: Resumes are not and will not be required for this procurement.**

102. At Section 1.3 (f), page 5 of the solicitation, What existing ITIL practices, processes, and tools are being used? Is it expected that the existing ITIL practice, processes, and tools will continue to be used during the scope of this solicitation?

**A: Although ITIL hasn't been fully implemented, based on established Information Technology Infrastructure Library (ITIL) criteria, it is currently being used at Level 3: defined (proactive) moving towards Level 4: managed (pre-emptive) being present as well. The primary tool being used in support of ITIL is the BMC Remedy application. The following are processes in the ITIL model that have been implemented that are used on a daily basis and will continue during the scope of this solicitation:**

**Service Design: Service-Level Management, Availability Management, Capacity Management, IT Service Continuity Management, Information Security Management System**

**Service Transition: Change Management, Service Asset and Configuration Management, Release and Deployment Management**

**Service Operation: Functions, Service Desk, Application Management, IT Operations Management, Technical Management, Event Management, Incident Management, Problem Management, Root Cause Analysis, Identity Management**

**Continual Service Improvement (CSI)**

103. At Section 1.3 (i), page 6, Enterprise Configuration Management (ECM) of the SOW. Does GSFC already have ECM processes and supporting software tools they currently use? If so, are there any shortcomings that should be addressed as contract requirements?

**A: No. GSFC is not currently using ECM processes and supporting software tools.**

104. At Section 2.1 Enterprise Architecture (EA), Page 10 of the SOW. Does GSFC already have EA processes and supporting software tools they currently use? ? If so, are there any shortcomings that should be addressed as contract requirements? What EA content is currently available and in what format? What is the level of detail? What Change Management artifacts are currently available and in what format?

**A: EA process is documented in NPR 2830.1. Other EA processes that describe collaborations and facilitations with the Mission and other stakeholders are either not documented or are included as a part of existing methods/processes. The Agency is piloting the use of the CaseWise enterprise tool for potentially leveraging at Centers. The IT Strategic Plan is on the GSFC Information Technology and Communications Directorate (ITCD) Website. Other EA content is in reformulation and/or draft. No new change management artifacts are available at this time.**

105. At Section 2.3 IT Governance, Page 12 of the SOW. Please provide this CPIC process executed within the scope of this work.

**A: GSFC utilizes the Capital Planning and Investment Control (CPIC) process prescribed by OMB Circular A-130.**

106. At Section L.26 GSFC 52.215-230 PAST PERFORMANCE VOLUME (JUN 2014) of the solicitation: The Instructions state that “Prime Offerors shall furnish the information requested below for all of your most recent contracts (completed and ongoing) for similar efforts with a minimum average annual cost/fee incurred of \$4M that your company has had within the last 3 years of the RFP release date.” For Joint Ventures, what are the requirements for Past Performance submissions?

**A: Please see previous response at Question #96. Additionally, any proposing JV shall submit past performance references that meet the solicitation’s instructions. This includes prime contract references from the individual partner companies that comprise the JV as well as any JV contract references (if applicable).**

107. Attachment A, Draft SOW: Which tasks are expected to be performed offsite? Whether this is directed by the Government or left up to the bidder, there is a direct impact on indirect cost and subcontractor labor.

**A: No technical tasks are expected to be performed offsite.**

108. Attachment A, Draft SOW Sec. 1.5, Program Project Management, p.7. Is there a specific, preferred format for the monthly report? If so, can it be included with the procurement?

**A: No, there is no specified or preferred format for the monthly report.**

109. Attachment A, Draft SOW Sec. 1.5, Program Project Management, p.7. Is there currently a system or format being used to track official communications with the COR? If so, what is it and can an example be provided with the procurement?

**A: No, there is no system or format for official communications with the COR; it is at the discretion of the contractor to determine how this element of the SOW will be completed. However, the GITISS vendor will be expected to use NASA's Task Order Management System (TOMS) for submitting tasks and proposals, and Attachment C of the RFP, Financial Management Reporting provides instructions for monthly contractor financial reports.**

110. Attachment A, Draft SOW Sec. 1.6, Systems Engineering, pp. 7-8. Please provide a list of all systems and current IT projects covered by this contract. Please indicate whether the systems/projects involve COTS, GOTS, Modified, and/or Custom applications, as defined by the SOW.

**A: Please refer to the GITISS e-Library.**

111. Attachment A, Draft SOW Sec. 1.7, Information Security, p. 9. How many Plan of Actions Milestones (POAMs) have been issued that the contractor will be responsible for completing?

**A: All POAMs are expected to be resolved before the new contract begins.**

112. Attachment A, Draft SOW Sec. 2.7.f, Information Security Management. Please re-word this sentence to clarify. It sounds like the NASA SAN has some type of best practice that we are to apply, as opposed to a requirement to apply best practices when managing/supporting the SAN.

**A: Sentence should read as follows: Incorporate industry best practices for IT security management practices from sources including Information Technology Infrastructure Library (ITIL), National Institute of Standards Technology (NIST) and other NASA Centers.**

113. GITISS Draft RFP Section F.3, Place of Performance-Services, p. 10. What is the current breakdown of personnel working out of each of the three facilities mentioned—Goddard Space Flight Center (GSFC),

Wallops Flight Facility (WFF) and Headquarters (HQ)? How often are staff required to travel from one facility to another? Where are the Key Personnel stationed?

**A: All non-management labor categories on this contract will be located at GSFC/Greenbelt. Approximately 6 trips per year are expected between GSFC and WFF and 12 trips to NASA Headquarters.**

114. Attachment I All. What make/model of virtual server host (e.g., VMWare) is hosting the Virtual Machines identified?

**A: Microsoft Hyper-V.**

115. Attachment I All. Is the hardware platform for these virtual machines is included in the list of physical servers?

**A: Please refer to the GITISS e-Library.**

116. Draft RFP F.2 Is this a five year base contract with no planned options?

**A. Yes. This is a Contract with a Five Year Ordering Period, no options.**

117. Draft RFP F.3. Is the intent that only these three locations will require ONSITE services, but that other locations may receive remote support? Does this clause preclude contractor-site performance? If so, why is there a distinction in other attachments about contractor-site rates and in-directs?

**A: Non-management labor categories are required to work on-site. It is at each Offeror's discretion to develop a technical and management approach in response to the requirements of this solicitation. Contractor-site performance is not precluded for management labor categories. However please note stated in Draft RFP Clause L.25 GSFC 52.215-223 Cost Volume Instructions states that for evaluation purposes all management and administrative costs shall be assumed offsite.**

118. GITISS Draft RFP L.26 (b) Prior Customer Evaluations (Past Performance Questionnaires), p. 84. The first paragraph references Exhibit 13 as the Past Performance Questionnaire. The Draft procurement had Exhibit 12 as the Past Performance Questionnaire.

**A: Exhibit 12 is the Past Performance Questionnaire. The Final RFP will be changed to show this correction.**

119. In Reference to Draft RFP Section H.7, page 22 -Is confirmation of an updated Reps & Certs in SAM sufficient for this requirement or does the Government expect a copy of the Reps & Certs to be delivered with the proposal?

**A: Offerors are required to submit a copy of the Reps & Certs with proposal. Confirmation of an updated Reps & Certs in SAMs will not be accepted.**

120. In Reference to Draft RFP Section L.21(a)(4),page 63 -How does the Government expect to receive the "written documentation that describes the contents of each CD-ROM and of each file"? Is this a separate hard-copy transmittal letter (or similar) or should it be included in the body of the proposal in some way?

**A: The final RFP will be revised to remove 'written documentation' language.**

121. In Reference to Draft RFP Section L.21 (b)(1), page The asterisk indicates that the Government is expecting a separate Basis of Estimate and separate "Information from the Offeror" for the Prime and each significant subcontractor and that each submission has the requisite page limits. Please clarify this

requirement. Our recommendation is to include both Prime and Sub input(s) to demonstrate TEAM capabilities and a cohesive basis of estimate.

**A: A separate Basis of Estimate for the Cost Volume, as specified in Draft RFP Section L.25, and Information from the Offeror for the Past Performance Volume, as specified in Section L.26, is required for the prime and each significant subcontractor. The RFP will not be changed.**

122. In Reference to Draft RFP Section L.21(b)(1) -Does the Government expect a narrative in the Basis of Estimate that describes how and why the labor mix and approach was determined or just a list of labor categories and rates to support the RTO, etc. The confusion is the 35 page limit as this seems excessive if the requirement is just to provide an LOE.

**A: As stated in Draft RFP Section L.25 GSFC 52.215-223 Cost Volume Instructions, page 80, 'At the contract level, the Offerors shall give the Government insight into the cost estimating thought processes and methodologies used by the Offeror in estimating the Program Management and Administrative Support and subcontracting. Emphasis should be placed on a description of the cost estimating processes and methodologies themselves, and how these relate to the technical approach described in the proposal.**

**For Program Management and Administrative Support, explain in detail how it is estimated. If direct, explain the estimating approach and assumptions (direct labor rates, hours per year, percentage of direct labor hours or costs, etc.). If indirect, identify what pool each function is included within. Describe how subcontracts were estimated and how determined reasonable. Please note if you have experience with the proposed subcontractor(s), if utilized. For any significant subcontract that has a potential estimated value in excess of the threshold stated in Section 1 instructions above, BOEs must be provided by that significant subcontract following the above specified format.'**

123. In the solicitation at L.22(c)(8). Although the issue of the facility clearance for a JV was discussed at Industry Day, we recommend you formally change the requirement. Any JV member with an existing facility clearance can hire cleared personnel and maintain the clearance as needed and JVs formed for this procurement would not have the ability to obtain the facility clearance without the contract award.

**A. Please see the Answer to Question 1.**

124. Attachment B, Sec. 2, p. 3. The Draft RFP states a 5 year POP, how does this relate to the six Contract Years identified in this document?

**A. NASA Requires rates for a possible sixth year of contract performance based on 1816.505-72, "Task and delivery order contract performance periods" (a), which states, "Performance of orders placed within the contract ordering period may extend for up to one year past the end of the ordering period if the contracting officer determines that performance of the order cannot reasonably be deferred to any planned follow-on contract."**

125. In Reference to Attachment B Sec.3, p. 3. Please provide more detail regarding the CER and how this relates to the indirect charges against direct labor.

**A: Cost Estimating Relationships (CERs) are specific and unique to each offeror, based on its accounting system and cost accumulation practices. If an offeror has no established CER-based charging practices, then this area should be left blank. Nothing related to the RFP requirements or resultant contract requires that a contractor establish or utilize any CERs.**

126. In Reference to Attachment B Sec. 6, p. 5 --Should vendors apply the labor categories and levels from Enclosure A to Part 6 of this document?

**A: Position Qualifications for labor categories listed in Enclosure A should be submitted in Part 6 of Attachment B Indefinite Delivery Indefinite Quantity (IDIQ) Direct Labor Rates, Indirect Rates and Fee Matrices. As stated in Draft RFP Section L.24.3 page 72, The offeror shall identify its minimum essential critical positions required to meet all of the requirements of the SOW. Additionally, the rationale for identifying these positions as critical shall be provided, as well as a description for each position. The description shall include the position title, to whom the position reports, summary of duties and responsibilities, any specific requirements/licensing, and minimum education and minimum experience required for the position. In addition, offerors shall provide written position qualifications for the specific labor categories envisioned for this requirement. Offerors need to address the minimum requirements in the position description, to include the necessary experience, summary of duties and responsibilities, specific requirements/licensing, minimum education and minimum experience required for the position. Each position qualification shall not exceed ½ page in length. All position qualifications will be incorporated into the resultant contract as Attachment B.**

127. In Reference to Attachment B Sec. 6, p. 5 --Is the intent that all vendors provide this document with a ceiling rate that is burdened (except for fee) for every position and level from Enclosure A? If not, the Government should define minimum position qualifications to ensure consistent assumptions/pricing from vendors.

**A: The Offeror shall insert its direct labor rates for all labor categories as specified in Attachment B. As stated in Draft RFP L.25 GSFC 52.215-223 Cost Volume Instructions page 77: the Prime Offeror shall propose, by Contract Year, unburdened direct labor rates for all labor categories in Section 1; all individual bid indirect rates in Section 2, clearly delineating Onsite; and all rates or factors for Cost Estimating Relationships in Section 3. Onsite is defined as NASA Goddard Space Flight Center, Wallops Flight Facility, or Headquarters. Offsite is defined as the Contractor's facility. The Offeror's fee percentage(s) included in Section 4 of the matrices shall be used to calculate the fixed fee for performing all task orders issued under the resultant contract. In Section 5, the Prime Offeror shall include fully-loaded direct labor rate matrices for each significant subcontractor. In Section 6, provide Position Qualifications for all Offeror proposed direct labor categories specified in Section 1 and all subcontractors' proposed direct labor categories specified in Section 5. Also see previous response at Question #126.**

128. In Reference to Attachment B, General --For pricing purposes, the Government should identify the labor categories expected to require a TS clearance (or those that have needed it historically). For example, if vendor A assumes no developer resources will require a TS, their underlying direct labor estimate will be significantly less than Vendor B that assumed a TS clearance for some number of development support staff.

**A: Please see previous response at Question #1.**

129. In Reference to Attachment E & F, General--Recommend these documents to be delivered 30 days post-award.

**A: As stated in the Draft RFP, L.24 Mission Suitability Volume Instructions, page 73-74 the Safety and Health Plan and Quality Assurance Plan remain due at the time of the proposal.**

130. In Reference to Attachment G, General --Will this plan be related to the awarded vendor's contract operations (e.g., offsite operations security) or some other scope?

**A: The Information Technology (IT) Security Plan is specific to the IT system and not the contract. The IT Security Management Plan shall describe the processes and procedures that will be followed to ensure appropriate security of IT resources that are developed, processed, or used under this contract. For additional information refer to NFS 1852.204-76 Security Requirements for Unclassified Information Technology Resources.**

131. In Reference to Attachment K --Is the data reported in the Contract Historical Data report protected from FOIA release due to the proprietary nature of the information (e.g., salary, experience, etc., of employees)?

**A: The data reported in Attachment K Contract Historical Data Report is permissible to FOIA release however information that is proprietary in nature is not releasable.**

132. In Reference to Attachment M --What is the intent of this document in terms of the IDIQ and the CPFF nature of the contract? For example, is the intent to request an increase in approved cost for a particular task order or is there some other scenario when (presumably) work in contract scope requires this request to be submitted.

**A: It is not the Government's intent to request an increase in approved cost for a task order or other work in contract. The Government does not encourage nor discourage enhancements to the contract's technical performance documents. However if an Offeror chooses to propose performance enhancements, the offeror must clearly define the enhancement(s) in Attachment M, "Contractor Proposed Enhancements". Please see Draft RFP Section L.24.1 page 70.**

133. In Reference to Attachment N --Does the Government expect direct-billed labor categories of a non-technical nature to be used that will require Wage Determination and applicability of the Service Contract Act?

**A: Please see responses provided for Questions #134 and #135.**

134. In Reference to Attachment N --Can the Government provide examples of when Wage Determination might be applicable under the IDIQ?

**A: A wage determination should be used for each classification with the Administrator of the Wage and Hour Division of the U.S. Department of Labor has determined to be prevailing in a given area. Additional information regarding wage determinations may be found at the Department of Labor website, [www.dol.gov](http://www.dol.gov); and [www.wdol.gov](http://www.wdol.gov).**

135. In Reference to Attachment N --For pricing purposes, can the Government specify and describe the categories that will need to be priced in accordance with the SCA and Wage Determination?

**A: For additional guidance refer to Enclosure A Government's Position Descriptions and Attachment O Statement of Equivalency Rates.**

136. In Reference to Attachment O --What is "Enclosure 5"? Was this meant to be "Enclosure A— Government Position Descriptions"?

**A: Attachment O will be corrected in the Final RFP to read Enclosure A- Government Position Descriptions.**

137. In Reference to Attachment O --What is the intent of providing this information for the IDIQ?

**A: Attachment O was provided in accordance with FAR Clause 52.222-42 Statement of Equivalent Rates for Federal Hires.**

138. In Reference to Attachment O -What is the intent of providing a link to the 2007 pay tables?

**A: Attachment O will be updated with the link to the 2014 pay tables.**

139. In Reference to Attachment O --Will the labor categories identified be specifically priced for the IDIQ or is this intended to be an example for historical purposes?

**A: For additional guidance refer to Enclosure A Government's Position Descriptions and Attachment O Statement of Equivalency Rates.**

140. In Reference to Attachment O --How does this list of labor categories impact the list in Enclosure A, especially where there is overlap?

**A: The labor categories listed in Attachment O Statement of Equivalency Rates are the non-exempt employees listed in Enclosure A Government's Positions Descriptions.**

141. In Reference to Enclosure A --Are vendors expected to provide a ceiling price for each labor category and level in Attachment B from the descriptions in this document?

**A: Please see previous response at Question #127.**

142. In Reference to Enclosure A --Recommend the Government replace BS with Bachelor's Degree and allow additional experience in lieu of a degree. There are many highly-qualified and mature candidates who did not attend college or who had a career change post-graduation.

**A: The minimum education and years of experience requirement listed in Enclosure A remains.**

143. In Reference to Exhibits 1-11 --How will these worksheets be evaluated for award?

**A: As stated in Draft RFP M.4 GSFC 52.215-323 Cost Evaluation Factor, page 91: The Proposed costs of the Government Pricing Model and the rates proposed in Attachment B, Direct Labor Rates, Indirect Rates and Fee Matrices will be assessed to determine reasonable and cost realism. The cost evaluation will be conducted in accordance with FAR 15.305(a)(1) and NFS 1815.305(a)(1)(B).**

144. In Reference to Exhibits 1-11 --We recommend the Government provide a detailed explanation (and examples) for every element of the worksheets beyond the general instruction in the RFP.

**A: Detailed information regarding Cost Exhibits 1-11 and complete instructions has been provided in the Draft RFP for an offeror to provide a response to the requirements.**

145. In Reference to Exhibits 1-11 --Are these worksheets required for the IDIQ or only at the Task Order level?

**A: Offerors shall submit Cost Exhibits 1-11 at contract level, as specified on each individual exhibit.**