

Previously Submitted Question Phase 1, #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.

Response (revised): FAR Part 16.301-3 states “A cost-reimbursement contract may be used only when -- ... The contractor’s accounting system is adequate for determining costs applicable to the contract or order.” Ultimately, it is the cognizant contracting officer who determines the adequacy of an accounting system prior to contract award. In most cases, this determination is supported by information obtained in a DCAA audit of the offeror’s accounting system.

Previously Submitted Question Phase 1, #90. Does the accounting system of the Prime have to be DCAA approved? Do the accounting systems of subcontractors have to be DCAA approved?

Response (revised): Yes, the accounting system of the prime must be determined to be adequate by the cognizant contracting officer, which is typically supported by information obtained in a DCAA audit of the prime offeror’s accounting system (see Question 87). No, subcontractors, significant or otherwise, are not required to have an approved accounting system in order for a contract to be awarded to the prime offeror.

1. 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?

Response: No. GSFC is not currently using ECM processes and supporting software tools. There are no shortcomings that should be addressed as contract requirements; however, we are looking for plausible solutions that will provide integration and infrastructure support.

2. In Reference to Exhibits 1-11 --How does these worksheets relate to Attachment B?

RESPONSE: In Attachment B, the prime offeror shall propose by contract year, the unburdened direct labor rates for all of the labor categories, all individual bid indirect rates, all rates or factors for Cost Estimating Relationships, fixed fee rates, and fully-loaded direct labor rate matrices for each significant subcontractor as stated in Draft RFP Section L.25 GSFC 52.215-223 Cost Volume Instructions, page 76.

3. In Reference to Exhibits 1A-1B --Should these worksheets be used to develop a notional labor mix/level of effort and price for the RTOs?

RESPONSE: The solicitation does not require pricing of the RTOs. The Government will evaluate the offeror’s written task plans addressing each representative task for thoroughness and understanding. The Government shall evaluate the offeror’s technical approach, labor categories, projected hours, the flow of activities from start to completion (including time line), and any other information required for adequacy and reasonableness.

4. In Reference to Exhibits 2A-2B --How does this document relate to Attachment B?

RESPONSE: Please see previous response at Question #2.

5. In Reference to Draft RFP M.5, Past Performance Evaluation Factor, pp. 91-93 --As with Section L.26 (a), we recommend reducing the requirement to one program with a minimum annual average cost/fees of \$4 million.

RESPONSE: The \$4M threshold for past performance references is appropriate for the size of this procurement. 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.”

6. In Reference to Enclosure 1-RTO 1 p. 1 --The document states, “Provide application hosting for MIS systems. This includes all server space, system administration, database administration, backup/restore service, etc. required to meet application integrity, availability and confidentiality requirements.” This makes it sound as if the Government wants the Offeror to host the systems on its own servers. However, the Draft RFP says personnel will be working out of GSFC, WFF HQ. Please correct the inconsistency.

RESPONSE: The Final RFP will include revisions to Representative Task Order #1 for clarity.

7. In Reference to Enclosure 1-RTO 1 p. 1 --Although information on the number of MIS systems projects is provided--20 MIS applications with less than 5 having any regular application development activity in a given month”—it would be helpful to have additional information on the applications. For example, we would expect the model and version of the operating system, database, and application development platforms. Also to price this task order, an estimated number of changes per month for each application, any planned major upgrades that would become our responsibility, the number of users for each app to gauge escalated support costs, and the currently installed hardware platform.

RESPONSE: The final RFP will include revisions to RTO 1. Please also check the GITISS e-library for updates.

8. In Reference to Enclosure 2-RTO 2 pp. 1 --There is a stray character in the sentence “The contractor shall travel...” If this is an incorrectly deleted word, please restore it or remove the stray character.

RESPONSE: RTO 2 will be corrected to reflect removal of the stray character.

9. In Reference to Enclosure 2-RTO 2 pp. 1-4 --The RTO is meant to provide Solutions for Enterprise Wide Procurement (SEWP) Program Management Office Support. It would be helpful in the preparation of pricing and the task plan for the Government to provide additional information on the SEWP Program Management Office, including how large the office is; how many individuals—both Government and other contract personnel—are being supported by this effort; how much equipment needs to be supported; and how many individuals and their labor categories the task has historically supported.

RESPONSE: The Final RFP will include revisions to RTO 2.

10. In Reference to Enclosure 2-RTO 2 Business Strategy and Outreach and General Business Support, pp. 1-2 --This task includes defining and executing marketing strategies, and planning and organizing logistics and staffing for multiple events each year. In order to enable offerors to price this task accurately and to provide a meaningful task plan, we suggest that the task include some specific subtasks to price and provide an approach and timeline for. For example, for marketing strategies, specify a range of products—creating 1 brochure, provide updates to 5 web pages and one Facebook

site, sending out an average of 2 Twitter “tweets” per week, etc. For events, it would be helpful to have a list of potential meetings, their purpose, duration, and location.

RESPONSE: Please refer to the GITISS e-Library.

11. In Reference to Enclosure 2-RTO 2 Contract Holder Relationship Management Support, p. 2 --The RTO says, “The contractor shall provide CH training and support, including annual one-on-one meetings with each CH both locally and throughout the US.” Please provide the number of Contract Holders supported and their locations, as well as how often they are generally changed, which would indicate the need for additional training and support for New CHs.

RESPONSE: Please see the updates Representative Task Order #2, Page 2 "Contract Holder Relationship Support".

12. In Reference to Enclosure 2-RTO 2 --In order to accurately scope labor categories and pricing for this task, significantly more detail about the technical and management environment is required. Any information regarding quantity of people and/or equipment to be supported, especially defined by task area, will greatly enhance our understanding of the magnitude of the requirement. For technical support, a count of tickets by month would help as well.

RESPONSE: Please refer to the GITISS e-Library.

13. In Reference to Enclosure 3-RTO 3 p.1 --Please provide the number and/or a listing of applications currently included in the System for Tracking and Registering Applications and Worksites (STRAW). If the data center equipment to be supported is represented by the inventory in Attachment I, then please state this fact. Otherwise, please identify which items from the inventory are included in the task (or provide a separate inventory). This information is most critical to determine labor categories and cost for the Task Plan.

RESPONSE: The STRAW applications list and the Data Center equipment list used for the RTO are provided in the GITISS e-Library.

14. Enclosure 3-RTO 3 p.1 --Assuming this task includes technical support for end user issues escalated from the Service Desk, please provide a historical monthly count of tickets that are resolved by this team.

RESPONSE:

Month	Tickets
October 2013	112
November 2013	174
December 2013	127
January 2014	143
February 2014	171
March 2014	169
April 2014	212
May 2014	149
June 2014	126
July 2014	215
August 2014	166
September 2014	152

15. In Reference to Draft RFP Section L.22 (c) (5), 8(a) Joint Ventures, p. 67 --We recommend changing the wording to:

“If an 8(a) joint venture is proposed, the Offeror is required to do one of the following:

- If the Small Business Administration (SBA) has already certified the 8(a) joint venture, the Offeror must submit the SBA signed and approved joint venture agreement with submission of the proposal.
- If the SBA has not approved the joint venture agreement at the time of proposal submission, the Offeror shall describe its status in achieving joint venture approval from the SBA, including:
 - Identify the companies included in the joint venture....”

RESPONSE: Unfortunately this request cannot be accommodated.

16. In Reference to Draft RFP Section L.22 (c) (8), Contract Security Classification, p. 68 --We recommend that the following phrase be dropped:

“For proposals submitted as joint ventures, the facility clearance must be granted in the name of the joint venture and the joint venture CAGE code shall be provided.” 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.

RESPONSE: The RFP will not contain a requirement for processing Classified National Security Information (CNSI).

17. In Reference to Draft RFP Section L.26 (a), Information from the Offeror, p. 82 --We recommend that the first sentence be edited as follows:

“Prime Offerors shall furnish the information requested below for all of your most recent (within the past 3 years) contracts (completed and ongoing) for similar efforts. At least one of these efforts should have a minimum average annual cost/fee incurred of \$4M 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.” This provides assurance of a proven vendor without needlessly limiting the competition.

RESPONSE: Unfortunately this request cannot be accommodated.

18. In Reference to Draft RFP Section L.26 (a), Information from the Offeror, p. 82 --We respectfully recommend that the Government eliminate the mathematical determination of what constitutes the minimum annual average cost/fee for subcontractor past performance references. It is unnecessarily complicated and cumbersome, and provides cost information within a non-cost volume.

RESPONSE: Unfortunately this request cannot be accommodated.

19. Regarding the request for comment on the 30-day response time, we respectfully request a longer period due to the specificity required for the pricing proposal. Extra time will enable us to price the effort more precisely and enable us more time to find ways to complete the work more efficiently, thus saving the Government resources in the long run. The complexity of the required attachments and exhibits will also complicate submissions from partners and subcontractors in the cost plus model. 45-60 days would be more appropriate.

RESPONSE: The government has revised its previous response for Question #25 in Phase 1 of the Questions and Answers. The proposal due date will be extending to 45 days after the Final RFP release.

20. A number of questions were submitted at Industry day that have not yet been answered. Would the Government consider extending the Question period until 5 days after the release of Q&A from Industry Day?

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

21. In Reference to Enclosure A - Govt Position Descriptions --In the Staff Position Summary, the Levels are listed as Junior, Low Intermediate, etc., but in the descriptions that follow, the positions are listed with Roman numerals I, II, III, IV, V. May we assume that these are the same positions, e.g., I=Junior, II=Low Intermediate, etc.

RESPONSE: The Final RFP will include revisions to Enclosure A.

22. In Reference to Enclosure A - Govt Position Descriptions --The Staff Position Summary includes "Years Experience" and "Years Experience w/BS" for positions requiring a BS (Intermediate and above). Please confirm that the "Years Experience" column refers to staff without a degree and that the "Years Experience w/BS" is the experience required of a degree-holding staff member. Essentially, it includes a 6-year equivalent for a degree.

RESPONSE: Correct. The minimum years of experience for a junior level and low intermediate level position are 1-3 years and 4-6 years, respectively. The minimum years of experience for an intermediate, high intermediate and senior position are 1-3 years, 4-6 years, and 7+ years experience, respectively.

23. In Reference to Enclosure A - Govt Position Descriptions --In the Staff Positions, please confirm that a BA degree is equivalent to a BS for the purposes of meeting the minimum qualifications.

RESPONSE: Enclosure A revised to indicate a Bachelor's degree requirement.

24. In Reference to Draft RFP Section L.21(a)(4), p.63, 4th paragraph "The Offeror shall provide written documentation that describes the contents of each CD-ROM and of each file." Would the Gov't provide instructions detailing where Offerors are to provide the documentation describing the contents of each CD-ROM?

RESPONSE: The Final RFP will be revised to remove 'written documentation' language.

25. In Reference to Draft RFP Section L.21(b)(3), p.64, 1st paragraph -Please confirm transmittal letter, title pages, executive summary, tabs, table of contents, list of figures, list of tables, list of acronyms, and compliance matrix are exclude from page count.

RESPONSE: Section L will be revised in the Final RFP to clarify what documents are excluded from the page count.

26. In Reference to Draft RFP Section L.21(b)(3), p.64, 1st paragraph --The task plans for the RTOs are not included in page count. This invites extremely lengthy responses, which may amount to hundreds of pages and also gives a significant competitive advantage to the incumbent, being the only contractor able to provide detail to the individual worker level. We recommend limiting RTO responses to 15 pages per RTO to minimize evaluation effort and level the competitive playing field.

RESPONSE: Section L will be revised in the Final RFP. RTO's will be included in the mission suitability page count.

27. In Reference to Draft RFP Section L.21(b)(3), p.64, Table --The table indicates that the "Management Plan" is excluded from the 80 page limit, as are several plans included in Subfactor B. There is no requirement for inclusion of a "Management Plan" in Section L. For the purposes of this table, what constitutes the "Management Plan"? Is it all of Subfactor B (in which case the explicit exclusion of the plans is unnecessary)?

RESPONSE: There is not a requirement for a separate management plan. The Final RFP will include revisions to Proposal Content and Page Limitations, under Section L.

28. In Reference to Draft RFP Section L.22 (a), pg. 65, 1st paragraph --Section L states that "...the indicated Offeror required fill-ins in Section B-K must be completed". Please confirm the specific fill-ins that the Offeror is to complete are only Sections B and K.

RESPONSE: All required fill-ins are indicated throughout RFP Sections B-K.

29. In Reference to Draft RFP Section L.22 (a), pg. 65, 1st paragraph --Section L states that "All SF-33's require original signatures". Please confirm that all 7 copies of the cost volume (1 original, 5 copies, and 1 DCAA copy) are to be submitted with original signatures.

RESPONSE: No. An offeror is only required to submit original signatures on the original volume.

30. In Reference to Draft RFP Section L.22(c)(1), p.66, 3rd paragraph --"If an Offeror is relying on the accounting system adequacy of a Joint Venture team member, sister company, or any other affiliated company's accounting system, they must demonstrate a convincing basis for using that system as a basis for determining their own adequacy." Would the Gov't consider replacing the aforementioned in its entirety with the following: "If the Offeror is a Joint Venture, indicate whether the Joint Venture will implement a new accounting system for the Joint Venture (if so, provide a completed SF1408 (complete Section II only) and Preaward Survey of Prospective Contractor Accounting System Checklist for the Joint Venture) or if the accounting for the Joint Venture will be performed by a Joint Venture member."

RESPONSE: Unfortunately this request cannot be accommodated.

31. In Reference to Draft RFP Section L.24.2., Subfactor A, p.70, 2nd paragraph and L.24.3., p.71, 1st paragraph --Section L.24.2 states, "The Work Breakdown Structure (WBS) contained in Enclosure C of this solicitation shall be used to structure the Mission Suitability Volume." while Section L.24.3 states, "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." Given the conflicting instructions between Section L.24.2 and L.24.3, would the Gov't please clarify the requirements for responding to the SOW?

RESPONSE: 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 san 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.

32. In Reference to Draft RFP Section L.24.2., Subfactor A, p.70, 2nd paragraph and L.24.3., p.71, 1st paragraph --"The offeror shall explain the approach for identifying the optimum skill mix based upon the requirements of the SOW and the approach for matching skill mix to services/functions." Please clarify if Offerors are to use Enclosure A, Government Position Descriptions for identifying optimum skill mix.

RESPONSE: This language has been deleted from the final RFP.

33. In Reference to Draft RFP Section L.24.2., Subfactor B, p.72, 3rd paragraph “Additionally, the rationale for identifying these positions as critical shall be provided, as well as a description for each position....” Please clarify if the referenced position descriptions are above and beyond the Gov’t-provided position descriptions in Enclosure A, Government Position Descriptions.

RESPONSE: Offerors are required to identify the minimum critical positions that are required to meet all of the requirements of the SOW (see Section L of additional instructions). Enclosure A, only provides the non-management labor categories that are needed for the GITISS effort.

34. In Reference to Draft RFP Section L.24.2., Subfactor B, p.72, 3rd paragraph “In addition, offerors shall provide written position qualifications for the specific labor categories envisioned for this requirement.” Please clarify if the reference position qualifications or position descriptions are for essential critical positions or for all positions under the resulting GITISS Contract. If the later, please distinguish the requested position qualifications or position descriptions from the Enclosure A, Government Position Descriptions.

RESPONSE: Offerors are required to provide written position qualifications for the specific labor categories envisioned for this requirement. Each position qualification shall not exceed ½ page in length; and all position qualifications will be incorporated into the resultant contract as Attachment B. In addition, Offeror shall identify its minimum essential critical position required to meet all of the requirements of the SOW.

35. In Reference to Draft RFP Section L.24.3 Subfactor A, pg. 71, 4th paragraph --The instructions say to prepare the RTO Task Plans in accordance with the “Task Ordering Procedure Clause in Section H”, yet there is no such clause in Section H. Does the Government mean the clause in Section I: I.108 1852.216-80 TASK ORDERING PROCEDURE (OCT 1996)

RESPONSE: Yes. The final RFP will be revised to reflect the correction.

36. In Reference to Draft RFP Section L.24.3 Subfactor A, RTO #1; Enclosure 1 - RTO 1 --Re: “There are approximately 20 MIS applications with less than 5 having any regular application development activity in a given month.” Please clarify with respect to the number of staff performing development on these 5 (or less) MIS applications ‘having any regular application development activity in a given month’ in addition to the number of development staff working on the other applications.

RESPONSE: The Government believes RTO #1, as written, provides adequate information to assess the magnitude of the effort.

37. In Reference to Draft RFP Section L.24.3 Subfactor A, RTO #1; Enclosure 1 - RTO 1 --For applications with regular monthly development, please provide an indication of average or typical number of new requests/requirements per month and the average or typical number of requests that are released to the mission per month.

RESPONSE: There are approximately 10 new requests each month for the MIS applications. There are approximately 20 incidents related to the MIS applications each month.

38. In Reference to Draft RFP Section L.24.3 Subfactor A, RTO #3; Enclosure 3 - RTO 3 --Please provide parameters for sizing of Data Center support staff e.g. number of current staff and/or current annual budget for labor.

RESPONSE: The Government believes RTO #3, as written, provides adequate information to assess the magnitude of the effort.

39. In Reference to Draft RFP Section L.24.3 Subfactor A, RTO #3; Enclosure 3 - RTO 3 --Typically, how many new issues are entered into the Remedy System each month and typically, how many issues are resolved each month? Approximately what percentage of these issues are resolved by Code 700 data center support personnel?

RESPONSE: There are approximately 55 new issues entered into the REMEDY system each month. The number of resolved issues varies per month. Approximately 20% of the work is resolved by the Data Center staff.

40. In Reference to Draft RFP Section L.24.3 Subfactor A, RTO #3; Enclosure 3 - RTO 3 --Re: the Enterprise Test Environment (ETE), please specify the maximum number of concurrent and total users to be supported by an enterprise application.

RESPONSE: The maximum number of concurrent and total users to be supported by an enterprise application is 250.

41. In Reference to Draft RFP Section L.24.3 Subfactor A, RTO #3; Enclosure 3 - RTO 3 --Does the scope of: 'Develop, host, and manage' include developing the initial requirements and associated documentation for the ETE?

RESPONSE: Yes.

42. In Reference to Draft RFP Section L.24.3 Subfactor A, RTOs (all) --As the incumbent GUEST contractor possesses detailed knowledge of ongoing operations and programs (e.g., SEWP), would the Gov't consider providing additional details such as historical workload data, schedule of deliverables and milestones, work instructions, operating procedures, tools in use by GSFC for performing work, staffing levels, skills mix, etc. in order to enable non-incumbent Offerors the ability to produce a comprehensive response to RTOs 1-3? Alternatively, would the Gov't consider utilizing RTOs that are fictitious in nature along with fictitious historical workload data information in order to allow all Offerors an opportunity to provide a comprehensive response to RTOs?

RESPONSE: The RFP and its attachments have been designed and written to level the playing field to all potential Offerors. Representative Task Orders (RTOs) have been included in this solicitation to provide a look into typical tasks that may be completed under the new GITISS contract. The GITISS e-Library (available at <https://foiaelibrary.gsfc.nasa.gov/>) also contains documentation that may provide offerors additional insight into contract requirements.

43. In Reference to Draft RFP Section L.24.3 Subfactor B, pg. 72, 3rd paragraph; pg74, 2nd paragraph -- "Section L requests a discussion of critical positions in two places, once in the management discussion and once in the discussion of the QAP:

""The offeror shall describe the positions considered critical to meet the requirements of the contract. The descriptions shall include the rationale for identifying these positions as critical. The descriptions shall also include a list of the qualifications associated with each position. The list shall include the position title, to which the position reports, summary of duties and responsibilities, and minimum education and minimum experience qualifications required for the position.""

Further, Section M only addresses the critical positions in the management section. Are we correct that this repetition was unintentional? If so, we recommend removing the above referenced paragraph.

RESPONSE: The Final RFP will be revised to remove the additional paragraph in Section L.24, page 74.

44. In Reference to Draft RFP Section L.21 (b) (1), p.64 --The table containing page limitations lists as all of the following proposal sections "Excluded" from page count: "Cover Page, Indices, List of Acronyms, Dividers/Tabs, Task Plans for RTOs 1, 2 and 3, Management Plan, Phase-in Plan, Staffing Plan, Total Compensation Plan, Quality Assurance Plan Safety and Health Plan", Could the Government please confirm that Cover Page, Indices, List of Acronyms, Dividers/Tabs, Phase-in Plan, Staffing Plan, Total Compensation Plan, Quality Assurance Plan, and Safety and Health Plan are excluded from page count, while the remaining sections are included in page count?

RESPONSE: Please see previous response at Question #25.

45. In Reference to Draft RFP Section 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." Section L.24 (3), 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." Enclosure C (WBS) includes all of the GITISS SOW elements 1.0 through 2.8. However, the instructions for Subfactor A state that the Offerors only need to address SOW 1.3-1.7. Please confirm that the only SOW elements 1.3-1.7 need to be addressed in Subfactor A of the Mission Suitability Volume?

RESPONSE: Please see previous response at Question #31.

46. In Reference to Draft RFP Section H.9 Contractor Proposed Enhancements, p.23 -- "The Contractor shall provide the enhancements that are described in Attachment M." Section L.24.1 General Instructions, 70, "Although the Government does not encourage/discourage enhancements to the contract's technical performance documents (e.g. Statement of Work, Specification, etc.), offerors may choose to propose performance enhancements. In order for the Government to consider a proposed enhancement's value, the offeror must clearly define the enhancement(s) in Contract Attachment M, "Contractor Proposed Enhancements", in Performance Work Statement (PWS) language in accordance with the PWS instructions in Attachment A. In addition, the offeror must describe the associated benefit(s) of the proposed enhancement(s) in their Mission Suitability Volume under the applicable Mission Suitability subfactor(s). The offeror shall include Contract Attachment M as part of the model contract in the Contract Volume of their proposal." Could the Government please clarify where within the Mission Suitability Volume Contractor Proposed Enhancements should be discussed? (2) Could the Government please clarify which PWS Instructions they are referring to in Attachment A, Statement of Work? (3) Could the Government please confirm that Attachment M is excluded from page limitations?

RESPONSE: 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". An offeror may, if it chooses, to provide enhancements to the contract's technical documents. Depending on what type of enhancement an offeror chooses to propose will determine where in its proposal it will appear.

47. In Reference to Draft RFP Section L.26.(a) Information From the Offeror, p.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.", In addition to the specified requirements in the RFP, would the Government consider requiring that the Offeror has had a cited contract for at least 1 year in order to be able to adequately assess their past performance?

RESPONSE: Unfortunately this request cannot be accommodated.

48. In Reference to Draft RFP Section L.24.3 Subfactor B Management Approach, p. 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."* L.24.3 Subfactor B Management Approach, 74, *"The offeror shall describe the positions considered critical to meet the requirements of the contract. The descriptions shall include the rationale for identifying these positions as critical. The descriptions shall also include a list of the qualifications associated with each position. The list shall include the position title, to which the position reports, summary of duties and responsibilities, and minimum education and minimum experience qualifications required for the position."* The two separate paragraphs addressing critical positions on pages 72 and 74 seem to be redundant. We respectfully request that the Government consider combining these two paragraphs into a single section.

RESPONSE: Please see previous response at Question #43.

49. In Reference to Draft RFP Section L.21.(b).2 Proposal Content and Page Limitations, p.64 -- *"A page is defined as one side of a sheet, 8-1/2" x 11", with at least one inch margins on all sides, using not smaller than 12 point type Times New Roman font. Line spacing or the amount of vertical space between lines of text shall not be less than single line (Microsoft Word's default line spacing). Character spacing shall be "Normal", not "Expanded" or "Condensed."* The margins may contain headers and footers, but shall not contain any proposal content to be evaluated." Would the Government consider allowing 10 point font size for headers and footers?

RESPONSE: The offeror shall use text no smaller than 10 point type Times New Roman font. Text shall be 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.

50. In Reference to Draft RFP Section L.21 (a) (5), Matrix, p.63 -- *"The proposal shall include a matrix showing where in the proposal the technical requirements of the SOW and the evaluation criteria of this RFP are satisfied."*, (1) Is this SOW Compliance Matrix only required to be provided for the Mission Suitability Volume? (2) Since Offerors primarily are addressing Representative Task Orders, and WBS element 1.3 through 1.7 rather than the entire SOW, will the Government please clarify the contents of the matrix and how it will be used and evaluated?

RESPONSE: The matrix required in Section L shall show compliance for all aspects of the evaluated criteria as indicated in the Section L and M.

51. In Reference to Draft RFP Section L.24 3. Mission Suitability Instructions by Subfactor, Subfactor A, p.71 -- *"In accordance with the Task Ordering Procedure clause in Section H . . . "*, Please identify the Section H clause that describes the Task Ordering Procedure.

RESPONSE: The final RFP will be revised to read Section I.

52. In Reference to Draft RFP Section L.24.3 Mission Suitability Instructions by Subfactor, Subfactor B, p.72 -- *"In addition, offerors shall provide written position qualifications for the specific labor categories envisioned for this requirement."*, In the event the offeror intends to use the position descriptions

supplied in the RFP, do they need to be included in the proposal? If they do need to be included, the descriptions vary from ¼ page to more than 1 page, and are 45 pages in length. Will the Government consider requiring a page limit for the total collection of position descriptions rather than a limit for each one?

RESPONSE: Labor categories and corresponding minimum education and experience were provided in the Government Position Descriptions were provided in Enclosure A. Each Offeror shall submit a Management Approach and Staffing Plan as indicated in Section L, GSFC 52.215-210 Mission Suitability Volume Instructions (Competitive), Subfactor B –Management Approach, page 71. Please see previous responses at Questions #32 -#34, for guidance regarding position descriptions. Section L will not be revised to require a page limit for the total collection of position descriptions.

53. In Reference to Draft RFP Clause F.3 GSFC 52.237-92 PLACE OF PERFORMANCE – SERVICES (NOV 2013), 10, *“The services to be performed under this contract shall be performed at the following location(s): Goddard Space Flight Center (GSFC), Wallops Flight Facility (WFF), and Headquarters (HQ).”*, Will Government provide scope of expected activities or task requirements of contractor efforts expected at HQ and/or WFF as distinguished from GSFC?

RESPONSE: The Government’s intent for listing additional centers in Clause F.3 GSFC 52.237-92 Place of Performance –Services is to make notice to all offerors that services may be needed at additional centers. A list of expected activities or task requirements for the above locations does not exist at this time.

54. In Reference to Draft RFP Clause H.9 GSFC 52.211-100 CONTRACTOR PROPOSED ENHANCEMENTS (SEP 2013), 23, *“The Contractor shall provide the enhancements that are described in Attachment M. These enhancements, which are over and above the requirements required by the contract terms and conditions, Statement of Work and other contract attachments, were proposed by the Contractor in the proposal submitted in response to the Request for Proposal (RFP) NNG14475415R for Goddard Information Technology Integration and Support Services. The incorporation of these enhancements does not relieve the Contractor from the responsibilities of meeting all other contract terms and conditions and requirements in the Statement of Work and other contract attachments. The Contractor shall perform these enhancements on all work performed, unless specifically waived by the Contracting Officer in writing.”*, Are these enhancements expected to be “value added”, i.e. no costs to Government or reasonably priced to support proposed requirements in cost volume?

RESPONSE: Each offeror shall provide the enhancements that are described in Attachment M. It is the offeror’s responsibility to determine its technical approach, management approach and all elements of its pricing proposal.

55. In Reference to Draft RFP Clause L.21 GSFC 52.215-201 PROPOSAL PREPARATION—GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS (JAN 2014), p.62 -- *“It is NASA’s intent, by providing the instructions set forth below, to solicit information that will demonstrate the offeror’s competence to successfully complete the requirements specified in the Statement of Work (SOW), Attachment A and the Representative Task Orders (RTOs). Generally, the proposal should:”*, As Attachment A is the SOW and already included in list, please clarify this statement.

RESPONSE: Final RFP Clause GSFC 52.215-201 Proposal Preparation –General Instructions will reflect removal of the misplaced coma.

56. In Reference to Draft RFP Clause L.21 GSFC 52.215-201 PROPOSAL PREPARATION—GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS (JAN 2014) (b) PROPOSAL CONTENT AND PAGE LIMITATIONS, 64, *“(1) The following table contains the page limitations for each portion of the proposal submitted in response to this solicitation. Additional instructions for each component of the proposal are located in the contract provision noted under the Reference*

heading. **Prime Offeror individually and each individual significant subcontractor individually.*”, Is the intent here to provide BOE for each contractor, as applicable, and still remain within 35 page limit for all?

RESPONSE: A separate Basis of Estimate for the Cost Volume, as specified in Section L, and Information from the Offeror for the Past Performance Volume, is required for the prime and each significant subcontractor. The 35 page limitation is for the total component (prime and significant subcontractors).

57. In Reference to Draft RFP Clause M.5 GSFC 52.215-330 PAST PERFORMANCE EVALUATION FACTOR (JUN 2014), 91, “A “relevant” contract depends on the size and content of the contract with respect to this acquisition. 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. A proposed significant subcontractor for this procurement is defined as any proposed subcontractor that is estimated to meet/exceed an average annual cost/fee of \$4M.”, Over what period is the \$4M average annual cost/fee expected to be calculated, i.e. fiscal year, calendar year, contract period of performance to date and/or including options years?

RESPONSE: The \$4M average annual cost/fee is over a contract year.

58. In Reference to Draft RFP Section L.22.c.7 Contract Security Classification, p.68 -- In accordance with Attachment D, Contract Security Classification Specification (DD 254), Offerors shall possess a Top Secret level facility security clearance for performance of this contract and this clearance shall be maintained throughout the life of the contract., Are subcontractors required to possess a TS level facility security clearance as well, or does this only apply to the Prime contractor?

RESPONSE: Please see previous response at Question #16.

59. In Reference to Draft RFP Section L.26.b Past Performance Volume/Prior Customer EVALUATIONS (PAST PERFORMANCE QUESTIONNAIRES), p.84 -- The offeror and any proposed significant subcontractor(s) [as defined in paragraph (a)] shall provide the questionnaires provided as Exhibit 13 to each of the above references to establish a record of past performance. The Offeror shall instruct each of its references to return the questionnaire directly to the Government in a sealed envelope. The questionnaire respondent shall be a representative from the technical customer and responsible Contracting Officer with direct knowledge of your firm's performance. If possible, the Offeror and any proposed significant subcontractor(s) shall provide questionnaires to customers from NASA contracts, other Government contracts, and commercial contracts. For proposed significant subcontractor(s), references shall concern only work performed by the subcontractor’s business entity that will perform the work under this contract, if awarded., Will the Government consider accepting Past Performance References via email from the customer directly to the NASA GSFC Contracting Officer?

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

60. In Reference to Enclosure 3, RTO 3, p.1, “Develop, host, and manage the Enterprise Test Environment (ETE), ensuring sufficient availability to support all of development and testing efforts”, (1) Please confirm the ETE does not exist today and is to be developed as part of the scope of this RTO and, therefore, will be in addition to the servers listed in Attachment I, GFP. (2) Please confirm that the ETE is built to mirror the production environment, consisting of about 99 production servers, listed in Attachment I. (3) Please confirm that the ETE will not be replacing any of the development or test servers listed in the Attachment I.

RESPONSE: The ETE does not exist today and is to be developed as part of the scope of RTO #3 and will be in addition to the servers listed in Draft RFP Attachment I. The ETE is intended to mirror whatever

is needed to be tested or developed. The ETE will not replace any of the development or test servers listed under RFP Attachment I.

61. Attachment A, Section 1.6, page 7., SYSTEMS ENGINEERING, Section states: *“The contractor shall be responsible for providing the necessary systems engineering for all IT Projects under the GSFC ITCD.”* Is it possible to provide a list for “all IT Projects” clarifying the level and breadth of coverage?

RESPONSE: Please refer to the GITIS e-Library.

62. Attachment A, Section 2.5.a, page 13., APPLICATIONS AND DATA CENTER, Section states: *“Provide and maintain GSFC Data Center services.”* What GSFC data centers are to be supported by GITISS?

RESPONSE: The Code 700 Data Center will be supported by the GITISS contract.

63. Attachment A, Section 2.5.c, page 13., APPLICATIONS AND DATA CENTER, Section states: *“Perform enterprise operations and maintenance ensuring desktop, server and application performance and availability.”* What is the extent and services provided for desktop performance and availability?

RESPONSE: The vendor is not expected to perform any maintenance or services on the Desktops located at GSFC except for those explicitly managed by the vendor in areas such as the test environments. The maintenance and services performed on the applications and servers must reflect the need to be correlated with the desktop environment to ensure Center customers have access and availability to the aforementioned areas.

64. In Reference to Draft RFP Section L.21, page 62.L.24.3, Subfactor A, page 71., GSFC 52.215-201 PROPOSAL PREPARATION—GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS (JAN 2014)GSFC 52.215-210 MISSION SUITABILITY VOLUME INSTRUCTIONS (COMPETITIVE) (MAY 2014), Does the government intend for vendors to provide an approach for elements of the SOW that fall under sections 2.1-2.8? If so, how will this be evaluated?

RESPONSE: Please see previous response at Question #31.

65. In Reference to Draft RFP Section L.24.3, Subfactor B, page 73., GSFC 52.215-210 MISSION SUITABILITY VOLUME INSTRUCTIONS (COMPETITIVE) (MAY 2014), At the top of page 73 it references the Task Ordering Procedure Clause in Section H of the solicitation; however it appears Section I.108 contains the Task Ordering Procedure referenced in Section L.24, is this correct?

RESPONSE: Please see previous response at Question #51.

66. In Reference to Draft RFP Section L.21, (a) (4), page 63., GSFC 52.215-201 PROPOSAL PREPARATION—GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS (JAN 2014), The third sentence refers to “Excel (Windows XP).” We recommend deleting the term “(Windows XP).”

RESPONSE: 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.

67. In Reference to Draft RFP Section L.21, (a) (4), second paragraph, page 63., GSFC 52.215-201 PROPOSAL PREPARATION—GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS (JAN 2014), The second sentence requests that “The Offeror provide written documentation that describes the contents of each CD-ROM and of each

file.” Where in the proposal do you want this written documentation? Also, we assume this discussion will be outside of page count. Is this a correct assumption?

RESPONSE: Please see previous response at Question #24.

68. In Reference to Draft RFP Section L.18, paragraphs (a) through (g), pages 60-61., 1852.245-80 GOVERNMENT PROPERTY MANAGEMENT INFORMATION (JAN 2011), The government requests a number of property items that it needs for the solicitation. , Where in the proposal is the government looking for this response?

RESPONSE: Government Property requested in Section L.18 shall be included in the Offer Volume. See RFP Clause GSFC 52.215-203.

69. Enclosure 2, RTO #2, page 1, last paragraph, fourth sentence, SOLUTIONS FOR ENTERPRISE WIDE PROCUREMENT (SEWP) PROGRAM MANAGEMENT OFFICE SUPPORT, The sentence states, “The contractor shall travel I to events as required to provide on-site support.” We assume the sentence should read, “The contractor shall travel to events as required to provide on-site support.” Is this assumption correct?

RESPONSE: Please see previous response at Question #8.

70. In Reference to Draft RFP Section L.25, 2. (a), page 76., GSFC 52.215-223 COST VOLUME INSTRUCTIONS (MAY 2014), Section states: *“The escalation proposed for labor must be stated along with the actual escalation experienced in the last three years. Provide a statement of rationale, including the derivation, for the proposed escalation rates. If escalation is not proposed, explain why. The Offeror shall also discuss the rationale for any escalation proposed for the other cost elements. The Offeror shall also include the company's escalation history for each other cost element experienced in the past three years.”* The RFP requires that escalation for proposed costs include costs over and above the discussion of direct labor escalation factors. To clarify, the required discussion contains the following language “for any escalation proposed for the other cost elements” Is this requirement referring to direct charge elements (travel, ODC, etc.) and not indirect rates?

RESPONSE: The offeror shall include, if applicable, any proposed escalation on all cost elements including indirect rates. The offeror shall also include, if applicable, actual escalation experienced for all cost elements including indirect costs.

71. Exhibits 1a-1b, PRIME OFFEROR – GOVERNMENT PRICING MODEL, The tables in Exhibit 1 require a “loaded rate.” Is it correct to assume the loaded rates are at a Cost Plus Fixed Fee (Price) level which includes an estimate for fee within the rate or are these rates at a Total Estimated Cost level and do not include a fee in the rates?

RESPONSE: A loaded rate is the direct labor rate plus all indirect costs, including fee, if applicable.

72. In Reference to Draft RFP Section F.2, page 10., GSFC 52.217-92 EFFECTIVE ORDERING PERIOD (JAN 2014), Does the five year Period of Performance represent a Base Period only or a Base Period with Option Years?

RESPONSE: This is a contract with a Five Year Ordering Period, no options.

73. In Reference to Draft RFP I.42, page 29., 52.222-2 PAYMENT FOR OVERTIME PREMIUMS (JUL 1990), Section states “zero,” with regard to payment of overtime premiums; however, does this exclude overtime premiums required by law for SCA or Wage Determination employees identified as a part of this acquisition?

RESPONSE: "Zero" does not apply to the exception in subparagraph (a)(1) through (a)(4) of Clause 52.222-2.

74. In Reference to Draft RFP Section L.21 (b) (1), page 64. L.25 2(g), page 80., GSFC 52.215-201 PROPOSAL PREPARATION—GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS (JAN 2014) GSFC 52.215-223 COST VOLUME INSTRUCTIONS (MAY 2014), Does the 35 page limit outlined in the table on page 64 apply solely to the requirement to define the BOE methodology described on page 80?

RESPONSE: The 35 page limit applies solely to the Basis of Estimates. Please see previous response at Question #56.

75. In Reference to Draft RFP Section L.26.b, last paragraph, page 85., GSFC 52.215-230 PAST PERFORMANCE VOLUME (JUN 2014), Section states *"Offerors shall include in their proposal the written consent of their proposed significant subcontractors to allow the Government to discuss the subcontractors' past performance evaluation with the Offeror."* List of Questionnaire recipients and other similar requirements to Subcontractor Consent Letters are excluded from page count. Would the government consider excluding Consent Letters from page count so as not to penalize companies that have opted to bid with teammates for the Government's benefit?

RESPONSE: The Final RFP will be revised to exclude Subcontractor Consent letters from the 25 page limitation for the past performance volume.

76. We request that NASA provide a 45 day response time from the release of the final RFP to the proposal due date.

RESPONSE: Please see previous response at Question #19.

77. In Reference to Draft RFP Section L.21(5) - Page 63 & L.24.2 - Page 70 & L.24.3 Subfactor A – Page 71 --L.21(5) states *"The format for each proposal volume shall parallel, to the greatest extent possible, the format of the evaluation factors and subfactors contained in Section L"* L.24.2 states *"The Work Breakdown Structure (WBS) contained in Enclosure C of this solicitation shall be used to structure the Mission Suitability Volume...The Mission Suitability Volume and the Cost Volume must follow the provided WBS."* L.24.3 states *"The technical approach shall address Sections 1.3-1.7 of the SOW..."* These three requirements appear to conflict with each other. Following the L.21(5) requirement, a first level table of contents for Subfactor A might read:

- Technical Approach
- Risk Management
- Innovative Methods, Techniques or Technologies
- RTO Task Plans

This does not agree with the WBS in Enclosure C which would produce a table of contents that is identical to the Statement of Work. Following the WBS contradicts L.24.3 which asks the offeror to address SOW Sections 1.3-1.7 only.

L.24.2 introduces the following additional complexities:

- Enclosure C is a reproduction of the SOW table of contents. It includes sections like "1.1 Statement of Work Structure" that don't make sense for a proposal structure.

- The Subfactor A Technical Approach can be made to align with SOW 1.3-1.7 and 2.1-2.8.

- However, what does WBS alignment mean for the RTOs, Subfactor B, and the Cost Volume?

- Each of these comes with different L requirements that do not align with the WBS structure.

We request that these conflicts be reconciled, preferably as follows:

Delete "The Work Breakdown Structure (WBS) contained in Enclosure C of this solicitation shall be used to structure the Mission Suitability Volume...The Mission Suitability Volume and the Cost Volume must follow the provided WBS."

Delete Enclosure C.

Please confirm that SOW 2.1-2.8 should NOT be addressed in the Subfactor A Understanding the Technical Requirements section and should ONLY be addressed in Subfactor B Management Approach.

RESPONSE: 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 Offeror's response to Representative Task Orders will address Section 2. Section L, GSFC 52.215-210 Mission Suitability Volume Instructions, and Enclosure C will be corrected to read 'Statement of Work'. Please see previous response at Question #31.

78. In Reference to Draft RFP Section L.21(b)(1) - Page 64 --What is the Management plan referenced on page 64 within the table? It is not referenced anywhere else in the RFP. Is it the same as Subfactor B - Management approach? If so, is the Subfactor B not within page count of L.24?

RESPONSE: Please see previous response at Questions #27.

79. In Reference to Draft RFP Section L.22(c)(8) – Page 68 --a) We request that NASA reconsider the requirement that the offeror possess a Top Secret level facility security clearance throughout the life of this contract. Any classified work for GITISS should be performed on the Goddard campus. The requirement that the offeror hold a TS level facility will unnecessarily restrict competition for this contract and favor the incumbent. Please remove the requirement for the contractor facility security clearance. b) This security requirement appears to be in conflict with DD Form 254 called for in I.105 on page 44. DD Form 254 does not require a contractor to hold a cleared facility. Please reconcile this conflict.

RESPONSE: Please see previous response at Question #16.

80. In Reference to Draft RFP Section L.24.1 – Page 70 --This section discusses the option to propose enhancements using Contract Attachment M, but it is unclear here or in section M how such enhancements impact evaluation of the proposal, as follows: If we propose an enhancement, is that element then scored as a baseline requirement and is ineligible to be scored as a Strength or Significant Strength? Are we able to receive evaluation points for innovations and Strengths without designating them enhancements per Attachment M?

RESPONSE: Enhancements if evaluated positive, may be scored as a strength or significant strength. However, an enhancement may be evaluated negative, scoring a weakness or significant weakness; and may also be evaluated neutral, having no impact. Please see previous response at Question #46.

81. In Reference to Draft RFP Section L.24.3 – Page 71-74 --Please number the paragraphs in these sections so that we can more easily refer to the requirement that each section of the proposal is fulfilling.

RESPONSE: Unfortunately this request cannot be accommodated.

82. In Reference to Draft RFP Section L.24.3 Subfactor A – Page 71 and Subfactor B- Page 73 --The last paragraph in Subfactor A specifies that "In accordance with the Task Ordering procedure clause in

Section H of this solicitation, each task plan shall....” The first paragraph on page 73 specifies that *“task orders will be issued in accordance with the Task Ordering Procedure clause in Section H.”* There is no such clause in Section H. Please update Section H or remove the reference.

RESPONSE: Please see previous response at Question #35.

83. In Reference to Draft RFP Section L.24.3 - Page 72&74 --There are two paragraphs in this section that seem to cover the same requirement.

Page 72: *“The offeror shall identify its minimum essential critical positions required to meet all of the requirements of the SOW....”*

Page 74: *“The offeror shall describe the positions considered critical to meet the requirements of the contract...”*

Please combine and reconcile these two paragraphs.

RESPONSE: Please see previous response at Question #43.

84. In Reference to Draft RFP Section L.24.3 Subfactor B - Page 72 --We suggest that ITCD specify minimum requirements for the essential critical position of Program Manager. An appropriately qualified PM is particularly essential to achieving ITCD’s goals of instituting cultural change and implementing Enterprise Architecture principles. We suggest that the PM be required to provide credentials including PMP certification, ITIL V3 certification, and Enterprise Architecture certification from a NASA-recognized organization.

RESPONSE: Unfortunately this request cannot be accommodated.

85. In Reference to Draft RFP Section L.26(a) – Page 82 --We respectfully suggest that the basis for setting the \$4M annual minimum for Prime past performance eligibility be revisited. This minimum would seem to be derived from a presumed \$190M GITISS contract value over 5 years, from which a 10% annual value would be \$3.8M and a reasonable requirement for past performance. However, the GUEST contract only has a \$75M contract value to-date (5 years of performance). Extrapolating that to an expected \$80M total contract value, a relevant past performance for GUEST might have a minimum annual value of \$1.6M. While we understand that the GITISS SOW extends beyond that of GUEST, we suggest that the value of GUEST might provide a realistic benchmark for determining relevance of GITISS proposal past performance requirements. We therefore request that the minimum annual value of eligible past performances be set to \$1.6M for the purpose of this proposal.

RESPONSE: Please see previous response at Question #5.

86. In Reference to Draft RFP Section L.26(a) – Page 82 --We request that the minimum average annual cost/fee requirement for prime offeror past performance be loosened to allow us to present the most relevant past performance validation. A contract supporting Goddard IT with an average annual value of \$2M is potentially just as, if not more, relevant as a DoD or DoT contract with an average annual value of \$4M. Allowing for some flexibility in the assessment of relevancy in size, scope, and complexity will provide Goddard with higher quality contractor options. We would propose lowering the minimum required annual value.

RESPONSE: Please see previous response at Question #5.

87. The “appendices” to the draft RFP are identified as Attachments A-O, Enclosure 1-3, Enclosure A-C, and Exhibits 1-12. Is there a distinction among the designations Attachment, Enclosure, and Exhibit? Please clarify the significance of these designations.

RESPONSE: Attachments will become part of the contract after award. Enclosures are included with the solicitation for information purposes. Exhibits are also included with the solicitation and are typically sheets that require the offeror to provide input.

88. In Reference to Draft RFP Attachment A SOW Section 1.6 - Attachment A Page 7 --All of the requirements described in this section relate to applications lifecycle management including development, testing, maintenance, security, provisioning, QA, etc. for different software types (e.g. COTS, GOTS, MOTS). Can the section be retitled Applications Lifecycle Management?

RESPONSE: Draft RFP Attachment A SOW Section 1.6 will not be retitled Applications Lifecycle Management.

89. In Reference to Enclosure A Government Position Descriptions – Enclosure A Page 2 --The Staff Position Summary Table on Enclosure A Page 2: the final column “Years Experience w/B.S.” does not seem to align with Columns 2 and 3. For instance, a Low Intermediate level that requires a H.S. minimum education with 4-6 years experience should include a value in “Years Experience w/B.S.” of some lower value, such as 1-3 years. Likewise, a High Intermediate position that requires 10-12 years experience with a B.S. cannot also require 4-6 “Years Experience w/B.S.”

RESPONSE: The Final RFP will include revisions to Enclosure A.

90. In Reference to Enclosure A Government Position Descriptions --The Labor Category Position Descriptions in this document do not seem to consistently align with the Staff Position Summary table. While Administrative Assistant I – SEWP may be acceptable with only a H.S. education, that does not seem an adequate educational requirement for IT Configuration Management Specialist I, for example, yet both of these positions are designated as junior level. We suggest eliminating the Staff Position Summary table and including relevant educational and experience requirements in each Position Description.

RESPONSE: The final RFP will include a revision to Enclosure A.

91. If company X is providing past performance references for a contract where they were a sub to Company Y, can Company X provide their Past Performance Questionnaire directly to their government customer rather than to their Prime (Company Y)? The concern is that Company Y may unfairly evaluate Company X if Company X is on a competing team but must use their contract with Company Y for past performance.

RESPONSE: As stated in the RFP Clause GSFC 52.215-330 Past Performance Evaluation—the Government may review and consider past performance information on other contracts that is aware of or that are made available from other sources and inquiries from previous customers. This will include references provided by the Offeror.

92. In Reference to Draft RFP Section L.21.a.4 requests Microsoft Word and Excel (Windows XP) formats for back-up copies; cost proposal exhibits are requested to use Microsoft Excel 2003. To facilitate review in widely supported formats would it be possible for back-up copies and cost proposal exhibits to be submitted in Excel 2007 or later version?

RESPONSE: Please see previous response at Question #66.

93. In Reference to Draft RFP Section 3: L.26.a. --Our 8(a) small business firm has excellent past performance on NASA and other contracts. The average annual cost/fee of \$4 million per past

performance could significantly limit 8(a) small businesses from being able to demonstrate excellent past performance. Can the average annual cost/fee of \$4 million be waived or lowered in order for broader 8(a) business participation and demonstration of past performance?

RESPONSE: Please see previous response at Question #5.

94. For planning purposes, can the Government provide a list of management and administrative labor categories including level of efforts required under this contract or a similar contract?

RESPONSE: Each Offeror shall provide all the anticipated program management and administrative support for this effort as required by the Section L. The Government cannot provide this information.

95. For planning purposes, can the Government provide a list of the non-labor recurrent cost (ODC's)?

RESPONSE: Non-labor recurrent cost (ODC's) are to be provided by each offeror.

96. Will the government provide a list of direct labor that has to be considered for the 30 days Phase-in Firm Fixed order?

RESPONSE: No, each offeror shall provide, at its discretion, an approach to ensure continuity and a smooth transition with the incumbent contractor.

97. Will the Government provide a list of non-labor other direct costs for the phase in period?

RESPONSE: Please see previous response at Question #96.

98. In Reference to Draft RFP Section L.21 a (4), Proposal Format and Organization --Microsoft 2003 is no longer a supported version of MS Excel per this Microsoft support article:

<http://technet.microsoft.com/en-us/library/dd873564%28v=office.12%29.aspx#section1>. Can Microsoft 2010 Excel be used to submit the Cost Proposal?

RESPONSE: Please see previous response at Question #66.

99. In Reference to Draft RFP Section L.21 b (1), Proposal Content and Page Limitations, Is it the government's intent to exclude the RTO Task Plans and Management Plan (or Management Approach) from the 80 page limitation of the Mission Suitability Volume?

RESPONSE: Please see previous response at Question #27.

100. The cover letter states, "Potential offerors are encouraged to comment on the clarity of the RTO requirements and your ability to effectively price each RTO." The Cost Volume does not address RTO pricing. Please clarify.

RESPONSE: There is not a requirement to provide pricing on RTOs. In accordance with section M.4. The total FFP Phase-In price and the proposed and probable Government Pricing Model evaluated cost (including proposed fee amount) will be presented to the Source Selection Authority as well as any cost risk associated with the proposal. RTO pricing will not be presented to the SSA; however, the SEB will assess the RTOs as described under section M.3

101. In Reference to Draft RFP Section L.21 (a)(5) --The government states, "(5) The format for each proposal volume shall parallel, to the greatest extent possible, the format of the evaluation factors and subfactors contained in Section L of this solicitation. The proposal content shall provide a basis for evaluation against the requirements of the solicitation. Each volume of the proposal shall specify the relevant evaluation criteria being addressed, if appropriate. The proposal shall include a matrix showing where in the proposal the technical requirements of the SOW and the evaluation criteria of this RFP are satisfied (i.e. SOW element versus offeror's

proposal page numbers). It is intended that this be a simple matrix that should in no way inhibit an innovative approach or burden the offeror. This proposal matrix is excluded from the page limitations contained in paragraph (b)(1) below." (1.) Should the proposal format parallel Section L or the evaluation factors in Section M? (2.) Should the matrix parallel the factors in Sections L or M? (3.) Is there supposed to be a matrix for all volumes including the Cost Volume?

RESPONSE: Please see previous response at Question #50.

102. In Reference to Draft RFP Section L.24 (3.)/M.3 (1.) --In Section L, the government states, "*The offeror shall identify the most significant potential risks under this contract and also describe the risk management techniques that will be used to manage identified risks during contract performance.*" In Section M, the government states, "*The Government will evaluate the offeror's procedures for identifying the most significant potential risks under this contract and the risk management techniques that will be used to manage identified risks during contract performance for thoroughness and understanding.*" Does the government want us to identify risks OR identify our procedures for identifying risks?

RESPONSE: The offeror shall identify the most significant risks and describe risk management techniques. Revisions to Section M will be included in the Final RFP.

103. In Reference to Draft RFP Section L.24 (3.), The government states, "*The Offeror shall describe its management approach towards accomplishing ALL of the requirements of the SOW. The Offeror shall address any features of its approach that support the most efficient and effective approach to changing workload fluctuations and priorities.*" What is the government's intention of addressing ALL of the SOW requirements in the Management Approach? Will the government consider revising this statement?

RESPONSE: Under Subfactor B, the government expects the Offeror to describe its management approach towards accomplishing ALL of the requirements of the SOW.

104. In Reference to Draft RFP Section L.24 (3.)/M.3 (1.) --In Section L, the government states, "*The offeror shall describe its strategy for using (or not using) significant subcontractors (based on the definition of significant subcontractor in the cost volume instructions).*" In Section M, the government states, "*In the event subcontractors are proposed, the Government shall evaluate the offeror's interfaces to the organizations structure, including the basis for the selection of the subcontractor, the nature and extent of the work to be performed by the subcontractor, the benefits of these arrangements to the Government and methods of management reporting to GSFC of subcontractor's financial and technical plans and performance, for efficiency and effectiveness.*" Are we supposed to address All subcontractors or only significant subcontractors?

RESPONSE: The offeror shall describe its strategy for using (not using) significant subcontractors. Section M.3 will be revised to reflect significant subcontractors.

105. In Reference to Draft RFP Section L.24 (3.)/M.3 (1.) --The term, "Critical Positions" is used in three locations. Please clarify their significance and how they differ from the Position Descriptions and the Position Qualifications.

RESPONSE: Please see previous response at Questions #33 and #34.

106. Is there a page count for resumes?

RESPONSE: Resumes are not and will not be required for this procurement. However if an offeror chooses to submit resumes, they will be subject to page limitation depending on which volume they appear, i.e. if an offer includes resume in Mission Suitability, the resumes will be counted in the 80 page limit.

107. Should risk management be addressed in the Management Approach?

RESPONSE: As stated in Clause L.24 GSFC 52.215.210 Mission Suitability Volume, each offeror shall identify the most significant potential risks under this contract and also describe the risk management techniques that will be used to manage identified risks during contract performance.

108. The Draft RFP states that the Government will evaluate the offeror's description of any new or innovative methods, techniques or technologies for efficiency and effectiveness. Is the response to this section required to comply with the requirement, *"The offeror shall include Contract Attachment M as part of the model contract in the Contract Volume of their proposal."* Is every innovation recommendation in this section required to be included in Contract Attachment M?

RESPONSE: Please see previous response at Questions #46, #54, and #80.

109. Draft RFP Section L states: Although the Government does not encourage/discourage enhancements to the contract's technical performance documents (e.g. Statement of Work, Specification, etc.), offerors may choose to propose performance enhancements. Draft RFP Section M states that the Government will evaluate the offeror's description of any new or innovative methods, techniques or technologies for efficiency and effectiveness. What are the evaluation expectations if no proposed enhancements are included in this proposal and no Contract changes are defined by the offeror?

RESPONSE: Please see previous response at Question #46. An offeror may, if it chooses, to provide enhancements to the contract's technical documents. If an offeror does not provide enhancements there is no impact to evaluations.

110. In Reference to Draft RFP Clause I.108, 1852.216-80 TASK ORDERING PROCEDURE (OCT 1996) – it states: "In accordance with the Task Ordering Procedure clause in Section H of this solicitation..." Should this reference section I.108 - 1852.216-80 TASK ORDERING PROCEDURE (OCT 1996) rather than section H?

RESPONSE: Please see previous response at Question #51.

111. Regarding the method of subcontractor management and reporting, Section L refers to Significant Subs, Section M refers to All Subs. Please define which subs this reporting requirements applies to.

RESPONSE: Please see previous response to Question #104.

112. The Program Managers Authority is asked for in 2 sections within Section L, the Section asking about the Responsibilities and Authorities for Contract Management and the next section asking about Program Manager Independence and Autonomy. Please define within in which section the Program Managers Authority should be discussed.

RESPONSE: The program manager's authority and autonomy shall be addressed in the Mission Suitability Volume under Subfactor B. Section L.24 GSFC 52.215-210 Mission Suitability Volume will be revised to remove duplication.

113. In Reference to the Total Compensation Plan response in the Sub Factor B: Is this a high-level with each sub submitting their own total compensation plan within each sealed cost package?

RESPONSE: Each significant subcontractor is required to submit a total compensation plan.

114. Does the Total Compensation Plan requirement apply to either all Subcontractors or Significant Subcontractor?

RESPONSE: The Total Compensation Plan requirement is applicable to each offeror and its subcontracts that have a potential value in excess of \$500,000 and the cumulative value of all of the subcontractor's service subcontracts under the prime contract is in excess of 10 percent of the prime contract's potential value.

115. Is it correct that the requirement for Cost for fringe is required to be included in the Sub Factor B, Mission Suitability Volume?

RESPONSE: The total compensation plan must include supporting data however the mission suitability volume must not include exhibit 10. Please refer to Section L for additional information.

116. Should the Total Compensation Plan be included in the Cost Volume or technical?

RESPONSE: The total compensation plan is a requirement for subfactor b in the mission suitability volume. Please refer to Section L for additional information.

117. What information from this Total Compensation Plan must also be included in the sealed packages?

RESPONSE: The total compensation plan must classify all labor categories proposed, briefly define the terms "exempt" and "non-exempt", identify categories of personnel and provide supporting data. Please refer to Section L for additional information.

118. The requirement for the definition of critical positions is asked for twice in Section L: In the middle and then again at the end of the section. Please define where, in what part of the Section L, Critical positions should be addressed.

RESPONSE: Please see previous response at Question #43.

119. Would the Government allow the offerors to combine all Government provided cost exhibits in one excel file for submission to maintain continuity and data integrity.

RESPONSE: Cost exhibits shall not be in one excel file for submission.

120. Could the Government please clarify as to which positions are to be bid as SCA under the applicable WD table?

RESPONSE: For additional guidance refer to Enclosure A Government's Position Descriptions and Attachment O Statement of Equivalency Rates. Attachment O will be corrected in the Final RFP to read Enclosure A-Government Position Descriptions.

121. In Reference to Attachment B Section 6 page 5 and Enclosure A --The Draft RFP includes positions and qualifications in Section 6 of Attachment B and also includes Government position descriptions in Enclosure A. Could the Government please clarify the difference between Section 6 and Enclosure A?

RESPONSE: The GITISS RFP provided the non-management and administrative Government Position Descriptions that maps directly to the labor categories and hours of the Government Pricing Model (GPM). However, each Offeror is required to provide written position qualifications for the specific labor categories envisioned for this requirement. Each position qualification shall not exceed ½ page in length; and all position qualifications will be incorporated into the resultant contract as Attachment B.

122. Could the Government please estimate the contract start date?

RESPONSE: The estimated contract start date is November 1, 2015.

123. In Reference to Cost Exhibit 1A --Are the labor hours provided in Exhibit 1A for evaluation purposes only? Can the Government please clarify?

RESPONSE: Labor hours provided in Exhibit 1A are for evaluation purposes only.

124. Could the Government please clarify if the 3 RTOs are to be priced separately or not priced in this submission?

RESPONSE: The RTOs will not be priced.

125. In Reference to Draft RFP Section L.25, page 80 –The Draft RFP asks for basis of estimates (BOE). At which WBS level should the BOEs be described? Please clarify.

RESPONSE: The basis of estimates (BOE) needs to be the cost estimating thought processes and methodologies.

126. Please confirm that only government site (Onsite) rates are to be proposed in all exhibits 1A, 1B, 2A, and 2B and other applicable Exhibits.

RESPONSE: For this solicitation the place of performance has been established as government onsite. Each offeror should submit pricing that reflects its technical approach and as instructed in the RFP. In addition, please note Section L Cost Volume Instructions, which states that for evaluation purposes all management and administrative costs shall be assumed offsite.

127. There are several labor categories that are named differently, for example, in Exhibit 1A and Enclosure A, there is a list of Database Administrators, but in Exhibit 2A those are listed as Data Administrators. The same issue occurs with the list of Penetration Testers. Can the Government please clarify which labor category list is correct and re-issue the exhibits to be priced?

RESPONSE: Exhibit 1A will be revised to reflect Enclosure A in the Final RFP.

128. In Reference to Draft RFP Section L.24 Subfactor B, page 73 –Are all significant subcontractors required to submit a Total Compensation Plan, in addition to Exhibit 10? Please clarify.

RESPONSE: As stated in Section L GSFC 52.215-210 Mission Suitability Instructions, the Offeror shall provide a Total Compensation Plan (TCP) for all personnel proposed in accordance with NFS provision 1852.231-71 Determination of Compensation Reasonableness and FAR provisions 52.222-46, Evaluation of Compensation for Professional Employees. This requirement is applicable to each offeror and its subcontracts that have a potential value in excess of \$500,000 and the cumulative value of all of the subcontractor's service subcontracts under the prime contract is in excess of 10 percent of the prime contract's potential value. This is in addition to Exhibit 10.

129. In Reference to Draft RFP Section L.24, page 72 and 74 –The Draft RFP requires information regarding “positions considered critical to meet the requirements of the contract” on page 72 and 74. Is this a duplicate requirement?

RESPONSE: Please see previous response at Question #43.

130. In Reference to Draft RFP Section L.24, page 72 –The Draft RFP states in the first full paragraph on page 72 “and the Program Manager’s authority to utilize and redirect subcontract resources and/or Joint Venture partner resources...” The same verbiage appears in the second paragraph on page 72. Should

Offerors address the “PM’s subcontractor resources authority” under the Management section or Program Manager Section?

RESPONSE: Please see previous response at Question #112.

131. In Reference to Draft RFP Section L.24, page 73 –The 2nd paragraph requests “a detailed phase-in plan that address the offeror’s approach to phase-in...during the 30-day phase in period. The phase-in plan shall clearly demonstrate an ability to assume full contract responsibility on the effective date of the contract.” Is it the Government’s intention that the phase-in period **only** cover the Award date activities through the start date of the contract (e.g. set up of infrastructure, incumbent capture, security requirements, etc.)

RESPONSE: The Phase-In period includes all activities required for an offeror to assume full contract responsibility on the effective ordering period of the contract. The Government now anticipates a 45-day phase in.

132. Is it the government’s intention that the phase-in period cover all costs from award date, including all labor costs of professional services, set up of infrastructure, incumbent capture, security requirements, etc. are captured in the phase-in period of January 1-29; or is it the government’s intention that the phase-in period cover a combination of or overlapping period of infrastructure/incumbent capture/security requirements and then professional services cost?

RESPONSE: Please see previous response at Question #131.

133. What is the Government contract year period of performance?

RESPONSE: Please see previous response at Question #72.

134. In Reference to Draft RFP Section L.21, page 63 –The Draft RFP states that the “Cost proposal exhibits shall use Microsoft Excel 2003...” Will the Government consider accepting exhibits using Microsoft Excel 2010 or higher?

RESPONSE: Please see previous response at Question #66.

135. Can the Government provide how many billable hours equates to one (1) Full Time Employee (FTE)?

RESPONSE: Each Offeror shall develop its Productive Work Year based on the amount of time off it grants its employees for vacation, sick, and holidays.

136. Can the Government provide how many hours equate to (1) Work Year Equivalent (WYE)?

RESPONSE: Please see previous response at Question #135.

137. Can Offerors add a separate tab to Exhibit 6 for Fringe Benefits?

RESPONSE: Fringe Benefits shall be addressed on Exhibits 10A and 10B.

138. Can Offerors modify Exhibit 6 to split Overhead and Fringe Benefits into separate columns/rows?

RESPONSE: See previous response at Question #137.

139. Can Offerors modify the Government Cost Volume spreadsheets to add additional columns or rows, as needed?

RESPONSE: The cost exhibit may not be modified however an offeror may provide additional spreadsheets if need be. Additional spreadsheets will not be accepted as replacements for the provided required cost exhibits.

140. In Reference to Draft RFP Section L.21(b)(1) --This section provides a table of Proposal Components and Page Limitations. The table states that the "Management Plan" is excluded from the page count. The instructions in L.24 specify items to be addressed in Subfactor B – Management Approach. Does the response to Subfactor B constitute the "Management Plan"? If so, please confirm that this response is excluded from the page count limitation.

RESPONSE: Please see previous response at Question #27.

141. In Reference to Draft RFP Section L.24, Paragraph 2 --The format instructions request that the offeror organize Volume II according to the PWS WBS identified in Enclosure C. Section L.24, Paragraph 3 provide specific instructions for Subfactor A that require Offerors to address only Sections 1.3-1.7 of the SOW. These two instructions make it unclear as to whether Offerors are to address all of the WBS or only the items 1.3-1.7. Also, the WBS references a "PWS" but the Government has provided a "SOW." Will the Government clarify (a) the nomenclature for the contract work statement and (b) the intent for addressing elements of the SOW (or PWS) in the response to Subfactor A?

RESPONSE: Mission Suitability Volume Instructions and Enclosure C will be corrected to read 'Statement of Work'. Please see previous response at Question #31.

142. In Reference to Draft RFP Section L.24, Paragraph 3, Subfactor B Management Approach --The third and fourth paragraphs of this section both contain instructions to address "the Program Manager's authority to utilize and redirect subcontract resources." Should one of these two instructions be eliminated?

RESPONSE: Please see previous response at Question #112.

143. In Reference to Draft RFP Section L.24, Paragraph 3, Subfactor B Management Approach --The fifth paragraph of the instructions requires to address "critical positions." The 16th paragraph also requires Offerors to "describe the positions considered critical" and seems to require nearly the same information as the fifth paragraph. Should the latter paragraph be eliminated?

RESPONSE: Please see previous response at Question #43.

144. In Reference to Enclosure A, Government Position Descriptions (PDs) --The table on page 2 of the Government PDs describes five levels (Junior, Low Intermediate, Intermediate, High Intermediate, and Senior) for various positions and includes years of experience and education For many of the PDs, there are five levels of description, although they do not follow the description in the page 2 table for level (they use I, II, III, IV, and V). For these it is easy to translate the table of PD levels to the actual PDs. However, for several of PDs, there is no "level" described (e.g., Cyber Security Specialist, Data Configuration Analyst, Disaster Recovery Analyst, Enterprise Architect, Software Engineer, and Subject Matter Expert). Would the Government consider revising the "levels" in the table to match the PDs, or change the PD descriptions to match the table of "levels"? Also would the Government provide the "level" for the six PDs described above that do not contain a "level" that can be easily identified?

RESPONSE: Please see previous response at Question #21.

145. In Reference to Enclosure 1 Representative Task Order #1 --It appears from the description of the Management Information System (MIS) that this system is currently operable at GSFC. Would the Government provide the following additional information:

(a) a description of the server environment used to host this application?

(b) Software system description information?

(c) the history and scope of subtasks developed over the past three years?

RESPONSE: The server environment used to host this application is Cluster 2012r2b. All the MIS applications are written using Cold Fusion 2010 and using Microsoft SQL 2012 for the database. Over the past three years there has been development activity on 3-5 MIS applications.

146. In Reference to Enclosure 1 Representative Task Order #1 -- In the description of this RTO, the contractor is asked to provide labor categories, projected hours and a schedule for the required support. The only details provided are that there are "approximately 20 MIS applications with less than 5 having any regular applications development activity in a given month." This provides no specific details on the level of effort required for support of these five monthly support requirements. Would the Government provide the following additional information:

(a) With this minimum amount of data, it is difficult to accurately provide an estimate of labor , projected hours, or a schedule. An offeror can provide an approach and process for providing the support, but cannot accurately make specific projections based on the current RTO. Can the Government provide any additional details on which to base an estimate of workload hours and schedule?

b) This appears to be an ongoing services type requirement which does not lend itself to a specific schedule. What type of schedule does the Government expect for monthly application service support?

RESPONSE: There are 20 separate MIS applications and all MIS applications are operational. Yes, the MIS applications are hosted in the Code 700 Data Center. It is the Government's intent that the vendor manage the additional space requirements and plan for future expansion.

147. In Reference to Attachment I, Installation Accountable Government Property --Could the Government please clarify how many racks of equipment are there in the Data Center?

RESPONSE: There are 15 racks of equipment in the Data Center.

148. In Reference to Attachment I, Installation Accountable Government Property --The equipment types and amounts listed in Attachment I and the Data Center Inventory (in the GITISS e-Library) do not seem to match. Could the Government please clarify the nature of the discrepancies?

RESPONSE: The e-library has been updated.

149. In Reference to Draft RFP Section L.25.1 – Page 75 --This section states that "A proposed significant subcontractor shall complete and submit Exhibits 2A, 2B, and 4 through 11A." Please confirm that significant subcontractors are not required to complete Exhibit 11B, despite that Exhibit including a "Significant Subcontractor" check box. Please confirm that non-Significant Subcontractors must submit a cost volume composed of Exhibits 2A, 2B (if applicable), 10A, and 10B.

RESPONSE: Proposed Significant Subcontractors, as described in Section L Cost Volume Instructions, shall complete and submit Exhibits 2A, 2B, and 4 through 11B and provide the same supporting information that is requested from the Prime Offeror. Non-Significant Subcontractors are not

required to submit cost exhibits. Clause GSFC 52.215-223 will be revised in the Final RFP to include exhibit 11B.

150. In Reference to Draft RFP Section L.25.1 – Page 75 --This sections states that “A proposed subcontractor shall complete and submit Exhibits 2A, 2B, and 4 through 11A and provide the same supporting information that is requested from the Prime Offeror.” Please clarify “same supporting information.” Does that mean the information relating to those Exhibits as specified in L.25.2(d)-(o)? Does it also include L.25.2(a)?

RESPONSE: Proposed Significant Subcontractors, as described in Section L GSFC 52.215-223 Cost Volume Instructions, shall complete and submit Exhibits 2A, 2B, and 4 through 11B and provide the same supporting information that is requested from the Prime Offeror. Non-Significant Subcontractors are not required to submit cost exhibits. Clause GSFC 52.215-223 will be revised in the Final RFP to include exhibit 11B.

151. In Reference to Draft RFP Section L.25.2(a) – Page 76 --Are significant subcontractors required to complete this section? What are the page count requirements for this section? It is not specified in the table on page 64.

RESPONSE: Yes. The information required in Section L.25 is a part of the Basis of Estimates (BOE) requirement. The 35 page limitation is for the total component (prime and significant subcontractors). See previous response at Question #56.

152. In Reference to Draft RFP Section L.25.2(b) – Page 76 --Is the Offeror expected to provide this section in the Attachment B format as a separate document? If so, please provide an editable version of Attachment B.

RESPONSE: Yes. Attachment B is provided in a PDF document, an alternate version will not be provided.

153. In Reference to Attachment B Section 6 – Attachment B Page 5 --Positions qualifications have been provided by ITCD in Enclosure A. Should we replicate those descriptions here? Please clarify the expectation for this section.

RESPONSE: Please see previous response at Questions #34 and #121.

154. In Reference to Draft RFP Section L.25.2(j) – Page 80 --This section requires that rationales be provided for multiple overhead/G&A pools and that explanation and basis of rates be provided for non-negotiated rates. What are the page count requirements for these elements? They are not specified in the table on page 64.

RESPONSE: Please see previous response at Question #151.

155. In Reference to Draft RFP Section L.25.2(n) – Page 81 --This section states that “These exhibits fulfill the Total Compensation Plan requirement under FAR 52.222-46 for non-significant subcontractors.” Does this mean that Significant Subcontractors are required to provide a more substantive Total Compensation Plan? Is that more substantive Total Compensation Plan to be included in the Mission Suitability Volume?

RESPONSE: No. Significant Subcontractors shall submit a Total Compensation Plan in accordance with instructions provided in Clause GSFC 52.215-210 Mission Suitability Volume Instructions. Please see previous response at Question #128.

156. In Reference to Cost Exhibit 1A --The formula in cell O108 does not include row 13 for 1885 hours by the Administrative Assistant I --SEWP Category.

RESPONSE: The Final RFP will include revisions to Cost Exhibit 1A.

157. In Reference to Attachment A --We need a better understanding of current systems in use, platforms, policies, procedures. Also need Inventory of the current systems, issues they are having? High-level architecture diagram of systems and components and how they relate, there is an inventory but interrelation unclear. Are these GFE or is the contractor deploying? Need to understand the full lifecycle. Task orders have a partial listing.

RESPONSE: The e-Library has been updated and the Final RFP will include revisions to the Representative Task Orders to provide this information.

158. In Reference to SOW 1.4 --Para graph 1 states “....shall support the Government in leveraging and collaborating to broker services via the Agency’s NASA enterprise-wide technologies and services ...” Would the Government please clarify what is meant by the phrase “leveraging and collaborating to broker services”? What are the “broker services” in this NASA-wide context?

RESPONSE: The Center is responsible for “brokering” Agency contracts (such as I3P). We coordinate, or broker, Agency services for our Center users and contractors. We interact continually with the Agency service provider to ensure Center users receive the required services.

159. In Reference to SOW 1.6 --In order for us to fully understand the current environment in responding to SOW 1.6 Systems Engineering, and to put bidders on equal footing with the incumbent, would the Government please consider making available the current GUEST System Engineering Management Plan in the e-Library?

RESPONSE: The current GUEST System Engineering Management Plan will not be made available.

160. What are the criteria used to balance use of shared services between the enterprise and the Center?

RESPONSE: Enterprise and Center shared services are to be used to the greatest extent possible to enable efficient and effective Mission support. The criteria to be used are detailed in section 1.f of the SOW, IT Integration and Business Infrastructure Support.

161. How important are quality certs, i.e., CMMI, Lean Six and ISO?

RESPONSE: CMMI, LeanSix and ISO are not required certifications for this procurement. However, such certifications are an indication of an Offeror’s commitment to quality and improving the maturity level of key business processes. NASA continually performs assessments to identify opportunities for business process and IT Service improvements according to guidelines such as CMMI, Six Sigma, ISO, etc.

162. Can you share your EA vision or to-be state with us? How far out does this vision go (1, 5, 10 years)? It is difficult to develop a service model when we don’t have baseline and your view of how much change you will accept over the near term.

RESPONSE: The EA vision is guided by the principles in the 5 year, 2011 IT Strategic Plan for GSFC Volume I. : The GSFC (enterprise level) IT Service Delivery Architecture shall enable the Center’s Vision by meeting the current and future General (or Non-Highly) specialized IT needs of all the

Center's Science & Engineering Missions, Flight Projects, and Supporting Organizations. This architecture shall be:

**Optimally Consolidated or Centralized
Fully Integrated, Available, and Efficient Optimally Automated and Organized
Responsive and Modernized
Measurably Effective and Scalable
Cost Optimal and Sustainable**

163. At Section 1.3 (a), page 5 of the SOW, what criteria will be used to evaluate whether a tool is "added value"?

RESPONSE: The vendor shall provide a Business Case to the COR (or his/her designee) for approval, demonstrating the added value of the tool before the tool is implemented. The vendor documentation should include, at a minimum, a Total Cost of Ownership study.

164. In Reference to Enclosure 2-RTO 2 General Office Management Support, p. 1 --This task includes physical security management and front desk staffing. What is meant by "physical security management"? (Providing security guards? Managing an alarm system?) Also, what are the hours and days for which the Offeror is required to provide front desk staffing?

RESPONSE: RTO 2 has been revised to exclude "physical security management" as this is not a requirement of the task. Regular business hours apply to all tasks for RTO 2.

165. In Reference to Enclosure 2 Representative Task Order #2 --The contractor is asked to provide labor categories, projected hours and a schedule for the required support. In the four page write-up for the RTO, there is a wealth of information about the type of support required, but no details as to the specific amount of work to be performed. Would the Government provide the following additional information:

(a) Can the Government provide any additional details on which to base an estimate of workload hours? Is there workload data available for the past three years on which to determine a staffing level for the basic staffing requirements?

(b) The RTO refers to Technical Support including "operations and maintenance on all SEWP Program systems, ensuring desktop, server, phones, firewall, router and application performance and availability. Is any of this equipment supported by the Center Network Environment and their Help Desk? Could the government provide the hardware and software systems description information for the SEWP operations configuration?

(c) Can the Government provide a list and approximate size of any applications to be supported along with the required programming language necessary for the support?

(d) Can the Government provide a detailed description of the hours of support for this requirement?

RESPONSE: For all labor questions please review the labor categories in the e-Library. No equipment is needed to support this task. Normal business hours are required.

166. In Reference to Enclosure 3 Representative Task Order #3: The contractor is asked to provide labor categories, projected hours and a schedule for the required support. The only details provided are general in nature and provide no specific details for analysis. Would the Government provide the following additional information:

(a) Could the government provide information about the current data centers to include system descriptions, locations, and contents of each?

(b) Can the Government provide any additional details on which to base an estimate of workload hours and schedule? With this minimum amount of data, it is difficult to accurately provide an estimate of labor categories, projected hours, or a schedule. An offeror can provide an approach and process for providing the support, but cannot accurately make specific projections based on the current RTO.

(c) This appears to be an ongoing services type requirement which does not lend itself to a specific schedule. What type of schedule does the Government expect for monthly data center service support requirement?

RESPONSE: The Code 700 Data Center is the core support data center with potential to expand to additional enterprise data centers. Details regarding software and hardware installed in the Data Center are located in the GITISS e-Library. This is an on-going services requirement.

167. In Reference to Attachment A –Has Information Security Continuous Monitoring (ISCM) been implemented at GSFC/GITISS in accordance with the NIST Risk Management Framework. If yes, are information systems reauthorized annually or every third year?

RESPONSE: Yes NASA/GSFC has implemented ISCM. NASA has aligned policies and procedures against the NIST guidance, including the Risk Management Framework. GSFC is in the process of completing the migration of information system accreditations into an annual authorization process. The information systems supported by the GITISS contractor are expected to be in the annual authorization mode prior to award.

168. Is GSFC/GITISS working with DHS to implement Continuous Diagnostics and Mitigation (CDM)?

RESPONSE: Yes. The NASA Office of the Chief Information Officer (OCIO) is working closely with the DHS CDM process, and will define the overall NASA approach and implementation timeline. The GSFC information security program is actively engaged with the OCIO and DHS teams, and expects to adopt the emerging capabilities. In addition, existing tools and processes are being aligned to prepare for the full CDM implementation.

169. What information security tools are used at GSFC/GITISS (i.e., GSAM, McAfee Vulnerability Manager, Webinspect, etc.)?

RESPONSE: NASA uses a wide variety of tools in support of information security and effective IT management objectives. The NASA Office of the Chief Information Officer (OCIO) provides some Agency tools and services. The GSFC information security program provides and uses additional tools. The specific tools change periodically based on operating needs and emergent requirements, such as the DHS CDM activities. At time of GITISS award, we anticipate the following security-oriented tools to be available for use by the GITISS team:

Mcfee Vulnerability Manager

Tenable Network Security's Security Center and Nessus Vulnerability Scanner

Cenzic Hailstorm

Dell KACE

170. In Reference to Attachment A --In order to adequately show understanding of systems engineering for ITCD, will the government provide the high-level architecture diagram of systems and components and how they relate?

RESPONSE: Specific diagrams will not be provided; however, please refer to the GITISS e-Library for supporting documentation.

NNG14475415R

GITISS

Questions and Answers Phase 2

171. In Reference to SOW 1.7 sec 2 –It states “All contractor support shall be: Qualified to perform the job tasks covered within this TO, including a summary of the support personnel qualifications, “Please clarify - Is the Government requiring personnel qualifications for SOW 1.7?

RESPONSE: Offerors are required to provide written position qualifications for the specific labor categories envisioned for this requirement.