

**QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS TO DRAFT RFP NNL15ZB1004R**  
**GEOSPATIAL SUPPORT SERVICES**

(Conference Charts are now Attachment VIIA and not provided herein as they were previously released and remain unchanged)

**QUESTIONS 1 THROUGH 87 PREVIOUSLY ANSWERED AT RELEASE OF FINAL RFP**

- Q1. Are policies in place defining\guaranteeing service request to the hosting agency? E.g. Delivery of Virtual Machines within "X" days of request? Justification Req's for non-"cookie cutter" VMs?  
A1. Yes
- Q2. Are there any HQ GIS requirements (reporting, storing, collecting, etc.) that are counter to LaRC's GIS visions?  
A2. No. LaRC is Co-Chair for Agency GIS working group and is expected to heavily influence the technology for the Agency. This contract has potential to support not only HQ, but also other Centers through the IDIQ process.
- Q3. Will mapping projects (i.e.: aerial photo\LiDAR) be part of the IDIQ?  
A3. No, not for the Year One task being priced. LaRC has recently updated data with very high resolution imagery and LiDAR has recently been completed.
- Q4. Do subcontractors under 300K that don't have entire parts of the contract, have to submit past performance?  
A4. In general, No. However, if the offer is submitted by a JV or several HUBZone's proposing together, then the answer is yes.
- Q5. Point cloud data is massive, is cloud or server space provided as needed?  
A5. Yes, space will be provided on LaRC servers. Cloud is currently not a solution that can be pursued due to IT Security policies.
- Q6. If parts of the GIS work can be done more efficiently, cheaper, and faster off site, is that an option?  
A6. Yes, as long as the SOW requirements are met and current capabilities, support to dynamic requests for support, and next generation capabilities are appropriately addressed. In addition, please note the Staffing Requirements in the SOW.
- Q7. Do you have KML options?  
A7. Not as general rule. KML is utilized to some extent, but not currently an option for the majority of the Center's spatial data.
- Q8. Is not having an ISO certification mean a non-responsive rating?  
A8. No, compliant is acceptable. See Clause H.19 and L.12 for ISO requirements.
- Q9. Is not having a safety and health certification mean a non-responsive rating?  
A9. No. There is no safety and health certification requirement. There is a safety and health plan submission with Volume II, but it is not being evaluated.
- Q10. Is not having a CMMI-SVC certification mean a non-responsive rating?  
A10. No, there is no CMMI compliance or certification requirements. The Year One Task does have CMMI methodology requirements. If your firm cannot meet the Exhibit A SOW requirements or the Year One Task Order requirements then your firm would be taking an exception to our SOWs which may make your proposal non-responsive.

**QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS TO DRAFT RFP NNL15ZB1004R**  
**GEOSPATIAL SUPPORT SERVICES**

(Conference Charts are now Attachment VIIA and not provided herein as they were previously released and remain unchanged)

Q11. Can we add Subcontractors to the IDIQ after award? Or respond with LiDAR & Thermal Imagery as ODC?

A11. If your intent is to understand where LiDAR and Thermal subcontractors are priced, then that is not part of the Year 1 Task Order, but could be an ODC if needed.

In general, yes. Subcontractors can be added; however, Exhibit B rates will not be revised to add them. All future tasks and the Year One Task will be estimated using the Exhibit B rates. If future tasks require specialized subcontractors that are not on your team, then that subcontractor can be proposed and their rates will be reviewed for reasonableness at task order award. If your intent is to change out subcontractors in their entirety for performance reasons that is a post-award situation and will need to be discussed before the Exhibit B rates will be revised.

Q12. Best value or LPTA award?

A12. Best Value. See Section M.2 for evaluation criteria.

Q13. What level of SUE effort must the contractor do directly? Toning?

A13. See Exhibit A, SOW, Paragraphs 5.5.8.1, 5.6.5.1, 5.11.1., and 5.12.2. See also Attachment VIII, Year One Task Order, SOW paragraphs 5.5.4.1, 5.6.1, 5.6.6, and 5.5.12. See also answer to Question 28.

Q14. Is U.S. citizenship a requirement for work on this project?

A14. Yes. See H-3, Requirements for Access to LaRC, and H-4, Security Program/Foreign National Employee Access Requirements, for entry requirements to LaRC.

Q15. Will you require named resources in the RFP response?

A15. No, if you mean proposed employee names. Yes, if you mean significant subcontractors.

Q16. For past-performance, can it be a combination of CPARS & PPQs?

A16. See Section L-15 for Volume III, Past Performance instructions and requirements. CPARS and PPQs are not sufficient as that only addresses the past performance element of Past Performance; it does not address pertinence (relevance). The two components of Past Performance are addressed in M.2, Factor 3 paragraph.

Q17. Any plan to use open source GIS?

A17. No. It shall be the contractor's responsibility to continually evaluate all software used and available based on industry trends to provide best or optimum next GSS performance as per our task requirement. See Year One Task Order SOW Paragraph 5.12.

Q18. Will you provide a template for task orders since turn-around is 5 days?

A18. There is no required format required for task proposals. Each contractor's estimating system is different. However, the Government will issue a task in accordance with H-7, Task Ordering Procedure. As a minimum, H-7, paragraph (b) (1), (2) and (3) shall be addressed. Contractor template can be finalized during phase in.

Q19. How many awards will you make?

A19. This is a single-award contract. Only one offeror will receive a contract.

Q20. Are key personnel required?

A20. No.

**QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS TO DRAFT RFP NNL15ZB1004R**  
**GEOSPATIAL SUPPORT SERVICES**

(Conference Charts are now Attachment VIIA and not provided herein as they were previously released and remain unchanged)

Q21. Will industry ppt presentation be provided?

A21. Yes. See the Draft RFP Amendment 2 and See Attachment VII to the final RFP once released.

Q22. Would you consider increasing page limit for Volume 1?

A22: Yes. See the Final RFP Provision L.7 once released.

Q23. Can a combination of two HUBZone firms be used to meet the requirement of HUBZone business completing the majority of work under the contract?

A23. Yes. See 52.219-3 for percentage of work that must be completed by HUBZones.

Q24. Can a HUBZone prime complete less than 51% of total contract work if the balance of the 51% is met or exceeded by a HUBZone subcontractor?

A24. Yes. See 52.219-3 for percentage of work that must be completed by HUBZones.

Q25. Can weekly meetings be conducted remotely via teleconference?

A25. Yes, if weekly meetings are needed. There is no current requirement for weekly meetings on the Year One Task Order or for the contract. See Exhibit C. There is a monthly progress report due and may be revised to add a monthly meeting. See the Final RFP for meeting requirements. In addition, if performance problems persist, physical presence of management may be required.

Q26. Are the safety and health plan along with the phase in plan part of the 8 page limit?

A26. No.

Q27. Will the contractor have access to IT hardware to install\update applications & ensure they run as designed?

A27. Yes

Q28. How much work do you expect to be surveying, GIS application development, and GIS services?

A28.The following is based on past performance of the various areas of GSS support: Staffing 1%, Technology 8%, Next Generation GSS Systems 11%, Software Applications 8%, Databases 9%, Spatial Data 9%, Configuration Control 14%, GSS Survey 10%, GSS Measurement 8%, GSS Mapping 8%, Visualization 9%, and Analytics 5%.

Q29. Can we submit more than 3 past performance items?

A29. Yes. But you may not exceed the page limits for the past performance volume.

Q30.Will the vendors be considered vendors and not sub-contractors for HUBZone 51% purposes?

A30. See FAR 52.219-3 to determine applicability.

Q31. Is a 10 page technical response acceptable?

A31. See the Final RFP for page limits.

Q32: DCAA certified rate/price buildups?

A32. See L-14 and Attachment III, Price Forms for supporting information needed.

**QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS TO DRAFT RFP NNL15ZB1004R**  
**GEOSPATIAL SUPPORT SERVICES**

(Conference Charts are now Attachment VIIA and not provided herein as they were previously released and remain unchanged)

Q33: Will the Government consider increasing the Mission Suitability Volume page count to 40 pages to properly provide detailed and complete responses to the RFP requirements?

A33. See the Final RFP for page limits.

Q34. The requirement for number of originals and copies for Volume II – Business Proposal is unclear regarding the sub-parts. Currently, the table indicates One Original and 4 copies of Volume II should be submitted, but there are separate quantities required for each of the sub parts. Considering that the entire volume included the sub-parts, will the Government please clarify the required number of originals and copies to be delivered for Volume II and included sub-parts?

A34. See Final RFP, L.7 for any changes.

Q35. To accommodate HUBZone businesses with numerous small GIS contracts, will the government consider modifying the definition of a “somewhat pertinent” contract from \$500k annually, to \$500k total value?

A35. We anticipate changing this to \$400K annually. See the Final RFP for any changes.

Q36. Will the Government accept past performance citations from contracts under \$500k, if the period of performance is less than one year?

A36. Yes. The value will be annualized for comparison purposes. However, note the answer to question 35 above as this is determined to be somewhat pertinent based on size pertinence.

Q37. RFP Provision L.7 excludes “copies of CPARS” from the Volume’s page limit, yet section L.15 does not specifically request submission of CPARS reports. Will the Government clarify the need to submit a copies of CPARS within the Past Performance Volume?

A37. Yes, we will clarify L.7 ad L.15 in the Final RFP. CPARS will be included in the Past Performance Volume.

Q38. Will the government consider accepting past performance citations from contracts completed within the last 5 years (versus 3 years as currently stated in the DRFP)?

A38. No

Q39. Considering the importance placed on Past Performance in Section M.3, will the Government increase the page limit from 5 pages to 10, for each prime as well as each significant subcontractor?

A39. No. The rational is 5 pages for 3 references which is about 1.5 pages per reference.

Q40. If the offerer is not ISO certified or able to show current practice compliance to the ISO references per Draft SOW requirements will that be considered a non-responsive submittal?

A40. Offerors do not have to be ISO certified but they are required to be ISO Compliant. See H.19 and L.12.

Q41. If the offerer has not had involvement nor formal/certified experience in any of the items listed in 'Attachment II S&H Ins' will that be considered a non-responsive submittal?

A41. For items that do not apply, please indicate N/A. However, the plan will need to address the intent of FAR 52.236-13.

**QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS TO DRAFT RFP NNL15ZB1004R**  
**GEOSPATIAL SUPPORT SERVICES**

(Conference Charts are now Attachment VIIA and not provided herein as they were previously released and remain unchanged)

Q42. If the offerer is not CMMI-SVC certified or able to show current compliance to the CMMI references per Draft SOW requirements will that be considered a non-responsive submittal?

A42. See question Q10.

Q43. Is there an establishment of a new baseline or is it updating current, existing baseline data (ref. sub-paragraphs 5.3.2.1, 5.3.3, 5.3.4)?

A43. See Attachment V for current baseline. See deliverables 2, 4, 6, 8, 10, 12, 14, and 17. Maintaining current data is the first order of business. Next Generation addresses raising the bar or establishing new baseline and is part of SOW 5.12.

Q44. In order for the offerer to be responsive may we assume that current teaming partners may not have the collection equipment capabilities for LiDAR and Thermal Imagery but are well versed in obtaining vendor/subcontractor support for source collection in past projects?

A44. Yes. This can be subcontracted out, but must be integrated with existing data/tools and must be accomplished within schedule.

Q45. Shall we determine such activities (LiDAR and Thermal Imagery) to be ODCs outside of the initial task order or does the Government foresee enough effort in collection to have the team include partners that have the equipment and resources to perform LiDAR and Thermal collection?

A45. At this time, imagery and LiDAR will not be required under the year one task. It is not anticipated to be needed as the data was recently updated. If thermal imagery is needed during Year One, the costs would be part of the \$240K ODC number provided by the Government that all offerors are instructed to use unless they justify any increases or decreases. If substantial thermal imagery is needed, it would be issued as a new task order and not part of the Year One task order.

Q46. May the offerer add subcontractor teammates after award of contract as needed based on task order requirements or does the IDIQ team need to be locked-in at proposal time?

A46. Yes, you may add subcontractor teammates after award of contract. However, the Exhibit B rates shall not be revised and shall be utilized for future orders.

Q47. Looking at the history information (Attachment IX), SGT is the prime contractor performing the subject GSS work. Who are the subcontractors supporting SGT in the performance of the subject work?

A47. The following subcontractors and/or vendors have supported the GSS effort. Genex, Craig, AS&M, CSC, AES Consulting Engineers, Orbis, Maser Consulting, Vsolvit and ESRI.

Q48. Will the Government be initiating all telecon and web meetings to connect with the contractor's off-line staff?

A48. No. The Government will not be initiating any telecons or web meetings. All offsite or telecommuting employees are responsible for calling or logging into the meetings. The Government does have a web meeting account that may be used to support GSS efforts. See Exhibit C, Contract Documentation Requirements, for monthly progress meetings that are being considered. See Final RFP.

**QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS TO DRAFT RFP NNL15ZB1004R**  
**GEOSPATIAL SUPPORT SERVICES**

(Conference Charts are now Attachment VIIA and not provided herein as they were previously released and remain unchanged)

Q49. Will such meeting costs be absorbed by the Government or the contractor should account for them?

A49. No, the Government will not absorb these costs. Any hours estimated for meetings shall be included in the Firm Fixed Price included in the Attachment III forms which are required to be submitted. In addition, the Government will not be covering any web meeting license cost as an ODC.

Q50. Would MS Word 2003 prepared documents be acceptable as long as they are readable by MS Word 2010?

A50. No. The Government is not responsible for any conversion errors that may occur due to the different versions.

Q51. Similarly, would MS Excel 2003 prepared documents be acceptable as long as they are readable by MS Excel 2007?

A51. No. The Government is not responsible for any conversion errors that may occur due to the different versions.

Q52. How many onsite contractor staff are currently executing this work?

A52. There are 14 contract personnel currently performing this effort; however not all are full time.

Q53. Do the employees on this contract also manage the Maximo system or do the employees only work in conjunction with another team that manages Maximo?

A53. No, GSS contractors are not responsible for Maximo. GSS contractors interface with the contractors responsible for Maximo. See H.9, Enabling Clause Between GSS Contractor and Other Langley Contractors. However, GSS is responsible for reading and writing data to Maximo. Exhibit A paragraphs 5.4.4.4 and 5.4.4.5 state the contractor shall maintain BIM data and export BIM data to Maximo. Also, Exhibit A para 5.5.6 states the contractor shall perform the extract, transform, and load (ETL) spatial data to Maximo. The functionality of this data exchange is also a requirement of paragraph 5.4.3 database management. Attachment VIII, paragraph 5.4 also addresses the transfer of BIM data to Maximo. Paragraph 5.5 addresses Spatial Data requirements, and specifically the contractor's requirement to accomplish Spatial Data gap analysis with Maximo data.

Q54. Are the development team members for this contract currently onsite or offsite?

A54. All employees are onsite, except those that have approved telecommuting agreements. One of the 14 is routinely offsite.

Q55. How far along is the BIM implementation? Is the technology currently in use?

A55. BIM capability is fairly mature at LaRC. We have two very involved BIMs that have been used for construction and three BIMs that are less sophisticated and under development for renovation; and at least three more in planning stages.

Q56. What type of authentication is currently required for the GSS web based portal i.e. CAC enabled?

A56. Integrated Windows Authentication is used, which is CAC enabled.

**QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS TO DRAFT RFP NNL15ZB1004R**  
**GEOSPATIAL SUPPORT SERVICES**

(Conference Charts are now Attachment VIIA and not provided herein as they were previously released and remain unchanged)

Q57. The RFP states that 80% of the work will be onsite – other than the onsite manager, is it expected and acceptable that the on-site support personal may vary depending on the task or does LaRC expect the same people to be on site throughout the duration of the project?

A57. It is up to the contractor to decide how to staff this effort. At the present time, support personnel has not been variable in the last 3 years and is very stable.

Q58. What is involved with obtaining access permissions to LaRC? How long will it take to get new people through the security process to be able to work on site?

A58. This is typically a two to three week effort to achieve full access to network services.

Q59. Are any background checks required and if so, will they be conducted by LaRC or the firm?

A59. Yes there are background checks and the Government will be conducting and covering the cost of them.

Q60. For any web interfaces that are developed, is the only requirement that they be supported by modern browsers? If any specific browsers are to be supported, what are they? (Chrome, Firefox, IE10+)

A60. All web interfaces shall be HTML5 compliant. However, the contractor is responsible for staying abreast of industry trends.

Q61. For the various products and data produced and disseminated via the web interfaces, will there be different levels of access to specific users?

A61. Yes

Q62. Will they need to be able to edit, add, delete, etc. based on their user permission?

A62. Yes

Q63. What is the expected frequency to update imagery, thermal and LiDAR data?

A63. 2-4 year intervals. Thermal may be required more frequently.

Q64. Ground-level (vehicle based) LiDAR is not mentioned. Is it expected that this data may also be necessary through the duration of the contract?

A65. Exhibit A, Statement of Work, paragraph 5.9.2 is revised to delete the word “aerial” so that all remote sensing technologies can be supported; however, it is not a requirement on the Year One Task.

Q66. How many conferences or training events are anticipated each year?

A66. 3-5 are anticipated. The cost for these items is included in the \$240K ODC estimated provided by the Government.

Q67. For any 3D models, is there an expectation or desire to have 3D printed physical models?

A67. Yes. NASA LaRC has an on-site capability and subcontract may be required as part of ODCs.

Q68. Is there a desire to move to non-proprietary geospatial software? Or other alternatives other than ESRI?

A68. Not at this time. This is a post-award next gen possibility to be addressed during performance in accordance with SOW paragraph 5.12.

**QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS TO DRAFT RFP NNL15ZB1004R**  
**GEOSPATIAL SUPPORT SERVICES**

(Conference Charts are now Attachment VIIA and not provided herein as they were previously released and remain unchanged)

Q69. For the map books, is it expected that they are paper maps? Digital delivery would be primary source with paper maps printed only as needed?

A69. Yes, paper may or may not be generated from the maps depending on the requestor's work flow.

Q70. Is the data accessible outside of the LaRC network?

A70. Yes, some GSS data is available beyond the firewall.

Q71. If we have a software developer working on the project who is not stationed on site or in the local area, will they be able to access the systems remotely?

A71. Yes. VPN is a possibility to facilitate remote access.

Q72. Is it expected that the contractor will utilize local (or non-local) colleges and universities for expanded resources?

A72. No, there is no expectation. See Year One Task Order SOW for staffing requirements.

Q73. Who will maintain ownership of any IP developed as a result of this contract? (There is discussion about inventions but it doesn't explicitly say who gets ownership of any inventions.)

A73. See FAR 52.227-14 and NFS 1852.227-14 for Rights in Data for this contract. See also clause G.3, Designation of New Technology representative and Patent Representative. See also NFS 1852.227-11, Patent Rights Retention by the Contractor.

Q74. Do you have a percentage breakdown of which areas in the scope of work will be more utilized than others?

A74. See question 28.

Q75. What is the NASA envisioned LOE percentage for its: GIS analysis/production and software life-cycle management activities (coding, CM, IV&V, test, etc.)

A75. See question 28.

Q76. What software packages does NASA currently possess and already programmed to procure/integrate?

A76. See Exhibit D software tab.

**QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS TO DRAFT RFP NNL15ZB1004R**  
**GEOSPATIAL SUPPORT SERVICES**

(Conference Charts are now Attachment VIIA and not provided herein as they were previously released and remain unchanged)

*For all questions below, NASA LaRC's current processes do not reference Subsurface Utility Engineering (SUE) at the four quality levels associated with this approach and Toning or marking of utilities in advance of excavation. Our utility data is considered Quality Level A, which is obtained from measurement during installation over the years, and has been corrected based on more recent very precise measurements of visible features and correction of historic data where applicable. Our requirements are clearly defined for dig permitting in Exhibit A SOW and Year One Task Order SOW Paragraph 5.6. Our effort address the majority of the functionality described under SUE, however, the various stages of program and levels are not necessary because our utility and facility data is very accurate (routinely better than 6 inches horizontal and vertical).*

Q77. Based on your very active Dig Permitting Program and what appears to be very active mapping of subsurface utilities and infrastructure will the onsite contractor in Task Order One (1) be required to provide Subsurface Utility Engineering (SUE) resources as a WYE onsite or have SUE resources available from the IDIQ contractor team for occasional efforts?

A77. Yes on site personnel is required to address short response times, additionally familiarity with our data, tools, and processes is required. See Year One Task Order SOW paragraph 5.6.

Q78: Or will SUE be considered an ODC activity where a specialized SUE vendor may be brought in for targeted project efforts?

A78. No. See Year One Task Order SOW paragraph 5.6.

*The following questions below are meant to help clarify the NASA LaRC GSS program's level of requirement for subsurface infrastructure mapping needs and the onsite Task Order One contractor's resource pool needed to meet it:*

Q79. Will the onsite contractor be locating which determines the approximate horizontal location of an underground utility line that may exist within a pre-specified area?

A79. Yes. Requirement is addressed in detail in Exhibit A SOW and Year One Task Order paragraph 5.6.

Q80. Will the onsite contractor be performing Subsurface Utility Engineering (SUE) as a highly efficient, nondestructive engineering process that incorporates civil engineering, surface geophysics, surveying and mapping, noninvasive vacuum excavation and asset management technologies to identify and classify quality levels of existing data and maps the locations of underground utilities?

A80. No. Current utilities are documented above SUE Levels. See the introductory paragraph above. In addition, the requirement is addressed in detail in Exhibit A SOW and Year One Task Order paragraph 5.6. Areas of work such as nondestructive engineering processes that incorporate civil engineering, surface geophysics, and noninvasive vacuum excavation are not currently required.

Q81. Will the onsite contractor be performing as a Locator that is sufficient for marking utility facilities immediately prior to excavation or construction?

A81. Yes. Requirement is addressed in detail in Exhibit A SOW and Year One Task Order paragraph 5.6.

Q82. Will the onsite contractor be performing as a SUE provider identifying the location of underground utilities prior to construction and during the design phase of a construction project where the SUE provides contributions to informed design decisions?

A82. Yes. Requirement is addressed in detail in Exhibit A SOW and Year One Task Order paragraph 5.6.

**QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS TO DRAFT RFP NNL15ZB1004R**  
**GEOSPATIAL SUPPORT SERVICES**

(Conference Charts are now Attachment VIIA and not provided herein as they were previously released and remain unchanged)

Q83. Will the onsite contractor be acting as a Locator generally using equipment such as a pipe-and-cable device and detecting one or two utilities at a specific job or as a SUE provider using various geophysical prospecting technologies – such as Pipe-and-Cable Locators, Electromagnetic Imaging (EMI), Acoustical, Pulse, Ground Penetrating Radar (GPR), Three Dimensional Radar Tomography, etc. – to image and detect as many utilities as possible at a site for contingent and deliberate, ongoing mapping activities?

A83. The Contractor is responsible for locating and marking all utilities that may potentially be impacted by a proposed ground penetration associated with a “specific job” at the LaRC standard, which is higher than SUE. The requirement is addressed in detail in Exhibit A SOW and Year One Task Order paragraph 5.6.

Q84. Will the onsite contractor be responsible for a basic level of information by Locating using existing drawings showing the location of underground utilities to mark the approximate horizontal location in the work area or will the onsite contractor be working at potentially all four levels of SUE process that does not rely solely on existing records and includes four quality levels of information with the understanding that a typical project may not include all four quality levels of information, since the highest level of accuracy may be needed only at those points where conflicts may occur?

A84. The Contractor is responsible for locating and marking not only horizontal but also indicating depth or elevation information associated with utilities at the LaRC standard which is higher than SUE. The requirement is addressed in detail in Exhibit A SOW and Year One Task Order paragraph 5.6.

Q85. If the Task Order One onsite contractor is working at SUE process level can you quantify the amount of each of the four quality levels of information the Task Order One may require, as those published by the American Society of Civil Engineers (ASCE) in its Standard Guidelines for the Collection and Depiction of Existing Subsurface Utility Data that a Task Order One SUE project may require?:

A85. NASA LaRC’s current processes do not reference SUE at the four levels associated with this approach and toning. As stated above; our utility data is considered Quality Level A, which is obtained from measurement during installation over the years, and has been corrected based on more recent very precise measurements of visible features and correction of historic data where applicable.

Q86. Will the Year One Task Order onsite contractor be performing the major SUE processes tailored to each project and typically including five major field activities?:

A86. NASA LaRC’s current processes do not reference SUE. NASA’s requirement is addressed in detail in Exhibit A SOW and Year One Task paragraph 5.6.

Q87. Would you be able to provide the names and email addresses or phone numbers of on-site staff currently supporting the GSS program?

A87. The POC for the current on-site contractor, SGT Inc., is Mr. Daniel Finkelsztein and he can be reached at (757)224-4127.

**QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS TO DRAFT RFP NNL15ZB1004R**  
**GEOSPATIAL SUPPORT SERVICES**

(Conference Charts are now Attachment VIIA and not provided herein as they were previously released and remain unchanged)

**THE FOLLOWING QUESTIONS 88 THROUGH 93 ARE IN RESPONSE TO THE ISSUANCE OF THE FINAL RFP AND HAVE NOT BEEN ADDRESSED PREVIOUSLY**

Q88. RFP Section L.6(b)(2) states “The offeror is requested to submit the Past Performance volume of the proposal on or before July 07, 2015.” Will the Government accept submissions until usual close of business (17:00ET)?

A88. The offeror needs to submit their past performance volume by 14:30 ET on July 7, 2015. Badge and Pass is not open at that time to issue visitor badges for access to the Center Provision L.6(b)(2) is updated to reflect this change.

All offerors delivering proposals shall contact Jeff Hisey at (757)864-3347 or [g.j.hisey@nasa.gov](mailto:g.j.hisey@nasa.gov) to request visitor badges for delivery purposes.

Q89. Please confirm that the deadline for receipt of completed PPQs from offeror’s clients is 23 July 2015 with the full proposal.

A89. Correct. Past Performance Questionnaires (PPQ) shall be submitted, by the references, by the proposal due time and date listed on the SF 33. Provision L.6(b)(2) is updated to reflect this. Also, Attachment I, Past Performance Questionnaire, cover letter is updated to reflect this date. Offerors shall update the Attachment I cover letter to insert the July 23, 2015 date.

Q90. Regarding Volume III, RFP Section L.7 states that the prime contractor is allowed 5 pages to describe past performance, and “Significant Subcontractor and JV Partners: 5 pages.” Are offerors allowed 5 pages for EACH subcontractor, or 5 pages TOTAL to describe subcontractors’ performance?

A90. Offerors are allowed to submit 5 pages for themselves and 5 PAGES FOR EACH Significant Subcontractor or JV partner in their past performance volume.

Q91. RFP Section L.13(c) states “If Offerors are certified (vs. compliant), a copy of the current ISO certificate is requested prior to award to ensure the scope of certification covers the SOW and also that it is a current registration to the existing version of the standard. In addition, a statement conveying whether or not and, if so, how the current management system will be modified as a result of this contract award.” Are offerors permitted to include a copy of their ISO certification with the proposal as an attachment (outside page count)?

A91. Yes, the ISO certification can be submitted with the offeror’s business proposal and will not be included in the page count of their technical proposal. See L.7, last column which indicates “N/A” for Other Submission page limits.

Q92. On Page 43, Section L.6 (b)(2) the RFP states that the Past Performance volume should be submitted before July 7. That same section goes on to say that “all volumes of the proposal must be submitted by the date and time shown in Block 9”, which is July 23. When is the past performance volume due to be submitted to the government?

A92. The past performance volume is requested to be submitted on or before July 7, 2015 at 14:30 ET. All other volumes, including the past performance volume if not submitted by July 7, 2015, shall be submitted by 1430 hours on July 23, 2015 as specified on the SF 33, Block 9. See L.6(b)(2) revision.

**QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS TO DRAFT RFP NNL15ZB1004R**  
**GEOSPATIAL SUPPORT SERVICES**

(Conference Charts are now Attachment VIIA and not provided herein as they were previously released and remain unchanged)

Q93. Our company is planning to pursue this opportunity as a Joint Venture (JV). Both companies have letters of certification from SBA as to their HUBZone status. We have contacted our cognizant SBA office to request approval of the planned JV. That office has informed us that approval of a JV between HUBZone businesses is not required so long as both entities are HUBZone certified and therefore they do not believe further approval is necessary. Would providing the letters from SBA approving the HUBZone status of the two companies suffice as SBA approval of the JV if we submitted them along with the JV agreement?

A93. Yes. See L.13 revision.