

Item	Issue/Comment	Question	Response
1	There is still a great deal of concern regarding whether offerors are limited to the NAICS code in the solicitation, 541512, for determining business size under the small business subcontracting program (52.219-9). Could you please confirm that the Prime may select a NAICS code in accordance with CFR 13 § 121.410 and that the NAICS code named in sections K-2 and K-12 of the draft is not determinative of business size for the proposed small business subcontracting goals.		<p>NAICS codes prescribed in the RFP are those recommended by the SPAWAR small business advocate working in coordination with DoD/DON Small Business Administration (SBA) and is consistent with the NAICS codes utilized under NMCI and CoSC.</p> <p>NAICS 541512 applies to the Prime Contractor. The Prime may utilize any NAICS code that aligns to the subcontracted service support requirement as it deems appropriate.</p> <p>Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) 13-120.410 prescribes the standards for use of NAICS codes and states the standards to be utilized. (500 employees and \$25.5M for IT services contracts)</p> <p>In accordance with the SBA guidance (found at <a href="http://www.sba.gov">www.sba.gov</a>), companies may petition the Small Business Office for changes to the size standards.</p>
2		Is it possible to get the street addresses for the attached doc (NGEN Combined Facilities Baseline)?	Physical addresses will be provided in the Technical Data Repository (TDR).
3		Is it possible to get the existing bandwidth requirements at each one of the sites in the attached doc (NGEN Combined Facilities Baseline)?	The Government will provide in the TDR a list of all sites and the circuits (e.g., T1, DS3, and OC3) associated with each site.
4		Is the DON considering "green" Passive Optical Information Transport Systems (ITS) as an option for substantial weight reduction aboard ships and in buildings? And significantly reduce power consumption? If so which ones and to what extent?	<p>Passive Optical Information Transport System (ITS) is an alternative technology for base area networks and local area networks and is proposed for NGEN use in lieu of the CoSC infrastructure (fiber and copper).</p> <p>The Government has outlined the requirement to operate and maintain the existing NMCI infrastructure at a specified service level and security posture. To the extent this initiative and others like it reduce cost, the cost savings should be reflected in the price of technically acceptable proposals.</p> <p>The NGEN Transport Offerors may offer this technology within their proposed approach for NGEN Technology Refresh and Modernization.</p>
5		<p>Provided with the RFP documentation is a list identifying the "Useful Life" of switches.</p> <p>Is the DON still considering this dated technology and is the DON open to learning about new Passive Optical technology that eliminates the need for expensive switches and yearly maintenance and license renewals?</p>	<p>The Government has outlined the requirement to operate and maintain the existing NMCI infrastructure at a specified service level and security posture in accordance with DoDI 8500.2. To the extent this initiative and others like it reduce cost, the cost savings should be reflected in the price of technically acceptable proposals.</p> <p>The NGEN Transport Offerors may offer this technology within their proposed approach for NGEN Technology Refresh and Modernization.</p>
6		Does the DON desire to decrease real estate requirements for housing NGEN transport systems (BAN/LAN closets) in buildings and on ships? If it is possible to significantly reduce the square footage and/or eliminate the need for these closets, is the DON interested in learning how?	<p>The Government has outlined the requirement to operate and maintain the existing NMCI infrastructure at a specified service level and security posture in accordance with DoDI 8500.2. To the extent this initiative and others like it reduce cost, the cost savings should be reflected in the price of technically acceptable proposals.</p> <p>The NGEN Transport Offerors may offer this technology within their proposed approach for NGEN Technology Refresh and Modernization.</p>
7		If the NGEN ITS solution can reduce and/or eliminate the need for expensive HVAC systems for Telecommunications Rooms or BAN/LAN closets in buildings and on ships is the DON interested? If so when can we discuss the possibilities?	<p>The Government has outlined the requirement to operate and maintain the existing NMCI infrastructure at a specified service level and security posture in accordance with DoDI 8500.2. To the extent this initiative and others like it reduce cost the cost savings should be reflected in the price of technically acceptable proposals.</p> <p>The NGEN Transport Offerors may offer this technology within their proposed approach for NGEN Technology Refresh and Modernization.</p>

Item	Issue/Comment	Question	Response
8		Is the DON aware that optical networks utilizing passive devices are IPv6 ready and considering them?	<p>The Government has outlined the requirement to operate and maintain the existing NMCI infrastructure at a specified service level and security posture in accordance with DoDI 8500.2. To the extent this initiative and others like it reduce cost, the cost savings should be reflected in the price of technically acceptable proposals.</p> <p>The NGEN Transport Offerors may offer this technology within their proposed approach for NGEN Technology Refresh and Modernization.</p>
9		Providing Power over Ethernet (PoE) to devices is an effective method to ensure network devices continue to work as long as the network is UP. Is the DON aware that the Passive Optical LAN (POL) or Passive Optical Network (PON) provides PoE for data, video and voice devices?	<p>The Government has outlined the requirement to operate and maintain the existing NMCI infrastructure at a specified service level and security posture in accordance with DoDI 8500.2. To the extent this initiative and others like it reduce cost, the cost savings should be reflected in the price of technically acceptable proposals.</p> <p>The NGEN Transport Offerors may offer this technology within their proposed approach for NGEN Technology Refresh and Modernization.</p>
10		Is the DON aware Passive Optical LAN (POL) or Passive Optical Network (PON) provides secure Voice over Internet Protocol (VoIP)?	<p>The Government has outlined the requirement to operate and maintain the existing NMCI infrastructure at a specified service level and security posture in accordance with DoDI 8500.2. To the extent this initiative and others like it reduce cost, the cost savings should be reflected in the price of technically acceptable proposals.</p> <p>The NGEN Transport Offerors may offer this technology within their proposed approach for NGEN Technology Refresh and Modernization.</p>
11		Is the DON aware of the significant cost savings in choosing Passive Optical LAN (POL) or Passive Optical Network (PON) over current switched technology?	<p>The Government has outlined the requirement to operate and maintain the existing NMCI infrastructure at a specified service level and security posture in accordance with DoDI 8500.2. To the extent this initiative and others like it reduce cost, the cost savings should be reflected in the price of technically acceptable proposals.</p> <p>The NGEN Transport Offerors may offer this technology within their proposed approach for NGEN Technology Refresh and Modernization.</p>
12		Will the DON consider a Small Business NGEN IDIQ as large business has a track record of not meeting their small business participation goals?	One of the Program Manager and Contracting Officer functions in coordination with the Small Business Office and Advocate is to monitor and promote adherence to the prescribed Small Business participation goals. The NGEN Award Fee Plan promotes adherence to stated objectives. Sections L and M of the RFP define specific elements required from each Offeror to demonstrate how they will achieve the Government's Small Business goals.
13	<p>Logistics Management includes the personnel, processes, and tools required to sustain NGEN services and associated infrastructure (e.g., HW, SW, and facilities).</p> <p>Logistics Management is a shared service. The ES Contractor is designated as the primary service provider, and the TXS Contractor is designated as the supporting service provider. The Contractors shall collaborate with each other and any other service providers to provide common management of the services described below</p> <p>Contractor suggests use of this language for requirement - red bold lettering indicates new language.</p> <p>Logistics Management includes the personnel, processes, tools, and OEM warranties required to sustain NGEN services and associated infrastructure (e.g., HW, SW, and facilities). OEM warranties and extended warranties will be utilized to support associated infrastructure until HW or SW end of life is reached.</p>		<p>The Government does not intend to manage Original Equipment Manufacturer (OEM) warranties nor direct the Contractors on how to manage said warranties. It is up to the Offerors to chose a technically acceptable and cost efficient strategy.</p> <p>The Government has outlined the requirement to operate and maintain the existing NMCI infrastructure at a specified service level and security posture in accordance with DoDI 8500.2. For the Navy, the NGEN Contractors are responsible for maintaining the network and infrastructure for the life of the contract and to determine the sustainment methods. Contractors may utilize OEM warranties and extended warranties if desired.</p>

Item	Issue/Comment	Question	Response
14	b. Maintain new commercial products from installation through the technology refresh date or the life of the contract, whether within or beyond the length of the OEM's warranty		<p>The Government does not intend to manage OEM warranties nor direct the Contractors on how to manage said warranties. It is up to the Offerors to chose a technically acceptable and cost efficient strategy.</p> <p>The Government has outlined the requirement to operate and maintain the existing NMCI infrastructure at a specified service level and security posture. For the Navy, the NGEN Contractors are responsible for maintaining the network and infrastructure for the life of the contract and to determine the sustainment methods. Contractors may utilize OEM warranties and extended warranties if desired.</p>
15	The Draft RFP, as written, does not provide the Navy the ability to upgrade existing capabilities for meeting the evolving mission requirements of the current and future expectations of Navy senior leadership. In its current form, the specification does not address or support the implementation of pervasive wireless and security, or the provisioning capability that supports the "bring your own device" approach of the future. The final NGEN RFP should be written in context to an agile architectural approach for the future NGEN end state, and not simply addressing the transition and support of the current "as is – where is" environment.		<p>The proposed strategy is not consistent with the Government's Capability Production Document (CPD) or Acquisition Strategy. It is neither feasible or cost effective for the Government to change the existing requirement to the recommended approach.</p> <p>The Government has outlined the requirement to operate and maintain the existing NMCI infrastructure at a specified service level and security posture in accordance with DoDI 8500.2. There are opportunities during contract execution to enhance the network such as during NGEN Technology Refresh and Modernization or via the shared savings clause H-10.</p>
16	Based on the historical precedence of NMCI and CoSC, NGEN will become, if the program Draft RFP remains as written, an environment of End of Life (EOL) management of existing components versus a true enterprise architecture will continue unless the specification and evaluation criteria are modified. Discussions with the Navy user community indicate that their expectations are that new functionality and service offerings will allow them to meet future requirements, address the growing cyber threats, and keep pace with what other enterprise-class networks can offer.		<p>The proposed strategy is not consistent with the Government's Capability Production Document (CPD) or Acquisition Strategy. It is neither feasible or cost effective for the Government to change the existing requirement to the recommended approach.</p> <p>The Government has outlined the requirement to operate and maintain the existing NMCI infrastructure at a specified service level and security posture in accordance with DoDI 8500.2. There are opportunities during contract execution to enhance the network such as during NGEN Technology Refresh and Modernization or via the shared savings clause H-10.</p>
17	Defense-in-Depth has been a DoD Information Assurance (IA) strategy for some time, yet the WAN or Enterprise border (the commodity Internet or Defense Information Systems Agency [DISA]-provided access) facing outer network perimeter is typically where the majority of security devices and technologies have been positioned or enabled. Little emphasis has been given to the access layer until recent changes were made to the DISA Security Technical Implementation Guides (STIGs). A pervasive security architecture must be a mandatory component of the final NGEN RFP.		<p>The Government has outlined the requirement to operate and maintain the existing NMCI infrastructure at a specified service level and security posture in accordance with DoDI 8500.2. There are opportunities during contract execution to enhance the network such as during NGEN Technology Refresh and Modernization or via the shared savings clause H-10.</p>

Item	Issue/Comment	Question	Response
18	The Navy's own data from Attachment 44 NMCI/CoSC Statistics highlights the support challenges that you face with 49 different versions of operating systems currently deployed, along with the numbers of service calls, sparring sites, and investment in spares. It is imperative that the support requirements be more specific in the final RFP.		<p>The Government does not intend to manage OEM warranties nor direct the Contractors on how to manage said warranties. It is up to the Offerors to chose a technically acceptable and cost efficient strategy.</p> <p>The Government has outlined the requirement to operate and maintain the existing NMCI infrastructure at a specified service level and security posture in accordance with DoDI 8500.2. For the Navy, the NGEN Contractors are responsible for maintaining the network and infrastructure for the life of the contract and to determine the sustainment methods. Contractors may utilize OEM warranties and extended warranties if desired.</p>
19	Contractor recommends that the final RFP be written in a way that rewards innovation, and any technical approach that can ease the management of the network with the use of automated tools to drive down touch labor costs. These incentives would be a win-win in the current and future austere budget environments.		<p>The proposed strategy is not consistent with the Government's Capability Production Document (CPD) or Acquisition Strategy. It is neither feasible or cost effective for the Government to change the existing requirement to the recommended approach.</p> <p>The Government has outlined the requirement to operate and maintain the existing NMCI infrastructure at a specified service level and security posture in accordance with DoDI 8500.2. There are opportunities during contract execution to enhance the network such as during NGEN Technology Refresh and Modernization or via the shared savings clause H-10.</p>
20	For the TXS offering, we propose that the Navy use "Best Value" criteria and outline a set of criteria that provides incentives and encourages the SIs to propose innovative approaches to reduce operational costs and increase service offerings. A tightly integrated network infrastructure is not a commodity, it is the foundation upon which all other services ride and should be evaluated and procured as the investment that it is. Innovation should be encouraged – LPTA does the opposite, it forces SIs to cut down the infrastructure and not position the network to be one that can accommodate growth of new service offerings. One of the unintended consequences of the LPTA evaluation approach for the TXS portion is that the Navy will pay much more in the long run for any new offerings.		The Government's use of LPTA is a best value source selection methodology and consistent with the NGEN Acquisition Strategy. There are opportunities during contract execution to enhance the network such as during NGEN Technology Refresh and Modernization or via the shared savings clause H-10. The present strategy will support requisite growth and technology enhancements. The Award Fee Plan supports innovative thinking.
21	For the ES portion of the bid, the LPTA evaluation criteria are more applicable to the end user instruments (desktops, laptops, printers, etc.) and other peripherals due to the shorter lifecycles, typically between 12 and 36 months. Lifecycles of these end-user devices are much shorter than networking equipment and there is significant competition from a variety of sources.		The Government's use of LPTA is a best value source selection methodology and consistent with the NGEN Acquisition Strategy. There are opportunities during contract execution to enhance the network such as during NGEN Technology Refresh and Modernization or via the shared savings clause H-10. The present strategy will support requisite growth and technology enhancements. The Award Fee Plan supports innovative thinking.
22		Does the Government consider the services needed to be more of a technical skill set (i.e., collecting the data, retaining, producing, securing, etc.) or is the Navy looking for more of a legal skill set (i.e., attorney, paralegal) to assist the DON Attorneys?	Modified PWS Section 6.1.2 Litigation to: "The Contractor(s) shall provide technical advice and assistance for the following:".
23		Is it anticipated that the technology used to collect and preserve the EIF data would also be used by the Navy LEGAL and INVESTIGATIVE communities/entities to analyze, review, and produce the necessary data, or are those communities going to be responsible for using their own eDiscovery solutions for those types of Legal and Investigative activities?	The Government is still reviewing this requirement and the final position will be reflected in the RFP. An updated matrix will be posted to reflect any changes.

Item	Issue/Comment	Question	Response
24	<p>This section provides guidance for structuring the RFP response, including responses to specific PWS sections. However, not all PWS sections are referenced or mapped to a Factor/Subfactor.</p> <p>As an example, L-15 (a) (1) (i) states: "The Offeror shall describe its capability and approach to providing the NGEN Services specific in PWS Section 3.3 (Services Portfolio) and PWS Section 3.4 (IT Service Management). The Offeror's proposal shall specifically address:...." and the section later goes on to list a subset of PWS sections 3.3 and 3.4 (3.3.3, 3.3.16, 3.3.23, 3.3.22, 3.3.14, 3.3.10, and 3.4.1.2).</p>	<p>How does the Government intend for Offerors to respond to those PWS requirements that are not specifically referenced/called out in the proposal instructions? Using the example provided above, does the Government intend for Offerors to respond to ALL of PWS 3.3 and 3.4 within Subfactor 1.1 (NGEN Services), or JUST the (subordinate) PWS sections specified?</p> <p>If responses to all PWS requirements are required, please specify the location by Subfactor. We also request that the page limits be increased accordingly.</p>	<p>For evaluation purposes, the Offerors technical proposal will represent a subset of the service delivery requirements. The Government does not intend to evaluate all service delivery elements but instead only those requirements identified in Sections L and M of the RFP. The Government's technical team believes the evaluated elements will support the determination of an Offeror's capability to deliver the contracted services. The CLIN structure is appropriately mapped to the PWS to ensure the pricing covers all anticipated service requirements.</p> <p>The Government no longer requires the Offerors to address all elements of PWS Section 3.3 Services Portfolio and 3.4 IT Service Management (ITSM), and language pertaining to this has been removed from Section L.</p> <p>The following additional clarifying language has been added to Section L: "Where PWS sections (at any level) are identified to be addressed by the proposal, their inclusive subsections (at all subordinate levels) shall also be addressed unless otherwise specified."</p>
25	<p>RFP section H-4 states "The Government will provide the Contractor with space required to deliver the services under this contract, with the exception of Contractor provided space for Service Desk, Application Hosting (USN only) and a Test facility (USN only)." This appears to be in conflict with PWS section 3.5.5.a, which states that demilitarization and disposal of HW and SW must be performed at contractor provided facilities.</p>	<p>Could the Government please clarify where demilitarization and disposal of NGEN hardware and software must be/can be performed?</p>	<p>PWS paragraph 3.5.5.a has been changed to "Demilitarize and dispose of HW and SW at cleared Contractor or Government facilities in accordance with:"</p> <p>Added reference document DoD5220.22-M, National Industrial Security Program Operating Manual (NISPO) as additional guidance under 3.5.5.a.</p>
26	<p>There are inconsistencies between the contract deliverables called out in PWS section 3.6.2.d, requirements called out in Section L-14(b), Table L-14-2, and due dates called out in CDRLs A005 CWBS/A050 Phase-in Plan A050.</p>	<p>Will the Government please confirm that CDRL A005 CWBS and CDRL A050 are due 60 days after contract award as designated in the respective CDRLs?</p>	<p>Section L identifies what is required in the Offeror's proposal; whereas, the CDRLs identify the what and when the Contractor(s) are required to deliver during the execution of the contract. The Contract Work Breakdown Structure (CWBS) and the Phase-in Plan are required of all Offerors as part of the proposal and are not CDRLs. The Contractor awarded the contract is required to update and submit the CWBS as CDRL A005 and the Phase-in Plan as CDRL A050 60 days after contract award.</p>
27	<p>Requirement is to "provide all Contractor furnished licenses for the software functionality identified in the CoSC Master Software List". Column A of the CoSC Master Software List identifies the Contract Segment responsible for each software item/functionality which does not align with the PWS requirements. Example is the NAC scanning software which is identified as TXS but line 2948 of the PWS clearly indicates that the ES contractor is responsible for the NAC scanning.</p>	<p>Will the Government revise the requirement to read "Provide all Contractor furnished licenses for the SW functionality for contractor assigned services and tasks. Reference the CoSC Master Software List, listed as Attachment 18 in Section J of the contract, for currently utilized software, license and maintenance agreement availability."</p>	<p>Will change the PWS language to: "Provide all Contractor furnished licenses for the SW functionality for Contractor assigned services and tasks in accordance with the Attachment 18 CoSC Master Software List."</p> <p>Attachment 18 reference to Network Access Control (NAC) has been changed to ES. All other software functionality is being validated again for alignment with the PWS.</p>
28	<p>Instruction Tab states "This workbook contains 4 sheets: "Instructions", "Price Detail ES", "Price Detail TXS" and "Price Detail Combined". When opening file, Contractor discovered that "Price Detail ES" and "Price Detail TXS" were either missing or hidden.</p>	<p>Will the Government please provide the various tabs as noted on the instructions tab?</p>	<p>The Government has updated Attachment 7 Pricing Format to include an Instructions tab, a TXS Pricing tab, an ES Pricing tab for Scenario 1 (GFP), an ES Pricing tab for Scenario 2, a Combined (TXS and ES) tab for Scenario 1 (GFP), and a Combined (TXS and ES) tab for Scenario 2.</p>
29	<p>CLIN 000704 and CLIN 0018 appear to be duplicates for the same TSX requirements, Classified Remote Access Service (RAS).</p>	<p>Will the Government clarify which CLIN shall be priced for TXS RAS services?</p>	<p>These are not duplicates. There are Remote Access Services (RAS) that are part of base services in CLIN 0007. And, there are RAS for classified dial-up that the Government will order as part of CLIN 0018. No classified dial-up is included in CLIN 0007.</p>
30	<p>No WBS has been established for TXS 3.3.20 Cross Domain Security (CDS) Services.</p>	<p>Will the Government provide the WBS for TXS 3.3.20?</p>	<p>A WBS for TXS Cross Domain Security (CDS) Services has not been established for the TXS Offeror because there are no PWS CDS Services requirements for the TXS Offeror.</p>
31	<p>No WBS has been established for either ES or TXS 3.5 Logistics.</p>	<p>Will the Government provide the WBS for TXS 3.5?</p>	<p>The Logistics component of the WBS falls under Program Management (WBS 1.4.3 - Planning and Management of Logistics Functions).</p>
32	<p>No WBS has been established for either ES or TXS 3.6 Transition Services</p>	<p>Will the Government provide the WBS for TXS 3.6?</p>	<p>The offeror should include Transition Services costs with the corresponding prime mission product services (the 38 services).</p>
33	<p>No WBS has been established for either ES or TXS 6.0 Law Enforcement and Litigation</p>	<p>Will the Government provide the WBS for TXS 6.0?</p>	<p>The Law Enforcement and Litigation components of the WBS fall under Program Management (WBS 1.4).</p>
34	<p>The Logistics Manager requirement asks for "experience with the Department of the Defense programs with a minimum of five (5) years of Logistics Manager Experience in ACAT I/II program."</p>	<p>Will the Government revise the requirement as it has for other Key Personnel positions by removing DoD ACAT I/II?</p>	<p>Modified Attachment 36 Key Personnel Qualifications for the Logistics Manager experience to: "ACAT I/II Program(s) or a program of equivalent scope, as reflected by the threshold values set forth in DoD 5000.02."</p>

Item	Issue/Comment	Question	Response
35	Key Personnel Labor Categories currently ask for degree and specialized years of experience. Industry recruiting practices typically require degree or years of specialized experience as equivalent for required skills and capabilities. Many technical candidates without degrees have military backgrounds with years of specialized experience and technical certifications. Not allowing equivalent years of experience to substitute for degree eliminates many excellent candidates with both technical skills and military specific experience. These candidates offer valuable expertise with military systems that cannot be substituted by a degree.	Will the Government amend the key personnel language qualifications to allow bidders to propose candidates with either a) degree and experience or b) equivalent years of experience representing the aggregate total experience of the degree and years of practical experience (for all positions except the Program Manager). We agree the years of experience identified for all other key personnel categories are appropriate for this type and size program.	Modified Attachment 36 Key Personnel Qualifications to: "an educational equivalency four (4) years of experience in a comparable (i.e., performing the same or similar function) assignment on a network of at least 40,000 seats may be substituted for a Bachelor's degree. An educational equivalency is in addition to years of experience."
36	The ITSM requirement was moved from the Command and Control section of the Management volume to the NGEN Services section of the Technical volume, but the page count was not increased in the Technical Volume to accommodate the change.	Will the Government adjust (increase) the page allocation of the Technical Volume to accommodate the move of the ITSM content?	The Command and Control of the Management volume has not been moved and is still in L-15(b)(4). No page count changes are required.
37	There is an inconsistency between Section L and CDRL A024 regarding the delivery of the Technology Refresh Plan (TRP). Section L states that the TRP is due with the proposal and CDRL A024 states that the TRP is due 60 days after contract award.	Will the Government amend the Section L requirements to align with the CDRL requirements by removing the TRP as a proposal deliverable?	Section L identifies what is required in the Offeror's proposal; whereas, the CDRLs identify the what and when the Contractor(s) are required to deliver during the execution of the contract. Thus, the TRP is required of all Offerors as part of the proposal, and the Contractor awarded the contract is required to update and submit the TRP 60 days after contract award.
38	There is an inconsistency between the rate card (the estimated hardware price in J-8, row 12) and the RFP/Section L Table L-15-1 (TRP Funding Profile).	Will the Government review the inconsistency and confirm what the correct hardware procurement numbers are for ES and TXS?	Attachment 8 Rate Card contains estimates based on historical values for technology refresh, catalog items, and CLIN 5000 task orders.
39	The Government has stated in various forums, e.g., industry day on 28 October 2011 and Q&A #858 released on 29 February 2012 that small business credit could be claimed to the third tier. The Draft RFP, Section L-15(c) is not reflective of the Government's direction related to small business credit for third tier subcontractors.	Will the Government update Section L-15(c) to ensure that offerors may claim credit for third tier subcontractors?	RFP L-15 (c)(5) has been revised to: "Offerors may claim small business credit for subcontractors to the third tier, which will be reflected in the offeror's small business subcontract plan."
40	The Government has stated in Q&A response #859 released on 29 February 2012 that the "primary NAICS Code is applicable to the prime contractor. Credit will be given for eligible small businesses."	Will the Government incorporate the language from Q&A (29 February 2012) in Section L-15 9(c) to provide definitive guidance on the use of small businesses?	<p>NAICS codes prescribed in the RFP are those recommended by the SPAWAR small business advocate working in coordination with DoD/DON Small Business Administration (SBA) and is consistent with the NAICS codes utilized under NMCI and CoSC.</p> <p>NAICS 541512 applies to the Prime Contractor. The Prime may utilize any NAICS code that aligns to the subcontracted service support requirement as it deems appropriate.</p> <p>Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) 13-120.410 prescribes the standards for use of NAICS codes and states the standards to be utilized. (500 employees and \$25.5M for IT services contracts)</p> <p>In accordance with the SBA guidance (found at <a href="http://www.sba.gov">www.sba.gov</a>), companies may petition the Small Business Office for changes to the size standards.</p>
41	For Transition, CLIN 0001 covers Planning and Pre-Execution activities. CLIN 0002 covers Operations and Sustainment services during Phase-In. There is no CLIN identified for Transition Execution, and we presume that will be funded as a Task Order. But the Attachment file to the 03/16/2012 RFP identified as "ES and TXS Draft CLIN Mapping" shows "Execution [of Transition] mapped to CLIN 0002 and no mapping for Operations and Sustainment Services during Phase-In."	Is our understanding correct that Execution during transition is funded as a Task Order and therefore will not be included in our NGEN price? Will the Government please verify that the information in Attachment "ES and TXS Draft CLIN Mapping" is correct?	<p>The CLIN 0001 activity are those tasks [e.g., Preliminary Design Review (PDR), Critical Design Review (CDR), and Readiness to Transition Review (RTR)] that will be performed by the Contractors to demonstrate to the Government their readiness to transition. During CLIN 0002 performance, the Contractor will provide various services that culminate in operating and maintaining the entire network. At the time when the Contractor is operating the entire network, Assumption of Full Operational Responsibility (AFOR), the Government will stop ordering CLIN 0002 and order CLINs 0007, 0008, 0010, 0011, and 0015. All transition costs should be captured in the price for CLIN 0001 and/or CLIN 0002.</p> <p>The Section C introduction language now includes: "The CLIN 0001 activity are those tasks [e.g., Preliminary Design Review (PDR), Critical Design Review (CDR), and Readiness to Transition Review (RTR)] that will be performed by the Contractors to demonstrate to the Government their readiness to transition. During CLIN 0002 performance, the Contractor will operate and maintain various services that culminate in operating and maintaining the entire network. At the point when the Contractor is operating the entire network, Assumption of Full Operational Responsibility (AFOR), the Government will stop ordering CLIN 0002 and order CLINs 0007, 0008, 0010, 0011, and 0015."</p>

Item	Issue/Comment	Question	Response
42	Because the current contracts are between the Incumbent and the various Software Vendors, only the Incumbent can accurately provide the annual maintenance cost for each software product listed. The other bidders do not have access to the T&Cs of the agreements with the vendors preventing us from understanding how pricing would be effected, if we can even use the licenses under the current ENT agreement, or purchase support on just the portion of the license we will be using.		<p>For software designated as GFP, the Government will provide all licenses and associated maintenance agreements.</p> <p>If a software product is identified as available as GFP in Attachment 18 CoSC Master Software List and the Offeror elects to use the product, the Offeror will be required to procure or provide associated maintenance agreements (if available) subject to terms and conditions it may negotiate with the software provider.</p> <p>No, the Government will not adjust the price of the bid. Attachment 18 identifies the software that will be provided as GFP and the additional functionality the Offerors must provide.</p>
43	CLIN number cited in the J7 Instruction does not match the CLIN number in the referenced RFP paragraph	<p>Is it correct to assume that the instructions for the J7 Pricing Format table that call out CLIN 0091 should actually refer to CLIN 0096 as stated in the referenced section (RFP (L-15(e)(4)(iv)))? Is it also correct that CLIN 0096AA would be for classified work and 0096AB would be for unclassified work?</p> <p>If the assumption for <b>item 8</b> is correct, please explain the rationale for increasing a bidders pricing by 10% of CLINs 7 and/or 8, if no value is provided for CLIN 0096. There appears to be a financial penalty assessed if a bidder is not proposing non-commercial technical data or software with less than Government Purpose Rights (GPR).</p> <p>If the assumption for <b>item 8</b> is not correct and since we are not able to find a CLIN 0091, please provide clarification for the relevant instruction in the tab for the J7 Pricing Format table.</p>	<p>Yes, it should be CLIN 0096. The Government has updated the RFP accordingly.</p> <p>It is not correct that CLIN 0096AA is for classified and CLIN 0096AB is for unclassified; rather CLIN 0096AA is for TXS GPR and CLIN 0096AB is for ES GPR.</p> <p>The 10% factor has been removed from the RFP.</p>
44	Section L-15(a) & (b) states, "The Offeror shall provide, in its Price Proposal, an unpriced version of the Basis of Estimate." It is not clear if/how this unpriced version of the Basis of Estimate will be used in Evaluation of the Technical and a Management Proposals.	Are the unpriced BOEs that are provided as part of the Price Proposal going to be used to establish the Technical and Management Proposal Evaluation Ratings? If so, how will they be evaluated?	The technical evaluators reviewing the Technical and Management proposals will consider the unpriced BOEs in their evaluation of Factor 1 (Technical Approach) and Factor 2 (Management Approach), including the subfactors. The RFP has been revised for L-15 (d) (3) (ii): " The Offeror shall provide an unpriced BOE in Contractor format. The unpriced BOE will be provided to the technical evaluators to provide additional insight into the Offerors' Technical and Management approach for their consideration in evaluating Factor 1 (Technical Approach) and Factor 2 (Management Approach), including the Subfactors."
45	The previous version (USN_TXS-ES_Site_Scheduling_Tool _v.02_Aug 17 2011) had nearly 2000 sites. The Feb 3 version has about half that amount and included new sites	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Will the number of sites remain in this range for the Final RFP, or can we expect a significant increase or decrease?</li> <li>2. Can the number of network devices be added back in</li> <li>3. Can the B1 and B2 columns be added back in also?</li> <li>4. The monthly numbers for the Projects 1-5 don't map back exactly to the numbers in the NGEN Navy Site Schedule. Can NGEN's assumptions for sites be included in the next version?</li> </ol>	<p>There are significant changes to the number of remote sites since the release of the September 2011 draft RFP. The most up to date list of sites are reflect in the latest draft. No significant changes are expected between now and the final RFP.</p> <p>The source for the number of network devices is provided in Appendix A of the Product Baseline in the TDR; therefore, the number of network devices will not be added back in the Site Scheduling Spreadsheet. Product Baseline is reference in PWS Table 2.1-1 Applicable Documents.</p> <p>Yes, the Government will add columns B1 and B2 back into the Site Scheduling Spreadsheet</p> <p>The number of seats have been verified and adjusted for Projects 1-5 to reflect the Site Scheduling Spreadsheet.</p>

Item	Issue/Comment	Question	Response
46	Instruction Tab states "This workbook contains 4 sheets: "Instructions", "Price Detail ES", "Price Detail TXS" and "Price Detail Combined". When opening file, Contractor discovered that "Price Detail ES" and "Price Detail TXS" were either missing or hidden.	Contractor requests the provision of an updated file with the four Tabs delineated in the instructions.	The Government will provide an updated Attachment 7 Pricing Format to include an Instructions tab, a TXS Pricing tab, an ES Pricing tab for Scenario 1 (GFP), an ES Pricing tab for Scenario 2, a Combined (TXS and ES) tab for Scenario 1 (GFP), and a Combined (TXS and ES) tab for Scenario 2.
47	The following four (4) labor categories used in the CLIN staffing are not included in Attachment 8 (Rate Card), and therefore have no specified Education Levels or Minimum Experience:  Infrastructure Analyst (mid level) IT/Cyber NetOps Specialist (junior level) Technical Writer/Editor (junior level) Training Support (junior level)	Contractor requests the provision of Education Levels and Minimum Experience for the four (4) labor categories.	The following four categories have been aligned within Attachments 19 and 20 to the existing labor categories in the Rate Card. -Infrastructure Analyst (mid level) -IT/Cyber NetOps Specialist (junior level) -Technical Writer/Editor (junior level) -Training Support (junior level)
48	The following six (6) labor categories used in the CLIN staffing are not included in Attachment 8 (Rate Card), and therefore have no specified Education Levels or Minimum Experience:  HVAC Engineer (junior level) HVAC Engineer (senior level) Infrastructure Analyst (mid level) IT/Cyber NetOps Specialist (junior level) Technical Writer/Editor (junior level) Training Support (junior level)	Contractor requests the provision of Education Levels and Minimum Experience for the six (6) labor categories.	The following six categories have been aligned within Attachments 19 and 20 to the existing labor categories in the Rate Card. -HVAC Engineer (junior level) -HVAC Engineer (senior level) -Infrastructure Analyst (mid level) -IT/Cyber NetOps Specialist (junior level) -Technical Writer/Editor (junior level) -Training Support (junior level)
49	In order to provide the lowest pricing to the Government, Contractor requests that, for all software line items identified with Note 4 ("Licenses are available to the Contractor as GFP. If the Contractor opts to use the licenses, they must procure/provide associated maintenance agreements"), additional information be provided regarding the residual maintenance (both type and duration) that will be available as of December 14, 2012 (estimated effective award date).	Contractor requests the provision of the additional software maintenance information.	For software designated as GFP, the Government will provide all licenses and associated maintenance agreements.  If a software product is identified as available as GFP in Attachment 18 CoSC Master Software List and the Offeror elects to use the product, the Offeror will be required to procure or provide associated maintenance agreements (if available) subject to terms and conditions it may negotiate with the software provider.
50	Based on nomenclatures provided in the multiple documents, it is unclear how to map the following PWS elements to information sub CLINs (both classified and unclassified) under ES CLIN 0008:  3.3.1.1 SETR Process 3.3.1.2 Core Build Services 3.3.1.4 Service Delivery & Mgmt SW	Contractor requests the mapping of PWS elements to information sub CLINs.	The Government has provided the PWS to CLIN mapping on 16 March 2012 under the heading TXS and ES Draft CLIN Mapping. The final RFP will incorporate as Attachment 45. Attachment 7 Pricing Format will be updated to remove the requirement to allocate pricing to informational sub-CLINs under CLIN 0007 (TXS Operations and Sustainment), CLIN 0008 (ES Operations and Sustainment), CLIN 0010 (TXS Security Management), and CLIN 0011 (ES Security Management).
51	Based on nomenclatures provided in the multiple documents, it is unclear how to map the following PWS elements to information sub CLINs (both classified and unclassified) under TXS CLIN 0007:  3.3.1.1 SETR Process 3.3.1.2 Core Build Services 3.3.1.4 Service Delivery & Mgmt SW	Contractor requests the mapping of PWS elements to information sub CLINs.	The Government has provided the PWS to CLIN mapping on 16 March 2012 under the heading TXS and ES Draft CLIN Mapping. The final RFP will incorporate as Attachment 45. Attachment 7 Pricing Format will be updated to remove the requirement to allocate pricing to informational sub-CLINs under CLIN 0007 (TXS Operations and Sustainment), CLIN 0008 (ES Operations and Sustainment), CLIN 0010 (TXS Security Management), and CLIN 0011 (ES Security Management).

Item	Issue/Comment	Question	Response
52	<p>Information sub CLINs (both classified and unclassified) under ES CLIN 0008 appear to be missing for the following PWS element:</p> <p>3.3.22 Data Storage Services</p>	<p>Contractor requests the mapping of PWS element to information sub CLIN, or the provision of an additional information sub CLIN.</p>	<p>The Government has provided the PWS to CLIN mapping on 16 March 2012 under the heading TXS and ES Draft CLIN Mapping. The final RFP will incorporate as Attachment 45. Attachment 7 Pricing Format will be updated to remove the requirement to allocate pricing to informational sub-CLINs under CLIN 0007 (TXS Operations and Sustainment), CLIN 0008 (ES Operations and Sustainment), CLIN 0010 (TXS Security Management), and CLIN 0011 (ES Security Management).</p>
53	<p>Information sub CLINs (both classified and unclassified) under ES CLIN 0008 appear to be missing for the following PWS element:</p> <p>3.3.27 Unclassified Mobile Phone Services</p>	<p>Contractor requests the mapping of PWS element to information sub CLIN, or the provision of an additional information sub CLIN.</p>	<p>The Government has provided the PWS to CLIN mapping on 16 March 2012 under the heading TXS and ES Draft CLIN Mapping. The final RFP will incorporate as Attachment 45. Attachment 7 Pricing Format will be updated to remove the requirement to allocate pricing to informational sub-CLINs under CLIN 0007 (TXS Operations and Sustainment), CLIN 0008 (ES Operations and Sustainment), CLIN 0010 (TXS Security Management), and CLIN 0011 (ES Security Management).</p>
54	<p>Information sub CLINs (both classified and unclassified) under ES CLIN 0008 appear to be missing for the following PWS element:</p> <p>3.3.28 Classified Mobile Phone Services</p>	<p>Contractor requests the mapping of PWS element to information sub CLIN, or the provision of an additional information sub CLIN.</p>	<p>The Government has provided the PWS to CLIN mapping on 16 March 2012 under the heading TXS and ES Draft CLIN Mapping. The final RFP will incorporate as Attachment 45. Attachment 7 Pricing Format will be updated to remove the requirement to allocate pricing to informational sub-CLINs under CLIN 0007 (TXS Operations and Sustainment), CLIN 0008 (ES Operations and Sustainment), CLIN 0010 (TXS Security Management), and CLIN 0011 (ES Security Management).</p>
55	<p>Based on nomenclatures provided in the multiple documents, it is unclear how to map the following information sub CLINs (both classified and unclassified) under TXS CLIN 0007 to the appropriate PWS element:</p> <p>000701 Transport Services 000702 Operation Services</p>	<p>Contractor requests the mapping of information sub CLINs to PWS elements.</p>	<p>The Government has provided the PWS to CLIN mapping on 16 March 2012 under the heading TXS and ES Draft CLIN Mapping. The final RFP will incorporate as Attachment 45. Attachment 7 Pricing Format will be updated to remove the requirement to allocate pricing to informational sub-CLINs under CLIN 0007 (TXS Operations and Sustainment), CLIN 0008 (ES Operations and Sustainment), CLIN 0010 (TXS Security Management), and CLIN 0011 (ES Security Management).</p>
56	<p>Contractor believes that Section C incorrectly maps ES sub CLIN 0037AA (End User Training Services) to PWS paragraph 3.3.12.2.</p> <p>Contractor believes that the correct mapping is to PWS paragraph 3.3.34.</p>	<p>Please confirm Contractor assumption.</p>	<p>PWS Section 3.3.12.2 Process and Tools Training (CLIN 0037AA End User Training Services) is training services and PWS Section 3.3.34 End User Training Services (CLIN 0061 Enterprise Classroom Services) is for classroom setup (HW, SW, and network) services.</p>
57	<p>Contractor believes that Section C incorrectly identifies the ES sub CLIN for "Dual Desktop/Quarantine Seat Support" as 0029AD.</p> <p>Contractor believes that the correct identification is 0029AF.</p>	<p>Please confirm Contractor assumption.</p>	<p>The assumption is correct. The CLIN has been changed from 0029AD to 0029AF.</p>
58	<p>Contractor believes that Section C incorrectly identifies the ES sub CLIN for "Non-NGEN Workstation Support(NNWS) and Other Non-NGEN Device" as 0029AE.</p> <p>Contractor believes that the correct identification is 0029AG.</p>	<p>Please confirm Contractor assumption.</p>	<p>The assumption is correct. The CLIN has been changed from 0029AE to 0029AG.</p>
59	<p>Contractor believes that Section C incorrectly identifies the ES sub CLIN for "Legacy Web, File, Print Server Support" as 0029AF.</p> <p>Contractor believes that the correct identification is 0029AH.</p>	<p>Please confirm Contractor assumption.</p>	<p>The assumption is correct. The CLIN has been changed from 0029AF to 0029AH.</p>

Item	Issue/Comment	Question	Response
60	Contractor believes that Section C incorrectly identifies the ES sub CLIN for "Legacy Mail Box Support" as 0029AG.  Contractor believes that the correct identification is 0029AJ.	Please confirm Contractor assumption.	The assumption is correct. The CLIN has been changed from 0029AG to 0029AJ.
61	Based on nomenclatures provided in the multiple documents, it is unclear how to map the following information sub CLIN (both classified and unclassified) under ES CLIN 0008 to the appropriate PWS element:  000816 Dormant Account Support	Contractor requests the mapping of information sub CLINs to PWS elements.	The Government has provided the PWS to CLIN mapping on 16 March 2012 under the heading TXS and ES Draft CLIN Mapping. The final RFP will incorporate as Attachment 45. Attachment 7 Pricing Format will be updated to remove the requirement to allocate pricing to informational sub-CLINs under CLIN 0007 (TXS Operations and Sustainment), CLIN 0008 (ES Operations and Sustainment), CLIN 0010 (TXS Security Management), and CLIN 0011 (ES Security Management).  New PWS Section 3.3.30.7.3 Dormant Account Support will be added to the PWS and included in CLIN 0008.
62	PWS 3.3.14.1.c.i (CooP, DR and BC planning) "Conduct fail over testing for all redundant NGEN standard services twice a year."	Which NGEN Standard services are defined as having redundancy included?	PWS paragraph 3.3.14.1.c.i has been modified to:  c. Conduct capability continuity and fail over testing. (CDRL A019 – Test Plan, CDRL A020 – Test Procedures, and CDRL A021 – Test Report) i. Conduct fail over testing for all redundant NGEN standard services twice a year. a. DNS b. DHCP c. Service Desk d. NOC and SOC e. Time Synchronization f. NIPRNet and SIPRNet g. RAS h. EMS
63	MOC failover	What are the NGEN services that need to be failed over at these MOCs? Please provide a list.	PWS paragraph 3.3.14.1.c.iv has been modified to:  c. Conduct capability continuity and fail over testing. (CDRL A019 – Test Plan, CDRL A020 – Test Procedures, and CDRL A021 – Test Report) iv. Conduct fail over testing of NGEN services (AD, DNS, Print services, Radia, anti-virus, and email) twice a year, as planned and approved by the local MOC Commander, for the following MOCs, currently equipped with this capability: a) PACFLT MOC. b) Fleet Forces Command MOC. c) 3rd Fleet MOC.
64	User counts	Mentions 800,000 active end user accounts, last Q & A responses said to use 600,000, need clarification.	There are approximately 854,000 end users (approximately 654,000 for the Navy and approximately 200,000 for the USMC). Since PWS Section 3.3.30.7.1 refers to the Navy, the number of end user accounts should be 654,000. PWS paragraph 3.3.30.7.1.a will be modified to: "3.3.30.7.1.a. Provision, maintain, and operate up to 654,000 active end user accounts for the following unclassified and classified account categories:"
65	Base CLIN	Is there a base CLIN for support of this service?	The PWS 3.3.22 Data Storage Services are part of the base services under CLIN 0008. Additional storage requirements are to be priced under CLIN 0026.
66	User counts	How many users should we consider for the data set backup?	The Offerors should use 654,000 end users for the data set backup.

Item	Issue/Comment	Question	Response
67	Software purpose	What is the status of software listed in the NGEN Product Baseline v1.3 - 16 Nov 2011 document when it doesn't appear in Attachment 18 COSC Master Software list. For example Northern Storage Suite	Section L-12 will designate J-18 as the authoritative source for software pricing purposes.  The Government understands the present software inconsistencies between Attachment 18 and the NGEN Product Baseline v1.3 - 16 Nov 2011 document posted in the TDR. Offerors should use Attachment 18 to develop their proposals with regards to understanding software requirements.
68	Definition	What is the definition of 'smaller' when used in reference to Applications Backup (PWS 3.3.22.c.ii.c.v)?	Modified PWS paragraphs 3.3.22.c.ii.c.v, 3.3.22.c.ii.c.vi, 3.3.22.c.ii.c.vii, and 3.3.22.c.ii.c.viii from "smaller" to "small". Small sites have 24 to 249 seats.
69	Storage Hardware	There is no storage hardware listed in attachment 16 Navy Representative Assigned ES and TXS Infrastructure?	Attachment 16 Navy Representative Assigned ES and TXS Infrastructure will be modified to include storage hardware.
70	No specific PWS requirements for Server monitoring, management or maintenance	Is it correct to assume that the monitoring, management and maintenance of the servers required to provide an NGEN Service is to be included as a requirement and priced in the appropriate NGEN Service?	Yes, the monitoring, management and maintenance of the servers required to provide an NGEN service is to be included in the requirement and priced as part of CLIN 0007 and CLIN 0008.  In addition, Attachment 16 Navy Representative Assigned ES and TXS Infrastructure will be updated to ensure all applicable servers are present and allocated across the segments.
71	The definitions include a reference to Attachments J19 and J20 for the level of effort to be priced for the USMC workload by location. The unit of measure is monthly for the level of effort. When included in the B table this level of effort will be fixed for the assigned CLIN.	Is it intended that the stated level of effort will be fixed by CLIN by month by labor category during execution when using the B table, ? If so, how will changes (additions/deletions) of the level of effort for each CLIN be handled during execution?	The assumption is correct. The pricing under CLIN 0003 and CLIN 0004 (the SLINs) will be fixed price on a per month basis and based on the USMC labor category, skill mix, and location requirements identified in attachments 19, 20, 29, and 30.  If the support requirements need to be increased the Government will execute CLIN 0003AK and CLIN 0004AK. If the support requirements need to be decreased the Government will renegotiate and issue a modification.  In the event changes to the level of service is required at a specific site the SLIN for that site will be renegotiated based on the Rate Card.
72		Contractor assumes that the stated level of effort will be fixed by CLIN by month by labor category during execution and, if the Government requires additional levels of support in excess of that directed in Attachments 19 and 20, CLIN pricing will be updated accordingly.	If the level of effort needs to be increased the Government will execute CLIN 0003AK and 0004AK. If the level of effort needs to be decreased the Government will renegotiate and issue a modification.
73	Contractor assumes the WBS structure provided in the Attachment 35 can be modified, or replaced by a Contractor-generated WBS structure, to meet NGEN-specific requirements.	Please confirm Contractor assumption.	No modification or replacement to the Defense Cost and Resource Center (DCARC) approved WBS will be permitted as part of the proposal. Any deviation will be deemed technically unacceptable. Any adjustments made to the WBS will occur during the post award Integrated Baseline Review (IBRs) in conjunction with and approval by DCARC representatives.  Added to Section L-15 of the RFP: "No modification or replacement to the DCARC approved WBS will be permitted as part of the proposal. Any deviation will be deemed technically unacceptable. Any adjustments made to the WBS will occur during the post award IBRs in conjunction with and approval by DCARC representatives."
74	Auditing and Accountability Services	What is the current storage/size requirement for audit logging? What is the retention duration for on-line audit log storage? What is the retention duration for off-line audit log storage?	As stated in PWS Section 3.3.7 Security Event Management Services and in accordance with DoDI 8500.2, the audit log storage retention is one year. Online audit log retention is approximately 15-30 days under CoSC. Offline storage retention is approximately one year under CoSC. Current audit log storage is approximately 1.7 TB per week and approximately 88.4 TB per year under CoSC.
75	Security Operations Center (SOC) services	What is the average number of newly initiated IAVA activities per month? What is the current number of outstanding IAVAs?	Per the weekly NETOPS Status Report, the average number of new IAVAs per month under CoSC is approximately 10. The current number of open IAVAs under CoSC is approximately 26. The average number of new IAVBs per month under CoSC is approximately 12. The current number of open IAVBs under CoSC is approximately 4.

Item	Issue/Comment	Question	Response
76	Security Operations Center (SOC) services	How many CND Response Actions are received per month or per year?	In FY10, approximately 1,000 CND Response Actions were received and, in FY11, approximately 900 CND Response Actions were received under CoSC. The number of CND Response Actions depends upon a variety of exterior factors, such as security events, vulnerabilities, and incidents.
77	Security and IT Certification and Accreditation Services	What is the average number of newly initiated IA POA&M remediation activities per month? What is the current number of outstanding POA&Ms?	Average number of new IA POA&Ms per month is approximately 14. The current number of outstanding IA POA&Ms is 772.
78	Remote Access Services	What is the typical and maximum number of Remote Access Users?	Under CoSC the network can currently support 26,670 concurrent remote end users through broadband and dial-up connections. On average 10-15% are in use, with daily peaks up to 30%. Infrequent regional events have seen usage spike up to 50%.
79	IdAM and PKI Services	How many certificates are presently managed by NMCI? How many are newly created per year? How many certificates are anticipated to be created and managed under NGEN per year by the "internal certification authority infrastructure"? How many revocations are presently experienced per year?	<p>As per NMCI Certificate Authority, CoSC currently manages 275,000 unclassified Navy end point certificates, and 25,000 classified Navy end point certificates.</p> <p>Under CoSC, the "internal certification authority infrastructure" issues and manages approximately 275,000 unclassified and 25,000 classified Navy certificates annually. The number of newly created certificates is directly proportional to the number of end points.</p> <p>Under CoSC, there are presently zero revocations.</p> <p>The anticipated requirements for NGEN are consistent with CoSC.</p>
80	Cross Domain Services	How many cross domain platforms are currently in the NMCI environment? How many cross domain platforms are planned for the NGEN environment? We understand the cross domain requirements as to assist with GDA data transfers and to recommend Cross Domain projects through the Navy Cross Domain Solutions Office.	<p>NMCI is currently not supporting the hosting of any cross domain platforms and does not anticipate any immediate requirements to integrate any Cross Domain platforms.</p> <p>Any future requirements will be ordered via separate task orders under CLIN 5000.</p>
81	The first area for review would be the End User Hardware specified allocations as detailed in the CLIN structure. In particular we believe that increasing flexibility in thin client ratios would ensure DoN is acquiring a network that is agile and modern, and is not, in fact, a legacy network. Additionally, under Scenario 1, the pricing evaluation model should reflect refreshed EUHW, not the entire environment.		The Government is still reviewing this requirement and the final position will be reflected in the RFP. An updated matrix will be posted to reflect any changes.
82	The other significant issue is the one-year base period of performance. NGEN requires a significant up-front corporate investment - to ensure NGEN success, we ask that you consider revising the contract to a two-year base period and three option years.		The use of a multi-year contract is not consistent with the NGEN Acquisition Strategy.
83	In your cover letter you asked that we identify any area where we are asking for a service that exceeds and will significantly drive price beyond what is normally provided by your company to the majority of your customers.		The Government is still reviewing this requirement and the final position will be reflected in the RFP. An updated matrix will be posted to reflect any changes.

Item	Issue/Comment	Question	Response
84	<p>We assume that the updated labor category list and qualifications apply only to the Rate Card (Attachment 08), USMC TXS CLIN definitions (Attachment 19) and USMC ES CLIN definitions (Attachment 20). We also assume that, in order to provide a fully compliant and comprehensive staffing response to all efforts required by the Performance Work Statement, the staffing plan in support of fixed price CLINs contained in the Price Format (Attachment 07) is not constrained by the labor categories contained in the Rate Card.</p> <p>Please confirm that the Contractor, for the purpose of pricing fixed price CLINs contained in Attachment 07 (Price Format), has the discretion of using labor categories other than those contained in Attachment 08 (Rate Card) (at a minimum, the addition of the Key Personnel, Transition Support staff, Litigation Support and additional Program Management labor categories).</p>		<p>The assumption is correct, under CLIN 0003, CLIN 0004, and the Rate Card, the Offerors must use the labor categories as prescribed. This does not apply to the other fixed price CLINs.</p>
85	<p>In the current draft RFP the small business NAICS code for this acquisition is identified as 541512 indicating a business with average annual revenue not to exceed \$25 million.</p> <p>In the 29 February 2012 Answers to Industry Questions the Government indicates in response to question 661 the primary NAICS code is applicable to the prime contract. The small business is not required to have the NAICS code of the prime contract. For purposes of determining size status for Subcontractors, a company is considered "small" if the company is certified as small as determined by the SBA size standard for the appropriate NAICS for the specific work being subcontracted and which is the principal service/supply being provided by the Subcontractor.</p> <p>We were unable to locate this language in the current draft RFP. Will the Government please correct this oversight by including the above language in the final RFP.</p>		<p>NAICS - North American Industry Classification System NAICS codes prescribed in the RFP is that recommended by the SPAWAR small business advocate working in coordination with DoD/DON Small Business Administration (SBA) and is consistent with the NAICS codes utilized under NMCI and CoSC.</p> <p>NAICS 541512 applies to the prime Contractor. The prime may utilize any NAICS code that aligns to the subcontracted service support requirement as it deems appropriate.</p> <p>Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) 13-120.410 prescribes the standards for use of NAICS codes and states the standards to be utilized. (500 employees and \$25.5M for IT services contracts)</p> <p>In accordance with the SBA guidance (found at <a href="http://www.sba.gov">www.sba.gov</a>), companies may petition the Small Business Office for changes to the size standards.</p>
86	<p>The draft Attachment 7 provided on 3/16/12 does not allow for the correct price evaluation of end user hardware under Scenario 1 in CLIN 0070 (where existing EUHW is provided as GFE). The evaluated quantities in the referenced document represent pricing for the entire environment, where only refreshed EUHW should be priced and evaluated. We recommend modifying Attachment 7 for Scenario 1 to reflect only the refreshed quantities in each program year. This will ensure the Navy has the correct unit price for each device type and will also provide for accurate total pricing for Scenario 1.</p>		<p>The Government will provide an updated Attachment 7 Pricing Format which will include an Instructions tab, a TXS Pricing tab, an ES Pricing tab for Scenario 1 (GFP), an ES Pricing tab for Scenario 2, a Combined (TXS and ES) tab for Scenario 1 (GFP), and a Combined (TXS and ES) tab for Scenario 2.</p>

Item	Issue/Comment	Question	Response
87	<p>We believe DON can achieve significant cost reduction in the print and output by revising the current print services sections of the PWS. Currently the PWS promotes a commodity-centric approach that promotes printing/imaging, increasing cost. We believe DON would be better served by transitioning from a device-oriented approach to a mission-focused approach. Instead of procuring low-cost devices or device bundles, we recommend the PWS be modified and oriented toward the delivery of the base commodity functions of print, copy, fax, and scan within a services delivery model. This optimized service model should include and enable the flexibility to attach advance capabilities where and when needed to enable mission processes, while significantly eliminating the need to print. The result will be an agile and adaptive architecture that securely extends the reach and value of your network.</p>		<p>In accordance with PWS Section 3.3.31 Print Services, the Government has described its requirements which consists of a mix of devices and services-based print services. A single methodology does not support the Navy's customer base.</p> <p>There are opportunities during contract execution to enhance the network such as during technology refreshment or via the shared savings clause H-10.</p>
88	<p>Contractor recommends that the Department of the Navy consider the potential for a small business set aside portion within the NGEN program. There are numerous small, 8(a) and/or SDVOSB firms in the IT Community capable of performing large portions of work as outlined in the NGEN PWS to include System Design and Architecture, Project and Program Management and End User Support services. The use of one of these firms will also provide the Government with much needed credit for utilizing one of the Socio Economic programs. By selecting NAICS 517110 the government will ensure that the competition will attract more quality small businesses that can make the required financial and managerial commitment and provide the necessary technical and corporate resources to meet the ever growing challenges presented by the NGEN environment. Further, the proposed NAICS increases competition and does not eliminate small businesses that meet the \$25M size standard the competition.</p>		<p>NAICS - North American Industry Classification System NAICS codes prescribed in the RFP is that recommended by the SPAWAR small business advocate working in coordination with DoD/DON Small Business Administration (SBA) and is consistent with the NAICS codes utilized under NMCI and CoSC.</p> <p>NAICS 541512 applies to the prime Contractor. The prime may utilize any NAICS code that aligns to the subcontracted service support requirement as it deems appropriate.</p> <p>Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) 13-120.410 prescribes the standards for use of NAICS codes and states the standards to be utilized. (500 employees and \$25.5M for IT services contracts)</p> <p>In accordance with the SBA guidance (found at <a href="http://www.sba.gov">www.sba.gov</a>), companies may petition the Small Business Office for changes to the size standards.</p> <p>There will be no Small Business set aside under NGEN. The Government has established a 35% Small Business goal for the Prime to achieve.</p>
89	<p>EUHW – Despite clear efforts to balance the EUHW buyback between the incumbent provider and other Offerors, the various EUHW scenarios continue to offer undue advantage to the incumbent. We recognize the real cost to the Government, as reflected in CoSC CLIN 0272 revision P00028, and the resultant cost to provide as GFP. Since it is not clear how the two scenarios will be evaluated, we strongly recommend that Offerors be required to respond to Scenario 1 and that all options for Scenario 2 be removed. This enables Government to meet provisions of the CoSC while still allowing Offerors a level playing field with the incumbent.</p>		<p>The Government does not perceive there to be any unfair advantage regarding its acquisition strategy for end user hardware and associated services. The dual scenario pricing provision is deemed to provide the best acquisition solution in support of the Government's objectives.</p> <p>Any specific questions by the prospective Offerors regarding the clarity of the evaluation process should be submitted as part of the Bidders questions process associated with the issuance of the final RFP.</p>

Item	Issue/Comment	Question	Response
90	<p>Baseline Transparency - On several occasions the Government has communicated that all the information Offerors require to bid the NGEN opportunity have been made available; however, critical shortfalls and ambiguities persist.</p> <p>– Section L-15(a)(4)(iii) states “The Offeror shall use the current CoSC TRP and Enterprise Inventory Data (available per the link in L-8) to develop its NGEN TRP. Section L-8 states “The government does not warrant the accuracy of these documents”. In order for potential bidders to accurately price the existing CoSC EUHW for Scenario 2 options, a detailed and accurate accounting of the assets is necessary for every piece of end user equipment in order to accurately calculate the present asset value. In order to comply with Generally Accepted Accounting Principles, the incumbent contractor must have this data. It will need to be provided to prospective bidders to enable them to offer the lowest possible price for EUHW buyback Scenario 2. We are asking for non- proprietary data that a prospective buyer of the equipment would need to price a purchase. The following data needs to be detailed for competition:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Specific equipment configurations (e.g., manufacturer, model number, processor, RAM, hard drive(s), etc.)</li> <li>– Specific equipment locations (city, state, country)</li> <li>– Warranty date</li> <li>– Date of deployment of equipment</li> <li>– Purchase price</li> <li>– Depreciated value</li> </ul> <p>Reading room and website visits have not yielded the required data.</p>		<p>The Technology Refresh budget provided in Section L does not include the price of EUHW. EUHW is to be delivered as part of the service under CLIN 0070. The refresh requirements outlined in the CLIN 0070 description section. Section L-15(a)(4)(iii) does not apply to EUHW.</p> <p>The Government posted the Asset Management Database report in the TDR which includes the following fields:</p> <p>Asset ID, NMCI Asset Tag, Record Status, Serial Number, Description, Manufacturer, Model, Asset Category, Deployed Date, Disposal Date, NMCI Status, PSI, City, State, Building, Floor, Room, Cube, Tax Location Code, Task Order, UIC, Machine Name, Manufacturer Date, CLIN, Asset Type, Network Jack/Port ID, Service ID, Asset Order Date, Asset Refresh Date, Asset Owner, Parent ID, CoSC Category, ASDB Code, and Asset Class.</p> <p>The purchase price is not available however an estimate can be derived from CoSC CLIN 0272 pricing. See also provision L-10. The CoSC contract is available at:</p> <p><a href="http://www.public.navy.mil/spawar/PEOEIS/NEN/NMCI/Pages/ContinuityofServiceContract.aspx">http://www.public.navy.mil/spawar/PEOEIS/NEN/NMCI/Pages/ContinuityofServiceContract.aspx</a></p> <p>The depreciated value can be derived from estimated purchase price, install date, and 48 month refresh cycle. Additional information regarding EUHW estimates and pricing can be found in L-15(e)(2) and the CoSC Seat Refresh Plan can be found in the TDR.</p> <p>The transferability of OEM warranties for end user hardware is being assessed and will be reflected in the final RFP.</p>
91	<p>Technical Refresh Pricing – EUHW data provided to non-incumbent Offerors does not contain sufficient detail. To accurately price tech refresh to the lowest cost possible, all Offerors need to have the planned inventory status (including warranty information) at the time of NGEN contract start, incorporating current refresh plans up to the start of NGEN. Additionally, refresh quantities of devices per category (including VDI and Tablet) over the life of NGEN are important cost drivers for meaningful comparison. We have previously noted the lack of sufficient EUHW asset data, which continues to be one of the most important areas to be addressed by the Final RFP’s requirements.</p>		<p>The Technology Refresh budget provided in Section L does not include the price of EUHW. EUHW is to be delivered as part of the service under CLIN 0070. The refresh requirements outlined in the CLIN 0070 description section. Section L-15(a)(4)(iii) does not apply to EUHW.</p> <p>The Government posted the Asset Management Database report in the TDR which includes the following fields:</p> <p>Asset ID, NMCI Asset Tag, Record Status, Serial Number, Description, Manufacturer, Model, Asset Category, Deployed Date, Disposal Date, NMCI Status, PSI, City, State, Building, Floor, Room, Cube, Tax Location Code, Task Order, UIC, Machine Name, Manufacturer Date, CLIN, Asset Type, Network Jack/Port ID, Service ID, Asset Order Date, Asset Refresh Date, Asset Owner, Parent ID, CoSC Category, ASDB Code, and Asset Class.</p> <p>The purchase price is not available however an estimate can be derived from CoSC CLIN 0272 pricing. See also provision L-10. The CoSC contract is available at:</p> <p><a href="http://www.public.navy.mil/spawar/PEOEIS/NEN/NMCI/Pages/ContinuityofServiceContract.aspx">http://www.public.navy.mil/spawar/PEOEIS/NEN/NMCI/Pages/ContinuityofServiceContract.aspx</a></p> <p>The depreciated value can be derived from estimated purchase price, install date, and 48 month refresh cycle. Additional information regarding EUHW estimates and pricing can be found in L-15(e)(2) and the CoSC Seat Refresh Plan can be found in the TDR.</p> <p>The transferability of OEM warranties for end user hardware is being assessed and will be reflected in the final RFP.</p>
92	<p>The new Draft PWS from 16 March 2012 adds a requirement for security clearances above DoD SECRET. Please provide the work scope estimates and locations for TS/SCI-cleared FTEs.</p>		<p>The Government estimates a total of approximately 30 TS/SCI FTEs will be required in support of the MOCs (CLIN 0010 and CLIN 0011) and SOC's (CLIN 0007 and CLIN 0008).</p>

Item	Issue/Comment	Question	Response
93	<p>The latest Draft RFP includes several changes to the Past Performance requirements that represent a reversal in the Government's efforts to ensure that all bidders have an equal opportunity to compete.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o RFP Section L-15(d)(2)(iv) requires "evidence that the Offeror has achieved full service nationwide and global capability in the past to meet the NGEN SLRs (or equivalent)." NMCI currently has a limited global presence, and 55 new SLRs (including 10 specific to the MOCs) have been added to the requirements. We suggest this requirement be changed to "evidence that the Offeror has achieved a full-service CONUS capability to meet the network's SLRs."</li> <li>o RFP Section L-15(d) states: "Offerors submitting a combined proposal shall provide relevant past performance documentation for BOTH segments (ES and TXS)." Please confirm the Government's previous response stating that a combined proposal is required to submit five (5) past performance citations.</li> </ul>		<p>Section L-15(d)(2)(iv) requirements for global capability past performance has been removed.</p>
94	<p>RFP Section L-15(d) states: "Offerors submitting a combined proposal shall provide relevant past performance documentation for BOTH segments (ES and TXS)." Please confirm the Government's previous response stating that a combined proposal is required to submit five (5) past performance citations.</p>		<p>All Offerors (ES and TXS) are to submit 3 Past Performance Questionnaires per segment for the Prime and 2 questionnaires from among the major subcontractors for each segment. For a combined proposal, 6 Past Performance Questionnaires (3 for ES and 3 for TXS) and 4 questionnaires from among the major subcontractors (2 for ES and 2 for TXS).</p> <p>To be consistent, the Past Performance Questionnaire requirements do not change for combined proposals.</p>
95	<p>A large number of software packages are incumbent-owned custom code and not offered as GFP. Either licensing or replacing this SW drives a non-incumbent's price up relative to the incumbent. All non-COTS tools/SW should be GFP.</p>		<p>All non-COTS will not be provided as GFP. Attachment J-18 identifies the functionality requirements to be met and the incumbent's solution under CoSC. Where the Government is not providing the software as directed GFP under NGEN the Offeror may choose how to satisfy the functional requirements under NGEN.</p> <p>The Government is validating the list of incumbent custom code which will be offered as GFP. For the Final RFP, the Government will update Attachment 18 CoSC Master Software list based on this validation effort.</p>
96	<p>Per the RFP, Section L-15b(2)(i)a: "...for the USMC, all ES personnel shall be on site by 07 January 2013, and all TXS personnel shall be on site by 06 January 2014." Assuming this requirement is not in error with a December 14, 2012 award date it would be difficult for anyone other than an incumbent to fulfill this requirement.</p>		<p>Section L has been updated and now states that TXS Contractor personnel shall be on board 120 days after contract award at the MCNOSC and 150 days after contract award for all other sites and ES Contractor personnel shall be on board 180 days after contract award at the MCNOSC and 210 days after contract award for all other sites. Attachments 19 and 20 have been updated to reflect this change.</p>
97	<p>Three significant commercial facilities (Test, Service Desk and Applications Hosting) must be provided by the Successor Contractor. The application of a uniform facility transition cost would facilitate fair and open competition. However, the Government has taken the position that it will not apply a uniform cost as, "... it would result in potential for award to an Offeror that would evaluate as lowest price, but have a higher price in reality" (December 16, 2011, Government Response). Due to the Transition cost disparity between Incumbent and Non-Incumbents we recommend that price proposal evaluation procedures be instituted to evaluate only Offerors' transition technical approach and quality, but not their respective transition costs. Such an approach could be achieved via relatively simple instructions to the Selection Panel and is not uncommon in similar major acquisitions within DoD.</p>		<p>The Government has taken significant steps to foster competition by leveling the playing field to include the infrastructure buyback and IP purchase. The Government will not apply a uniform cost as it would result in potential for award to an Offeror that would evaluate as lowest price, but have a higher price in reality.</p>

Item	Issue/Comment	Question	Response
98	<p>Small Business Requirements - In the 24 February, 2012 "Responses to Industry" item #469 stated "Language is updated to include 2nd and 3rd tier subcontractors" in reference to credit toward satisfying small business participation goals. In the subsequent 29 February, 2012 "Responses to Industry - Updated Small Business Questions" item #733, stated "Small business requirements will be provided in section L-15 of the RFP and have been updated to include 2nd and 3rd tier subcontractors. The total amount of subcontracted dollars will be 35% of the contract price." While requirement L-15 (c) (5) does reflect that the small business participation goals are based on "total contract value" no language is included in the 16 March, 2012 DRFP regarding small business participation credit for second and third tier small business subcontractors. Please add such language.</p>		<p>RFP L-15 (c)(5) has been revised to: "Offerors may claim small business credit for subcontractors to the third tier, which will be reflected in the offeror's small business subcontract plan."</p>
99	<p>Attachment 8 Rate Card requests one discount rate off GSA prices for all hardware to be used for all contract years. The Government has not provided a list of hardware requirements, items, and services, to be procured. To provide the most economical price to the Government, discounts should be provided for each hardware line item or, at least, discounts should be provided for categories of hardware items (seats, servers, storage, peripherals, printers, mobile smart devices, etc.) by year.</p>		<p>The Government will revise the RFP to replace the one discount rate with discounts for item categories.</p> <p>The representative list of material has been provided in the Technical Data Repository (TDR) identified in L-8 and is expected to be substantially the same as the material procured under the NMCI contract and CoSC. The Technology Refresh Plan and the COTS Catalog are examples of the type of equipment to which the discounts apply.</p>
100	<p>PM NGEN Responses to Industry Comments &amp; Questions dated 24 February, 2012, Items #159 and #160 address Industry concerns that the NMCI/COSC Configuration Management Database may not yet be fully operational, and/or may be undergoing or have recently undergone tool change-out. Line 187 of the March, 2012 PWS DRAFT Attachment 18, Master Software List 23 February 12, 2012 contains the following comment:</p> <p>"CMDB Component: Service Management/ITIL Unk future functionality in NGEN/Probable replacement New Owner will incur O*M costs until replaced by incumbent"</p> <p>Offerors will need the planned status of this CMDB and its level of integration expected by the start of the NGEN program to allow for delivery of an accurately priced, lowest cost RFP response. As currently described in the DRFP it presents an unbounded risk and undefined operational cost to the program. Please clarify. Given the uncertainty, we recommend the CMDB be provided as GFE with a "should cost" estimate for the level of support, or as a Rate Card item for labor pricing for CMDB integration, operation, and sustainment.</p>		<p>The Government will provide the current state under CoSC of the Configuration Management Database (CMDB) in the TDR. Offerors should refer to the TDR for the current listing of non-COTS software which will be provided as GFP and Attachment 18 for the current listing of COTS software which will be provided or made available as GFP.</p>
101	<p>Section H-4, Government Furnished Facilities states "The Government will provide the Contractor with space required to deliver the services under this contract, with the exception of contractor provided space for Service Desk, Application Hosting (USN only) and Test facility (USN only)." The Application Hosting facility will be stood up during transition under CLIN 0002AS as tasked under PWS 3.3.21. After transition CLIN 0058 for Application Hosting has been identified as "Rate Card". How will the contractor be reimbursed for the investment in the Application Hosting facility after transition?</p>		<p>Attachment 7 Pricing Format and Section B CLIN 0058 will be revised to allow Offerors to price the applications described in Attachment 9 Application Hosting Services Requirements. The application hosting currently provided under CoSC, including facility requirements, will be orderable on monthly basis under CLIN 0058. The development documents for the 37 hosted applications are available in the TDR. All new applications that require hosting will be priced via the Rate Card under separate sub-CLINs.</p>

Item	Issue/Comment	Question	Response
102	<p>PWS 3.4.1.3, Asset Management (line 4908) specifies that the Offeror "Affix IUID tags to existing GFP as part of the physical asset inventory conducted during Phase-in." With this requirement, IUID tags would be applied only to the GFP sampled as part of the physical configuration audit described in PWS 3.6.2, Phase-in Services (Line 5893) of select NGEN sites and Communities of Interest (COI). This appears to be inconsistent with the overall objective of tagging all assets to enable effective asset tracking and management. We recommend that this inconsistency be resolved by specifying that the remainder of the assets be tagged as the contractor stands up each site so that we can provide a low price, technically acceptable solution. Additionally, we request clarification of the tagging requirement with respect to devices such as Blackberries which are too small for the IUID tags.</p>		<p>Section 3.4.1.3.c.ii has been modified to address the ambiguity: "Affix IUID tags to all existing GFP by the completion of Phase-in Transition Services".</p> <p>Assets procured under other contracts (e.g., BlackBerries) will be tagged under the provision of those contracts.</p>
103	<p>The new Data at Rest DAR Services (PWS 3.3.4.2) requirement to do "forensic level restores of encrypted hard drives" will drive significant cost for NGEN. In order to respond with the lowest price, current anticipated transaction volumes and requirements (e.g. chain of evidence) for these services are necessary. We also must know if this capability exists (i.e. tied to existing enterprise Encase working with encryption) or is to be developed. DoN may also want to consider using backup and restore tools to meet this requirement.</p>		<p>The Government is still reviewing this requirement and the final position will be reflected in the RFP. An updated matrix will be posted to reflect any changes.</p>
104	<p>Given the ES provider is the one responsible for providing EUHW as a service, there is a substantial termination liability risk for Offerors if the government discontinues use for EUHW Scenario 2 (Non-GFP), which would drive up price. The CoSC appears to have addressed the EUHW Termination liability risk to the Contractor [Per P00028 of the CoSC contract, CLIN 0272: "...If the Government discontinues this service on any existing task order, the government will acquire the discontinued end user device"]. Recommend the Government include in NGEN solicitation language and in subsequently awarded contract the clause that states "should the Government discontinue EUHW as a service (ES contractor) under the NGEN contract, the end user devices in place will continue to be leased through the end of their service life"- or that the government agrees to pay any early termination penalty cost. By eliminating contractor risk this significantly reduces cost that will be built into Offerors' proposals.</p>		<p>The Government recognizes the successful Offeror is assuming a financial risk associated with this procurement; however, termination liability language will not be added and this risk should be priced into the proposal.</p>

Item	Issue/Comment	Question	Response
105	<p>There is not enough specific information about the COI operational environment in many cases for Offerors to make a cost effective proposal for specific types of support.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- NNPI – What level of clearance is required for this COI, and at what sites and locations is the support performed?</li> <li>- NCIS - What level of clearance is required for this COI, and at what sites and locations is the support performed?</li> <li>- POR GO – How many sub COI's are in scope? What are the locations for support?</li> <li>- USPACOM – What are the COI's that make up PACOM?</li> </ul>		<p>Additional COI artifacts will be uploaded to the TDR.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- uNNPI – Secret clearance is required for uNNPI systems administration and system management. The uNNPI servers are maintained and operated from facilities at the Norfolk NOC, the Pearl Harbor NOC, and the Bremerton server farm that are cleared to process uNNPI data. All of the NGEN uNNPI end users are homed to one of those sites.</li> <li>- NCIS - Secret clearance is required for NCIS. The NCIS server farm (NCIS Data Center) is located at the Washington Navy Yard (WNYD).</li> <li>- POR GO – The POR GO COI is established via VLANs throughout the NGEN environment. Specific locations and current orders will be posted to the TDR. PWS Section 3.1.2.2.5 Program of Record (POR) Government Owned (GO) Seats has been modified to accurately reflect the requirements.</li> <li>- USPACOM – PACOM is a COI within NGEN defined by a separate AD forest and service delivery framework.</li> </ul>
106	<p>The current language of the CLIN 0070AL for Hosted Virtualized Desktop (HVD) is ambiguous in terms of the level of virtual desktop integration and timing. Desktop virtualization (PWS 3.3.30.4) has general requirements for VDI to be ordered under additional task orders – (e.g. Section "g. Expand the VDI [ordered via separate task orders], including deployment of additional 4467 servers and network storage"). CLINS 0070AL and 0072AB "Hosted Virtualized Desktop (Thin Client) and usage services" require the Offeror to respond with monthly pricing. We require specific data on the HVD standards (Citrix assumed), planned HVD project status at contract start, configurations, anticipated volumes of devices, and schedule to ensure no disruption to operations in support of the mission. For example a 100 percent VDI solution in option year one without consideration of the network would add significant risk to the mission. Absent this data Offerors will be unable to provide the lowest possible price to the DoN or be assured of fair evaluation of their proposals.</p>		<p>The Government is still reviewing this requirement and the final position will be reflected in the RFP. An updated matrix will be posted to reflect any changes.</p>
107	<p>Per the RFP, Section L-15b (2) (i) a: "...for the USMC, all ES personnel shall be on site by 07 January 2013, and all TXS personnel shall be on site by 06 January 2014." Staffing to this level over the shortened period from contract award on December 14 2012 could prove disruptive to operations.</p>		<p>Section L has been updated and now states that TXS Contractor personnel shall be on board 120 days after contract award at the MCNOSC and 150 days after contract award for all other sites and ES Contractor personnel shall be on board 180 days after contract award at the MCNOSC and 210 days after contract award for all other sites. Attachments 19 and 20 have been updated to reflect this change.</p>
108	<p>A large number of software applications (87) identified in attachment 18 are incumbent owned custom code and not offered as GFP. Most of this software is not available for sale and details of functions/use/complexity have not been provided. This has the potential to drive significant operational performance risk to the DoN. This also runs counter to the stated NGEN goal of a GO/CO network (Reference: PWS 1.1.1). There is potential impact to the stability of the network if these tools are not passed to the successful Offeror. Offerors will be unable to price the replacement of these tools effectively with the current level of data provided. We therefore recommend making all non-COTS tools and SW GFP.</p>		<p>All non-COTS will not be provided as GFP. Attachment J-18 identifies the functionality requirements to be met and the incumbent's solution under CoSC. Where the Government is not providing the software as directed GFP under NGEN the Offeror may choose how to satisfy the functional requirements under NGEN.</p> <p>The Government is validating the list of incumbent custom code which will be offered as GFP. For the Final RFP, the Government will update Attachment 18 CoSC Master Software list based on this validation effort.</p>

Item	Issue/Comment	Question	Response
109	<p>There is insufficient data on performance of the current system against current requirements and SLRs. Further, no data has been provided as to the ability of current systems to meet NGEN SLR levels, nor do we know if the tools will be in place to measure performance to NGEN SLRs. In addition, there are requirements for WAN SLRs that are not within the scope of this program, since WAN performance is managed by DISA. Offerors need data on current performance and planned tools to minimize disruption during transition in order for solution implementation to comply with new SLRs.</p>		<p>The Contractor will not be held responsible for any failures of DISA to support meeting the SLRs.</p> <p>Attachment 13 NGEN SLRs reflects the Government's requirements.</p> <p>The Government has determined the SLRs are achievable by the "as-is" infrastructure. Any authorized deviations from Service Level Requirements will be reviewed on a case by case basis.</p>
110	<p>The NGEN Homeport portal is HP custom SW and the license is not offered for sale. The PWS (3.3.24.1) specifies that the successor provide O&amp;M support, not develop a new version of Homeport software. However the master software list (Attachment 18) has this listed as "Note 5: Licenses will not be provided to the Contractor as GFP". We suggest the Government acquire the license and require the contractor to maintain the NGEN specific data as specified in the PWS to minimize disruption. Replacing Homeport or acquiring licensing, if required, would be a significant cost.</p>		<p>Homeport will be provided as GFP, and Attachment 18 CoSC Master Software List will be updated to reflect this.</p>
111	<p>Per the PWS, C2 is exercised through a 24x7x365 watch organization which conducts NAVGIG service operations including monitoring, managing, and reporting on IT services and security. Are these operational activities to be provided by NGEN Staff? If so what is the anticipated mix between Government and contractor personnel?</p>		<p>The Government will have the necessary staff to perform C2. The Contractor is responsible for providing all staff including managers for the delivery of all PWS services.</p>
112	<p>The Enterprise Management, (EM) section performs IT operations management, problem management, analysis and metrics collection, and coordinates with the Navy and Joint IT commands (PWS line 141). Are these operational activities to be provided by NGEN Staff? If so, what is the mix between Government and contractor personnel?</p>		<p>The Government will have the necessary staff to perform C2. The Contractor is responsible for providing all staff including managers for the delivery of all PWS services.</p>
113	<p>The government grouped both refresh and new seat requirements under single CLINS. ex: "Any new seat service deployment will be a complete hardware bundle that includes USB Smartcard keyboard, USB Optical Mouse, and Flat screen monitor. Any seat refresh will include CPU only."</p> <p>There will be a significant difference in cost difference between the 2 requirements therefore recommend the government either:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Have a separate CLINS for "new" as opposed to "refreshed" seats or:</li> <li>2. Specify the quantities of "new" vs. "refresh" seats so that offerors may accurately calculate a blended price</li> </ol>		<p>The description in Section C will be modified to: "Any new or technology refresh seat service deployment will be a complete hardware bundle (e.g., USB smartcard keyboard, USB Optical Mouse, and flat screen monitor)."</p> <p>A new machine provided either through technology refresh or a new order will require a new hardware bundle.</p>
114	<p>Please update attachment J-17 to include the specifications for all End User HW CLINS. Currently, only Desktop and Laptop specifications are listed. Missing:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Rugged Laptop</li> <li>• Graphics Workstation</li> <li>• Remote USB Device</li> <li>• High End Graphics Notebook</li> <li>• NMCI on a Stick</li> <li>• Hosted Virtualized Desktop (Thin Client)</li> <li>• Hard Drive Carriage Assembly</li> </ul>		<p>Attachment 17 Workstation Minimum Requirements will be updated to include the specifications for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Rugged Laptop</li> <li>• Graphics Workstation</li> <li>• Remote USB Device</li> <li>• High End Graphics Notebook</li> <li>• NMCI on a Stick</li> <li>• Hosted Virtualized Desktop (Thin Client)</li> <li>• Hard Drive Carriage Assembly</li> </ul>

Item	Issue/Comment	Question	Response
115		Under EUHW Scenario 1 – GFP - will the government be responsible for the disposal of the Government owned systems when they are refreshed at end of life?	No, the Contractor will be responsible for all disposal in accordance with PWS Section 3.5.5 Demilitarization and Disposal.  Section L-15(b)(5)(vii) also cites demilitarization and disposal instructions.
116		Will the government please provide a current and complete End User HW asset inventory to include: deployment date, remaining service life, warranty expiration date, location (for tax purposes), Model#, Manufacturer, and specifications (Processor, Memory, Hard Drive)?	The Government will post updated Asset Management information to Technical Data Repository. for the following fields: Asset ID, NMCI Asset Tag, Record Status, Serial Number, Description, Manufacturer, Model, Asset Category, Deployed Date, Disposal Date, NMCI Status, PSI, City, State, Building, Floor, Room, Cube, Tax Location Code, Task Order, UIC, Machine Name, Manufacturer Date, CLIN, Asset Type, Network Jack/Port ID, Service ID, Asset Order Date, Asset Refresh Date, Asset Owner, Parent ID, CoSC Category, ASDB code, and Asset Class.  The purchase price is not available however an estimate can be derived from CoSC CLIN 0272 pricing. The CoSC contract is available at: <a href="http://www.public.navy.mil/spawar/PEOEIS/NEN/NMCI/Pages/ContinuityofServiceContract.aspx">http://www.public.navy.mil/spawar/PEOEIS/NEN/NMCI/Pages/ContinuityofServiceContract.aspx</a>  The depreciated value can be derived from estimated purchase price, install date, and 48 month refresh cycle.  The transferability of OEM warranties for end user hardware is being assessed and will be reflected in the final RFP.
117	For Scenario 2, Method A – Buy from Incumbent: Recommend the government establish separate CLINs for offerors to price existing CoSC Hardware purchased and offered to the govt. as EUHW as a service. This will allow the Navy to realize cost improvements as soon as possible by minimizing dissimilar cost blending and will ensure greater transparency into Price vs. Requirement. The 0070AA-0070AM CLINs should be used only for new or refreshed EUHW that is fielded post award.	Will the Navy consider separate CLINs for billing purposes for this hardware group?	Separate CLINs will be established for the existing CoSC hardware and the new technology refresh end user hardware.
118	The Navy has indicated that an accelerated transition is desirable. To do so, an offeror's service elements will need to be shifted left to an earlier start date and "turned on" sooner than specified in the Navy's published transition plan. This will increase the offeror's cost and ultimately the evaluated price.	Question: If an alternate, accelerated transition enables the Navy to stop services provided by the CoSC incumbent earlier in the transition plan – will this cost avoidance be credited to the offeror's bid – thus decreasing the evaluated price?	No credit will be given to the Offerors for cost avoidance.
119	Virtual Desktop Infrastructure	Since the field service support costs can be greatly diminished for a VDI seat, can the Navy provide an estimated adoption rate of VDI so that offerors may provide the most accurate pricing?	The Government is still reviewing this requirement and the final position will be reflected in the RFP. An updated matrix will be posted to reflect any changes.
120		The Navy has provided the number of VIP's and the ability to designate someone as a VIP. Can the Navy provide an estimated number of VIP's per site? Will the SLA's travel with the VIP's for both NGEN and Non-NGEN locations?	The Government does not track VIP services by site. However 80% of all VIP services reside in the following sites: Pentagon, Norfolk, San Diego, and Pearl Harbor Hawaii.  The Government is revising the CLIN structure to address VIP Services.  In addition, PWS Section 3.1.2 General Requirements will be revised to capture the appropriate description for VIP service requirements.  The Government is still reviewing this requirement and the final position will be reflected in the RFP. An updated matrix will be posted to reflect any changes.

Item	Issue/Comment	Question	Response
121		Can the Navy provide more details on the Non-NGEN end user hardware, warranty status, number of systems, locations, SLA's, VIP requirements?	<p>There are no SLRs specific to Non-NGEN seats (legacy) and no VIP requirements for Non-NGEN seats. The estimates for Non-NGEN end user hardware connectivity are in Attachment 7 Pricing Format as CLIN 0029AE and CLIN 0029AG.</p> <p>Warranty information is unavailable for Non-NGEN seats. The location of the Non-NGEN seats is available in the Technical Data Repository (TDR).</p> <p>PWS, CLINs, Attachment 7 Price Summary Format, Attachment 32 Ongoing Infrastructure and Engineering Support, and other applicable documents will be updated to support effective pricing by the Offerors.</p>
122	<p>PWS Section 3.3.33.1 –Legacy Services - Legacy Services consists of integrating and supporting legacy servers, end user devices, network 4661 components, and other devices, as well as COTs software in the NGEN environment.</p> <p>Can the Navy provide clarification around the applications, configurations and locations of the environments to be supported under Legacy Services, and explain how this support differs from the support being provided for the rest of the NGEN environment as detailed in the PWS? Please include device totals, SLAs, etc...included in this support.</p>		<p>The devices supporting Legacy Services will be command owned equipment. The NGEN Contractor is responsible for the support identified in PWS Section 3.3.33.1.</p> <p>There are no SLRs specific to Non-NGEN seats (legacy) and no VIP requirements for Non-NGEN seats. The estimates for Non-NGEN end user hardware connectivity are in Attachment 7 Pricing Format as CLIN 0029AE and CLIN 0029AG.</p> <p>PWS, CLINs, Attachment 7 Price Summary Format, Attachment 32 Ongoing Infrastructure and Engineering Support, and other applicable documents will be updated to support effective pricing by the Offerors.</p>
123		Descriptions do not match the specifications in Attachment 17. Example: workstations in the spreadsheet request 104-key keyboards, not smartcard reader keyboards. Also, the laptop core configuration in the spreadsheet doesn't include a bag, as implied. Will the government please clarify the exact EUHW specifications to be priced?	Attachment 17 Workstation Minimum Requirements will be updated to include the appropriate end user hardware specifications.
124	During the last industry day and in the responses to Q&A, the government confirmed that Tier 2 and 3 Small Business subcontractor credit would be granted. The latest Draft RFP does not reflect this. Recommend the RFP be revised to clearly state that Tier 2 and 3 Small Business subcontractor count towards the prime offeror's goals.		RFP L-15 (c)(5) has been revised to: "Offerors may claim small business credit for subcontractors to the third tier, which will be reflected in the offeror's small business subcontract plan."
125	USMC CLINs 0003xx and 0004xx are defined both in terms of staffing hours required (using Attachments 19 and 20) and PWS-defined scope.	Does the Government intend for the Offeror to commit to: (1) deliver the services (IAW QASP and other defined metrics) using a contractor-defined staffing plan; or (2) provide staff at the levels and hours specified (in Attachments 19 and 20) to perform work WITHIN the scope defined by the PWS?	<p>The Government intends for the Offerors to commit to: option (2) provide staff at the levels and hours specified (in Attachment 19 USMC TXS CLIN Definitions and Attachment 20USMC ES CLIN Definitions) to perform work within the scope defined in the PWS.</p> <p>If the Government has additional requirements, separate task orders will be issued.</p> <p>The QASP is deemed a surveillance tool. The Contractor will be held accountable for the requirements identified in the RFP.</p>
126	AHS services outlined in PWS and attachment 9 are not in line with CLIN table	AHS section, along with Attachment 9 outlines the need for the vendor to provide all infrastructure. However the CLIN tables in attachment 7 outlines AHS is to be billed via rate card.... Will the DON clarify how the infrastructure and other ODC cost are to be billed?	Attachment 7 Pricing Format and Section B CLIN 0058 will be revised to allow Offerors to price the applications described in Attachment 9 Application Hosting Services Requirements. The application hosting currently provided under CoSC, including facility requirements, will be orderable on monthly basis under CLIN 0058. The development documents for the 37 hosted applications are available in the TDR. All new applications that require hosting will be priced via the Rate Card under separate sub-CLINs.
127	The sustainment CLINs are divided by Classified and Unclassified; however some of the services included in the lot sustainment CLINs are not tracked by classified and unclassified.		For costs that support both classified and unclassified, the Offerors should include the cost/price under the unclassified element. The Government requires this visibility.

Item	Issue/Comment	Question	Response
128	Currently in the price evaluation model provided in Attachment 7, the Phase In CLINs (CLINs 0001 and 0002) are additive to the Operations and Sustainment CLINs (CLINs 0006 onwards). Please clarify if the Operations and Sustainment CLINs will be evaluated on a full 5 year basis. Please further clarify whether the total evaluated price would reflect 5 full years of operations and sustainment + some months of transition depending on the bidders' phase in plan.	Please confirm that the Government is evaluating transition cost in addition to 5 years of operations and sustainment	No, the total evaluated price requires less than five years of operations and sustainment because of Phase-in CLINs 0001 and 0002. This will be reflected in the updated Attachment 7 Pricing Format.
129	Please clarify whether the Government will order the Operations and Sustainment CLINs (CLINs 0006 onwards) only after ALL the profiles have successfully transitioned to NGEN based on the bidders' phase in plans?	During the Phase-In period, please confirm that the operations and sustainment services post AFOR for each respective profile should be priced in the corresponding CLIN 0002 till all the profiles have been transitioned to NGEN?	<p>The CLIN 0001 activity are those tasks [e.g., Preliminary Design Review (PDR), Critical Design Review (CDR), and Readiness to Transition Review (RTR)] that will be performed by the Contractors to demonstrate to the Government their readiness to transition. During CLIN 0002 performance, the Contractor will provide various services that culminate in operating and maintaining the entire network. At the time when the Contractor is operating the entire network, Assumption of Full Operational Responsibility (AFOR), the Government will stop ordering CLIN 0002 and order CLINs 0007, 0008, 0010, 0011, and 0015. All transition costs should be captured in the price for CLIN 0001 and/or CLIN 0002.</p> <p>The Section C introduction language now includes: "The CLIN 0001 activity are those tasks [e.g., Preliminary Design Review (PDR), Critical Design Review (CDR), and Readiness to Transition Review (RTR)] that will be performed by the Contractors to demonstrate to the Government their readiness to transition. During CLIN 0002 performance, the Contractor will operate and maintain various services that culminate in operating and maintaining the entire network. At the point when the Contractor is operating the entire network, Assumption of Full Operational Responsibility (AFOR), the Government will stop ordering CLIN 0002 and order CLINs 0007, 0008, 0010, 0011, and 0015."</p>
130	We understand that the CLIN structure is organized as base services CLINs and uplift CLINs. For example Testing Services in PWS section 3.3.13 are to be priced in the base services CLINs (CLIN 0008) and also as uplifts in CLINs 0047 and 0049. For services that need to be priced using the base and uplift approach, please clarify what volume of the service need to be priced in the base. Please also specify the threshold after which the Government will order from the uplift CLINs. This clarity will help bidders submit proposals that can be evaluated comparably. We have raised some of these issues in prior comments as well and would request a clarification.		<p>Section C will be modified to provide additional clarification.</p> <p>Service data is available in the TDR. For example, approximately 300 CLIN 0047s and 10,500 CLIN 0049s were ordered.</p> <p>Any additional data not provided in the TDR should be specified by the Offerors.</p>
131	Speaks to refreshing HVAC, Electrical, Heating, Ventilation, and AC.	Would like the DON to clarify that facilities maintenance is limited to server farms, NOCs and SOC which is maintained today. Vendors do not have the ability to maintained HVAC, electric and such for facilities other than those components since they are owned by the Navy.	<p>As identified in PWS Section 3.5.8 Facilities Management, system operation, maintenance, auditing inspections, testing, and repair will be performed for all assigned GFF. Assigned GFF will consist of NMCI infrastructure currently being maintained by the Incumbent. As under NMCI, the Navy will be responsible for operating and maintaining the GFF infrastructure.</p> <p>The complete Consolidated Facilities Infrastructure list is contained under the "CFI Baseline" tab on the NGEN Tech Data site which can be found at <a href="https://partners.mitre.org/sites/NEN_TXS_RFP_GOV_TECH_DOC/default.aspx">https://partners.mitre.org/sites/NEN_TXS_RFP_GOV_TECH_DOC/default.aspx</a>.</p>
132	Section states we replace or upgrade legacy network. This is very open ended and would be expensive. Line 3641 and 3657 states the government is responsible for Switch replacements.	To accurately reflect the support required in CLIN 29AH and CLIN 29AJ for legacy networks, please clarify quantity and locations of these legacy networks in order to ensure the vendor can develop the necessary support structure	PWS, CLINs, Attachment 7 Price Summary Format, Attachment 32 Ongoing Infrastructure and Engineering Support, and other applicable documents will be updated to support effective pricing by the Offerors. To be priced via Rate Card if information is not made available.

Item	Issue/Comment	Question	Response
133	Sections states this will be performed by the ES Contractor.	<p>VoIP is listed as a ES only service. VoIP is integrated solution that requires support from both Transport and ES providers in order to be successful. Working with the voice circuits and terminating them at TXS equipment is key to enabling the VoIP system both to receive and make calls outside the local base. There are numerous key TXS components critical to the over success of managing VoIP some of which are as follows.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• QOS aware gateways for Switches, routers</li> <li>• PSTN interfaces</li> <li>• Local Session Controllers (LSC),</li> <li>• Edge Boundary Controllers (EBC)</li> <li>• Supporting the circuits and demark point with facilities,</li> </ul> <p>Strongly recommend the DON ands TXS as support the VoIP services - for Pat to review for letter to swap 24x 7 this language for MOC language</p>	The Government has outlined its requirement, which is to operate and maintain the existing VoIP infrastructure. The existing infrastructure is limited (local only) and not end-to-end. There are opportunities during contract execution to expand VoIP during technology refresh or via the shared savings clause H-10, at which point the to-be VoIP architecture will be defined and appropriate system and service elements allocated to the appropriate segment contractors.
134	Award Fee identifies 55% of the award fee is linked to the success of the transition milestones.	Please clarify what the evaluation factors and the associated award fee pool % will be after the phase in period is completed.	Per the Attachment 3 Award Fee Plan, the factors and criteria may change over time to reflect the changing priorities of the Program. However, the percentages that correspond to present program concerns have been established and are contained in Attachment 3. Per the Award Fee Plan, these percentages may be adjusted unilaterally with 30 days notice to the Contractor.
135	Given the requirements In Section L15 (e), for bidders to submit pricing for 2 different scenarios Attachment 7 does not align.	Please clarify how the pricing will be provided in Attachment 7.	The Government will provide an updated Attachment 7 Pricing Format which will include an Instructions tab, a TXS Pricing tab, an ES Pricing tab for Scenario 1 (GFP), an ES Pricing tab for Scenario 2, a Combined (TXS and ES) tab for Scenario 1 (GFP), and a Combined (TXS and ES) tab for Scenario 2.
136	Logistics Manager	Should the requirement pertaining to ACAT experience be consistent with other key personnel requirements that state specifically, "...ACAT program(s) or equivalent dollar value commercial contract."?	Modified Attachment 36 Key Personnel Qualifications for the Logistics Manager experience to: "ACAT I/II Program(s) or a program of equivalent scope, as reflected by the threshold values set forth in DoD 5000.02."
137	Service Manager	Service Delivery Manager role is not consistent within an ITIL v3 oriented organization. This role should be re-oriented and aligned to Transition Management. Does this need to be a Key Personnel position rather than a Required position within the PWS?	Language in the Attachment 36 Key Personnel Qualifications will be revised to align with ITIL v3 structure.
138	One lesson from the NMCI deployment of printers is that the mandated and constrictive user-to-device guidelines did not match the needs of the users and mission. While a user-to-device ratio target may be appropriate to guide a deployment, it must ultimately be derived by actual user needs, work load, facility constraints and their mission requirements. As a result, DON organizations purchased incremental printers outside of their core devices. The results were unintended and unnecessary devices being introduced driving up the total cost of operations. 'Device Creep' is a frequently observed result when unrealistic and mandated metrics are present. Best practices in DoD implementations find that the optimal target user-to-device ratio range is between 8:1 and 12:1 and the target proximity radius metrics are 20 feet to 30 feet for mono and 50 feet to 100 feet for color. The actual result will depend on the physical facility and the requirements of the work groups. Perhaps the NGEN team can set target deployment goals in the solicitation along with governance policy for substantiating deviation, but wait until the print services contractor conducts an assessment of a specific DON organization before defining the actual metrics. We respectfully request that the NGEN team remove the specified user-to-device ratio and walking distance mandates as a minimum criteria. Instead, NGEN should establish reasonable targets such as those previously mentioned and charge the respondents to put forth their approach, best practice methods and measurements to control costs while meeting user requirements.		<p>The DON will not remove the specified user-to-device ratio and walking distance mandates as the minimum criteria, this is the DON's current requirement.</p> <p>The individual commands have the ability to order additional printers under CLIN 0013 and on the COTS Catalog to meet their mission needs or to increase their user-to-device ratio.</p> <p>There will be opportunities to modify the ratios of printer devices during technology refresh and through the Shared Savings Clause H-10.</p>
139		Directory Services asked for maintenance of Global Address List look up from Outlook and Outlook Web Express. Does this requirement also extend to network-based multifunction print devices?	Multi-function print devices are not part of the Global Address List under NGEN.

Item	Issue/Comment	Question	Response
140		Does the cross domain data exchange capabilities also apply to the print services to require that printing from NIPRNet can be released on the SIPRNet as a means to optimize the infrastructure and consolidate assets?	No, there are currently no cross domain print capabilities in the NMCI environment.
141		In order to reduce the burden and cost associated with mapping every computing device, especially mobile devices, and personnel travelling, relocating, etc. The technology exists now to eliminate the need to map drivers to individual print devices. Will the NGEN team change this requirement to reflect that every computer seat shall have the capability to print to a network queue, leveraging a universal driver, such that print jobs can be retrieved from any printing device on the network? This would drive redundancy and capability.	The Government has outlined their requirement for print services, which is to operate and maintain the existing print infrastructure and service delivery paradigm. There are opportunities during contract execution to improve the delivery of print services as part of task order execution, during technology refreshment or via the shared savings clause H-10 that will enable a more efficient mapping process.
142		Has the DON selected an enterprise electronic records management system to be maintained? Is it a requirement that all document capture systems must be integrated with existing TRIM installations?	<p>Total Records and Information Management (TRIM) is an electronic documents and records management system. DoD mandates any tool supporting records management be compliant with the DoD 5015.02-STD, Electronic Records Management Software Applications Design Criteria Standard, April 25, 2007. Updated content in the PWS Data Management Section 3.4.1.11 clarifies the Navy NGEN requirement for the successor vendor to provide a Records Management Application (RMA) that is certified as 5015.2 compliant. The requirement to perform electronic records management in accordance with 5015.2 has also been added. No specific system is specified on the required functionality. TRIM is a 5015.2 certified application currently available for use by the Navy.</p> <p>TRIM is currently in place as the DON Records Management Application (RMA). Requirements for the sustainment of a DON Electronic Records Management Solution are provided in PWS paragraphs 4.5.1.1.t-bb, 4.5.1.1.dd, 4.5.19.1.nn, and 4.5.30.h.xiii. The requirements for the Contractors to retain and manage records are also provided in paragraphs 4.7.1.i, 4.7.1.p.ii.a, and 6.1.1. Information about the current TRIM solution is available in the Technical Data Repository.</p> <p>PWS Section 3.4.1.11 Data Management, Attachment 16 Navy Representative Assigned ES and TXS Infrastructure, and Attachment 18 CoSC Master Software List will be updated.</p>
143		Is the DON looking for potential contractors to provide an electronic records management system to fulfill this requirement or implement an existing DON standard system?	<p>The successful prime contract Offeror will determine its requisite subcontracting support to fulfill the Government's requirements for all contracted services.</p> <p>Total Records and Information Management (TRIM) is an electronic documents and records management system. DoD mandates any tool supporting records management be compliant with the DoD 5015.02-STD, Electronic Records Management Software Applications Design Criteria Standard, April 25, 2007. Updated content in the PWS Data Management Section 3.4.1.11 clarifies the Navy NGEN requirement for the successor vendor to provide a Records Management Application (RMA) that is certified as 5015.2 compliant. The requirement to perform electronic records management in accordance with 5015.2 has also been added. No specific system is specified on the required functionality. TRIM is a 5015.2 certified application currently available for use by the Navy.</p> <p>TRIM is currently in place as the DON Records Management Application (RMA). Requirements for the sustainment of a DON Electronic Records Management Solution are provided in PWS paragraphs 4.5.1.1.t-bb, 4.5.1.1.dd, 4.5.19.1.nn, and 4.5.30.h.xiii. The requirements for the Contractors to retain and manage records are also provided in paragraphs 4.7.1.i, 4.7.1.p.ii.a, and 6.1.1. Information about the current TRIM solution is available in the Technical Data Repository.</p> <p>PWS Section 3.4.1.11 Data Management, Attachment 16 Navy Representative Assigned ES and TXS Infrastructure, and Attachment 18 CoSC Master Software List will be updated.</p>

Item	Issue/Comment	Question	Response
144		Will the NGEN team please provide the information on the legacy RMA system needed for integration?	<p>Total Records and Information Management (TRIM) is an electronic documents and records management system. DoD mandates any tool supporting records management be compliant with the DoD 5015.02-STD, Electronic Records Management Software Applications Design Criteria Standard, April 25, 2007. Updated content in the PWS Data Management Section 3.4.1.11 clarifies the Navy NGEN requirement for the successor vendor to provide a Records Management Application (RMA) that is certified as 5015.2 compliant. The requirement to perform electronic records management in accordance with 5015.2 has also been added. No specific system is specified on the required functionality. TRIM is a 5015.2 certified application currently available for use by the Navy.</p> <p>TRIM is currently in place as the DON Records Management Application (RMA). Requirements for the sustainment of a DON Electronic Records Management Solution are provided in PWS paragraphs 4.5.1.1.t-bb, 4.5.1.1.dd, 4.5.19.1.nn, and 4.5.30.h.xiii. The requirements for the Contractors to retain and manage records are also provided in paragraphs 4.7.1.i, 4.7.1.p.ii.a, and 6.1.1. Information about the current TRIM solution is available in the Technical Data Repository.</p> <p>PWS Section 3.4.1.11 Data Management, Attachment 16 Navy Representative Assigned ES and TXS Infrastructure, and Attachment 18 CoSC Master Software List will be updated.</p> <p>NMCI/CoSC related TRIM information can be found in the Technical Data Repository Facilities.</p>
145		In managing and creating workflow, will the DON include a requirement that the system must be able to electronically map existing workflow processes to identify bottlenecks and inefficiencies that can be corrected in the future workflow implementation?	There are currently no requirements to map existing electronics records management processes in order to identify bottlenecks and inefficiencies. There will be an opportunity post transition to address future workflow implementation via the Continuous Service Improvement Plan (CSIP) detailed in PWS Section 3.2.2 Continuous Service Improvement and CDRL A010 - Continual Service Improvement Plan (CSIP).
146		Will potential Awardees have access to all previous NMCI Deliverable for estimation and costing of current support resources? These can include, but not limited to, DEV 40x series documents? (i.e. DEV 400 - Architecture Design Documents, DEV 403 - Solution Delivery and Installation Documents, DEV 408 - Requirements Document, and Certification and Accreditation Package (C&A))	Yes, this information is available in the TDR.
147		Will NGEN leverage DoD Reciprocity, released by DoD PAA (Dated July 23, 2009) to ensure timely deployment, advance information sharing, reduce rework and cycle time when establishing Software and Hardware Certification and Accreditation.	NGEN will follow the DoD Information Assurance Certification and Accreditation Process (DIACAP) and subsequent instructions for all C&A activities. Available certification and accreditation data from other DoD agencies will be integrated as applicable.
148		4.5.33 Printing Services - Section J, specifically references the monitoring of paper and consumables. Will the contractor be responsible for ordering and maintaining all consumables including paper? Will the Marine Corp be able to provide paper usage if this is the case?	USMC: All consumables (paper, toner, etc.) will be provided by the Government. The Contractor is not responsible for procuring these items.
149		Section B references the contractors responsibility to provide all consumables sans paper. This would imply that the contractor is responsible for procuring and installing consumables such as toner. Will DON provide historical volumes to enable the contractor to adequately account for the cost of toner and related consumables that are directly impacted by utilization, such as maintenance kits and photoconductors?	<p>The assumption is correct, the Contractor is responsible for procuring and installing printer consumables as defined in Tier 1 and Tier 2.</p> <p>No, the Government has not collected historical usage data therefore cannot provide.</p> <p>Under CLIN 0013AA Printer Site/Command Survey, the Contractor shall conduct unit survey to determine projected usage rates.</p> <p>Prior to ordering Tier 1 and Tier 2 print services, the Government will request the Contractors conduct a survey to collect printer utilization information and other related detail to support the ordering of print services. Once the order is issued for Tier 1 or Tier 2 print services the Contractor must fulfill the print requirement regardless of page count.</p>

Item	Issue/Comment	Question	Response
150	<p>One of the critical data points when sizing the proper device for the workload of the user community is the anticipated Recommended Monthly Page Volumes (RMPV). RMPV is represented as a range from an effective low volume expectation to a max reasonable representation of maximum consistent monthly image volume. RMPV is the current standard in the industry. RMPV is the most appropriate metric for hitting a particular device's sweet spot. RMPV places the accountable for accommodating the stated range on the vendor. The old way of specifying utilization was Monthly Duty Cycle. Monthly Duty Cycle is not an appropriate measure of real world application. Monthly Duty Cycle is calculated based on short period printing runs to estimate when a device is going to need a maintenance overhaul that would include replacing most of, if not all of the engine parts. No device should run consistently at its Monthly Duty Cycle or it will be cost prohibitive to maintain. Monthly Duty Cycle is not a real world metric to align capability to anticipated page volumes. We respectfully request that NGEN provide the anticipated average volumes for each of the catalog bands so that the respondents can propose the appropriate devices.</p>		<p>The assumption is correct, the Contractor is responsible for procuring and installing printer consumables as defined in Tier 1 and Tier 2.</p> <p>No, the Government has not collected historical usage data therefore cannot provide.</p> <p>Under CLIN 0013AA Printer Site/Command Survey, the Contractor shall conduct unit survey to determine projected usage rates which includes Recommended Monthly Print Volume (RMPV).</p> <p>Prior to ordering Tier 1 and Tier 2 print services, the Government will request the Contractors conduct a survey to collect printer utilization information and other related detail to support the ordering of print services. Once the order is issued for Tier 1 or Tier 2 print services the Contractor must fulfill the print requirement regardless of page count.</p> <p>There will be opportunities to modify the ratios of printers devices during tech refresh and through the Shared Savings Clause H-10.</p>
151	<p>Having qualified bidders is the most important factor, and must be addressed as the priority. The assumption that the 40,000 seat threshold is a valid mechanism for qualifying contractors is a fundamental misunderstanding of the operational and logical architecture that allows NMCI to function today. That threshold might be valid if the DON focused solely on a "bottoms up" view of the physical network infrastructure. NMCI's largest physical enclave is just under 4000 seats, but with all the attendant enterprises services that go with each of the accounts. The 40,000 seat performance threshold is too low.</p>		<p>DON technical authorities (SPAWAR 5.0) have reviewed the current NGEN RFP Past Performance requirements and determined that they are sufficient to ensure that an Offeror would be capable of taking over NGEN service delivery responsibilities without unacceptable risk to the network.</p> <p>As Offerors prepare their proposals, they have access to essentially all network Technical Data including technical drawings, processes and procedures. After award, the NGEN Contractors will take over a network that is fully operational. Prior to the implementation of any new architectures or technical solutions, certification and accreditation in accordance with DoD and DON instructions will be required along with test and pilot demonstrations (see PWS Section 3.3.1 , Engineering Design and Support Services (EDSS), Section 3.3.8 Security and IT Certification and Accreditation (C&amp;A) Services, and Section 3.3.13 Testing Services). After satisfactory certification and accreditation, testing and pilot demonstrations, new solutions will be rolled out incrementally. If problems of scale emerge, there will be sufficient warning to pause further deployment until issues have been resolved.</p> <p>The Government has done a technical evaluation of the risks associated with scaling on enterprise networks and has determined the risk of scaling from 40,000 seats to the full NGEN capability is sufficiently low to deem a demonstrated capability of providing 40,000 seats technically acceptable.</p>

Item	Issue/Comment	Question	Response
152	<p>Additional risk with respect to provider qualification is introduced because there are new requirements beyond existing NMCI , and a new set of services. This combination of new technical and service requirements introduces transition risk even with a qualified bidder at the helm. Specifically, there are revised performance standards, potential for operations in multiple transition scenarios under multiple contracts, new reporting requirements and CLIN tables, among others.</p>		<p>DON technical authorities (SPAWAR 5.0) have reviewed the current NGEN RFP Past Performance requirements and determined that they are sufficient to ensure that an Offeror would be capable of taking over NGEN service delivery responsibilities without unacceptable risk to the network.</p> <p>As Offerors prepare their proposals, they have access to essentially all network Technical Data including technical drawings, processes and procedures. After award, the NGEN Contractors will take over a network that is fully operational. Prior to the implementation of any new architectures or technical solutions, certification and accreditation in accordance with DoD and DON instructions will be required along with test and pilot demonstrations (see PWS Section 3.3.1 , Engineering Design and Support Services (EDSS), Section 3.3.8 Security and IT Certification and Accreditation (C&amp;A) Services, and Section 3.3.13 Testing Services). After satisfactory certification and accreditation, testing and pilot demonstrations, new solutions will be rolled out incrementally. If problems of scale emerge, there will be sufficient warning to pause further deployment until issues have been resolved.</p> <p>The Government has done a technical evaluation of the risks associated with scaling on enterprise networks and has determined the risk of scaling from 40,000 seats to the full NGEN capability is sufficiently low to deem a demonstrated capability of providing 40,000 seats technically acceptable.</p>
153	<p>While the 40k seat past performance threshold may be appropriate at moderate risk for evaluating the Transport Services bid, we believe that this threshold presents extreme risk to the Navy for the ES and Combined bids. We have recommended in the past that bidders be required to have experience operating enterprises of over 100,000 seats. At minimum , we recommend that the DON mitigate this risk by raising the ES and Combined bid thresholds for qualifying experience to operations of at least 80K seats in a single enterprise.</p>		<p>DON technical authorities (SPAWAR 5.0) have reviewed the current NGEN RFP Past Performance requirements and determined that they are sufficient to ensure that an Offeror would be capable of taking over NGEN service delivery responsibilities without unacceptable risk to the network.</p> <p>As Offerors prepare their proposals, they have access to essentially all network Technical Data including technical drawings, processes and procedures. After award, the NGEN Contractors will take over a network that is fully operational. Prior to the implementation of any new architectures or technical solutions, certification and accreditation in accordance with DoD and DON instructions will be required along with test and pilot demonstrations (see PWS Section 3.3.1 , Engineering Design and Support Services (EDSS), Section 3.3.8 Security and IT Certification and Accreditation (C&amp;A) Services, and Section 3.3.13 Testing Services). After satisfactory certification and accreditation, testing and pilot demonstrations, new solutions will be rolled out incrementally. If problems of scale emerge, there will be sufficient warning to pause further deployment until issues have been resolved.</p> <p>The Government has done a technical evaluation of the risks associated with scaling on enterprise networks and has determined the risk of scaling from 40,000 seats to the full NGEN capability is sufficiently low to deem a demonstrated capability of providing 40,000 seats technically acceptable.</p>
154	<p>While the requirements in the March DRFP represent an improvement over previous versions, NMCI baseline volumes are still not fully captured. Specific input has been provided to the program office that captures the scope and scale of the NMCI network, which as been incorporated into the DRFP as Attachment 44. However, bidders are not requirement to solution to the scope presented in Attachment 44, nor are they required to consider Attachment 44 as a basis for their cost models. As a result the standard for technical acceptability is not adequately defined to ensure that pricing reflects the appropriate workload or required workforce skill levels.</p> <p>We <b>recommend</b> that Section L require bidders to address the volume-metrics in Attachment 44 as part of their demonstration of technical acceptability, and that their pricing be evaluated in the context of those baseline values. Additionally, we recommend that the contents of Attachment 44 be apportioned between Navy and Marine Corps, and incorporated into Section J of the contract.</p>		<p>The data previously contained in Attachment 44 has been published to the NGEN TDR and is accessible to all Offerors. The Government believes the requirement is accurately captured in the RFP. The TDR provides additional data to assist industry in further understanding the requirement to include the NMCI CoSC Statistics.</p>

Item	Issue/Comment	Question	Response
155	<p>We recommend the following changes to the DRFP to reduce risk of service and security disruption during transition.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Re-sequence the transition phases to enable the incoming contractor(s) to prove processes on smaller segments of the enterprise before assuming full-scale responsibilities.</li> <li>• Enable uninterrupted service management throughout transition by requiring winning contractors to execute an 'as-is, where-is' transition, interacting with working government and incumbent tools and processes until transition is complete.</li> <li>• Formalize DON roles and processes for directing service integration and transition in the RFP so that offerors can consider them in their solution planning.</li> <li>• Reinstate the DON's previous "pilot" activity requirement, where incoming contractors would prove minimum capability before assumption of enterprise responsibility.</li> </ul>		<p>1. The current sequence does include the stepping up of smaller segments prior to assuming full-scale responsibilities and meets the Governments requirements to transition contracts successfully.</p> <p>2. The Successor(s) will be responsible for transitioning certified solutions "as-is, where is" in accordance with the approved Product Baseline. The SMIA will produce the Government approved refinements to the "as-is" processes that will be utilized throughout transition. Any tools introduced to the NGEN environment for transition must be Certified and Accredited prior to use and must not negatively impact transition schedule, cost, or risk.</p> <p>3. The roles and responsibilities will be defined for service integration prior to release of the Final RFP. The SMIA will refine the roles and responsibilities for service integration prior to Readiness to Transition Review (RTR).</p> <p>4. Pilots are only one of the methods available to demonstrate Successor capability and readiness prior to Assumption of Responsibility (AOR). The Government already requires the Successor(s) to complete PDR and CDR events wherein they demonstrate their understanding of the Allocated and Product Baselines, complete an SMIA, and meet RTR requirements before entering into transition and AOR. The Offerors must provide a combination of transition methodologies that meet the Transition Schedule; pilots can be included provided they do not negatively impact transition cost and risk.</p>
156	<p>Ref: K-15 52.219-1 Small Business Program Representations (DRFP pg 399)</p> <p>This section states that ". the NAICS for this acquisition is 541512". We believe this is overly restrictive and there are other qualified SB NAICS which can provide beneficial technical support to NGEN requirements. We request clarification.</p>		<p>NAICS - North American Industry Classification System NAICS codes prescribed in the RFP is that recommended by the SPAWAR small business advocate working in coordination with DoD/DON Small Business Administration (SBA) and is consistent with the NAICS codes utilized under NMCI and CoSC.</p> <p>NAICS 541512 applies to the prime Contractor. The prime may utilize any NAICS code that aligns to the subcontracted service support requirement as it deems appropriate.</p> <p>Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) 13-120.410 prescribes the standards for use of NAICS codes and states the standards to be utilized. (500 employees and \$25.5M for IT services contracts)</p> <p>In accordance with the SBA guidance (found at <a href="http://www.sba.gov">www.sba.gov</a>), companies may petition the Small Business Office for changes to the size standards.</p>
157		<p>CFR 121.410 (Small Business Subcontracting Program) states that ". a concern is small for subcontracts which relate to Government procurements if it does not exceed the size standard for the NAICS code that the Prime contractor believes best describes the product or service being acquired by the subcontract." So, as an example, will a Prime receive SB credit for assigning work to a SB NAICS 517110 ". primarily engaged in operating and/or providing access to transmission facilities and infrastructure . for the transmission of voice, data, text, sound, and video using wired telecommunications networks"?</p> <p>The variety of different kinds of work required on a large procurement such as NGEN, requires access to a number of different NAICS. No one NAICS could possibly be able to meet the 35% SB requirement for this procurement.</p>	<p>NAICS - North American Industry Classification System NAICS codes prescribed in the RFP is that recommended by the SPAWAR small business advocate working in coordination with DoD/DON Small Business Administration (SBA) and is consistent with the NAICS codes utilized under NMCI and CoSC.</p> <p>NAICS 541512 applies to the prime Contractor. The prime may utilize any NAICS code that aligns to the subcontracted service support requirement as it deems appropriate.</p> <p>Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) 13-120.410 prescribes the standards for use of NAICS codes and states the standards to be utilized. (500 employees and \$25.5M for IT services contracts)</p> <p>In accordance with the SBA guidance (found at <a href="http://www.sba.gov">www.sba.gov</a>), companies may petition the Small Business Office for changes to the size standards.</p>

Item	Issue/Comment	Question	Response
158	<p>Operating NGEN will require NMCI-like capabilities that are not specified in the current draft RFP. Further, the RFP changes the IT service model, the governance, and the delivery model. The pass/fail acquisition strategy does not allow for evaluation of the performance and financial risk posed by these changes. Offerors will only bid what is specified in the RFP, expecting to recover substantial known but unbid costs through the claims process. The gap between the draft RFP and operational environment is a significant operational and financial risk for the government, and the risk of uncompensated expense makes a bid decision for industry substantially more challenging, potentially decreasing the field of competitors.</p>		<p>If any Offerors have specific items that they believe were omitted thus creating perceived gaps in the requirement they should inform the PCO.</p>
159	<p>The transition of NGEN is unprecedented in size and complexity, particularly when DON plans to implement complex and unproven service models. Awarding solely based on lowest price disregards any consideration of transition risk and prevents DON from considering the total cost of transition in their evaluation.</p>		<p>DON technical authorities (SPAWAR 5.0) have reviewed the current NGEN RFP Past Performance requirements and determined that they are sufficient to ensure that an Offeror would be capable of taking over NGEN service delivery responsibilities without unacceptable risk to the network.</p> <p>As Offerors prepare their proposals, they have access to essentially all network technical data including technical drawings, processes and procedures. After award, the NGEN Contractors will take over a network that is fully operational. Prior to the implementation of any new architectures or technical solutions, certification and accreditation in accordance with DoD and DON instructions will be required along with test and pilot demonstrations (see PWS sections 3.3.1, 3.3.8 and 3.3.13). After satisfactory certification and accreditation, testing and pilot demonstrations, new solutions will be rolled out incrementally. If problems of scale emerge, there will be sufficient warning to pause further deployment until issues have been resolved.</p> <p>LPTA is used for a verity of source selections, and there are no discriminators for which the Government will pay a premium.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Offerors will be required to provide an unpriced Basis of Estimate (BOE) which will provide the source selection team the visibility into how the pricing was developed and if the pricing is unbalanced. If a proposal is deemed to be technically acceptable and low price, the Government will review their funding to align with the successful Offeror's proposal.</li> <li>• It is accurate to say that no premium will be given for a combined award versus an award to TXS segment and ES segment.</li> <li>• While it is true the Government will not be evaluating future technologies there are opportunities to migrate to new technologies, such as increasing the footprint of Hosted Virtual Desktop (HVD) under NGEN.</li> <li>• The Government will only evaluate the price as represented in Section M to ensure a level playing field during source selection.</li> </ul>
160	<p>The past performance criteria is set artificially low at 40,000 seats (roughly 10 percent of the current seat count). A pass/fail evaluation does not give DON the ability to assign value to actual experience with equivalent scale.</p>		<p>DON technical authorities (SPAWAR 5.0) have reviewed the current NGEN RFP Past Performance requirements and determined that they are sufficient to ensure that an Offeror would be capable of taking over NGEN service delivery responsibilities without unacceptable risk to the network.</p> <p>As Offerors prepare their proposals, they have access to essentially all network technical data including technical drawings, processes and procedures. After award, the NGEN Contractors will take over a network that is fully operational. Prior to the implementation of any new architectures or technical solutions, certification and accreditation in accordance with DoD and DON instructions will be required along with test and pilot demonstrations (see PWS sections 3.3.1, 3.3.8 and 3.3.13). After satisfactory certification and accreditation, testing and pilot demonstrations, new solutions will be rolled out incrementally. If problems of scale emerge, there will be sufficient warning to pause further deployment until issues have been resolved.</p> <p>While raising the current 40,000 seat threshold to 100,000 seats would reduce risk, it would significantly constrain the competitive field and potentially increase the cost of NGEN services. The current Past Performance requirements reasonably balance the Governments interests in controlling risk and cost.</p>

Item	Issue/Comment	Question	Response
161	<p>The incumbent has reengineered most standard off-the-shelf products to meet required security standards and performance at scale. This requires advanced IT engineering skills. The pass/fail technical evaluation and the lowest price award will necessitate that offerors bid less qualified talent, thus adding risk to schedule and cost during transition and operation.</p>		<p>The Government has captured the full requirement in the RFP. If any Offerors have specific items that they believe were omitted thus creating perceived gaps in the requirement they should inform the PCO.</p>
162	<p>CSDR Reporting Requirements. The CSDR plan, as currently proposed, will impose significant additional costs on the program to meet the reporting requirements. Additionally, it will require contractors to disclose cost information on an ongoing basis which is contrary to the notion of fixed price contracts where contractors take on significant risk to meet service delivery requirements at the fixed price. The DoN's February 24, 2012 responses to Industry Questions shows that there were fifteen (15) separate questions regarding the incorporation of DFARS 252.234-7000 and the related requirements to submit Contractor Cost Data Reports (CCDR) pursuant to DoD 5000.04-M-1. In response to these questions and concerns, the DON stated only that the CCDR is required by the DFARS, and that this requirement would be clarified in the final RFP. However, neither the February 24th responses or the revised Draft RFP address whether the DoN has considered whether to request a waiver of the CCDR requirement pursuant to DoD 5000.04-M-1, which expressly states that CCDRs "are not required under the following conditions provided the DoD PM requests and obtains approval for a reporting waiver from the OSD DDCA: procurement of commercial systems or for non-commercial systems bought under competitively awarded, firm fixed-price contracts, as long as competitive conditions continue to exist." See DoD Cost And Software Data Reporting (CSDR) Manual, DoDM 5000.04-M-1, Enclosure 5, ¶ 4(c)(1). Recommend that, in light of the significant number of questions and concerns raised by offerors regarding the CCDR provisions in the RFP, the DoN consider obtaining a waiver of the CCDR requirement, as expressly authorized by DoD 5000.04-M-1, Enclosure 5, ¶ 4(c)(1).</p>		<p>The OSD Cost Assessment and Program Evaluation (CAPE) Office has determined the CCDR are required for the NGEN program. The Offeror is required to meet the CCDR requirements detailed in Section 3.2 Program Management of the PWS and in CDRLs A005, A006, A007, A008, A009, A103, and A104.</p> <p>This requirement is in accordance with DFARS 252.234-7000.</p>

Item	Issue/Comment	Question	Response
163	<p>Flat Discounts. The draft RFP in Section L-15 (e2) requires bidders to quote a single discount rate which will be applied to all technology material purchases, except for material that is part of an established fixed price CLIN. Requiring bidders to commit to a single discount rate is not in the best interest of the Government. Various equipment manufacturers offer significantly different discounts off list prices for various product types and categories. If bidders are required to propose a single discount across all types of materials, they will be forced to be conservative and offer a lower discount because of the uncertainty around the future material purchases by the Government.</p> <p>Recommend that bidders be required to propose separate discounts by manufacturer and by product category. For evaluation purposes, the Government can use a notional distribution of the hardware spend across the different product types and discounts proposed.</p> <p>Further, our experience shows that installation and shipping costs vary significantly across different product types and locations. In many cases, the installation costs are greater than the discount proposed on the product price. We believe bidders who do not fully understand these additional installation and shipping requirements will not fully incorporate these costs in their discounts proposed. Conversely, bidders who do include these costs may be forced to offer very small discounts because of the high level of risk imposed by this structure on bidders. Both of these scenarios are not in the best interest of the Government and hence we recommend that the costs for installation and shipping of the products on the catalog be recovered through separate CLINs.</p> <p>Recommend that the costs for certification, installation and shipping of products on the catalog be recovered through separate CLINs and not be subject to the uniform "discount off list" pricing mechanism proposed for all material.</p>		<p>The Government will revise the RFP to replace the one discount rate with discounts for item categories.</p> <p>The representative list of material has been provided in the Technical Data Repository (TDR) identified in L-8 and is expected to be substantially the same as the material procured under the NMCI contract and CoSC. The Technology Refresh Plan and the COTS Catalog are examples of the type of equipment to which the discounts apply.</p>
164	<p><b>Physical Inventory Requirements.</b> Requirements for 100% physical inventory annually and to perform scans monthly exceeds industry norms and appears to exceed requirements of DODI 5000.64, May 19, 2011 which allows for physical inventories not less than every 3 years.</p> <p><b>Recommend</b> this requirement be changed to 100% physical inventories every 3 years.</p>		<p>Modify PWS language for 3.4.1.3 paragraph (d) to "Perform physical asset audits to validate inventory in accordance with DoDI 5000.64, Accountability and Management of DoD Equipment and Other Accountable Property, May 19, 2011. For large sites, perform physical asset audits at a minimum of every three years. For NOCs, large Server Farms and other classified or sensitive property, perform physical asset audits on an annual basis. Sampling methods may be used, where appropriate, provided they achieve statistically valid results. Such methods shall not be used for classified or sensitive property. (CDRL A040 - Asset Audit Report). In addition, new requirement (d.i) has been added to PWS which states "98 percent physical inventory accuracy rate (100 percent for classified or sensitive property) shall be achieved and maintained."</p>
165	<p><b>VIP Service.</b> Numbers of VIPs have increased significantly and the PWS now requires dedicated 7x24 support. This will drive a requirement for on-site personnel on 2 and 3rd shift and weekends at undefined site locations. This requirement exceeds normal industry standards, where after hours work is typically on call, except for data centers and mission critical locations, and providers are held to Service Levels rather than staffing standards.</p> <p><b>Recommend</b> this requirement be reframed in a manner that requires bidders to solution to a VIP incident resolution SLR.</p>		<p>The Government does not track VIP services by site. However 80% of all VIP services reside in the following sites: Pentagon, Norfolk, San Diego, and Pearl Harbor Hawaii.</p> <p>The Government is revising the CLIN structure to address VIP Services.</p> <p>In addition, PWS Section 3.1.2 General Requirements will be revised to capture the appropriate description for VIP service requirements.</p> <p>The Government is still reviewing this requirement and the final position will be reflected in the RFP. An updated matrix will be posted to reflect any changes.</p>

Item	Issue/Comment	Question	Response
166	<p>SLRs. A number of SLRs impose new requirements that drive additional cost without equivalent gain in reliability, availability, security or user experience. The most prominent examples are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Award 103 – Security Configuration and Management Services. Standards have changed substantially from previous versions. The sample size has changed dramatically creating a significant increase in scope: 25,000 workstations/month to 100%; 20% of sites per year to 100% of sites per year. Furthermore, as written the performance expectation is attainable only at the cost of a large workforce dedicated to patching PCs and other devices in person every month.</li> <li>• Report 208 – File Removal Services. Otherwise known as Spillage, the performance level recommends removals within 24 hours and an objective of 12 hours. These standards do not appear to recognize the link between scope of the spillage, delay in discovery, and the amount of time required to remove.</li> <li>• Report 213 – Average Speed to Answer at Service Desk. Drives cost for minimal value to DON or end-users. Current ASA is ~90 seconds but first call resolution rate is more than 70%. Meeting the ASA metric will require the offeror to add significant staff to the Service Desk or shift calls more quickly to the Field Services for resolution. The latter is the most expensive and the least timely issue resolution process. Best practice strikes a cost effective balance between answer time and first call resolution. Industry evidence is that average answer speeds of ~90 seconds do not degrade end user satisfaction for standard users.</li> <li>• Reports 227, 228, 229 – WAN Performance. ES and TXS contractors have no ability to affect performance across the circuits and wires owned by DISA.</li> <li>• Reports 401-410 – A variety of MOC C2 support, services, and performance. Dictates dedicated support model 24x7 to support 150 MOC users at multiple sites. Given the geographical distribution of MOCs, mandating this specific support model is unlikely to be the most cost effective solution.</li> <li>• General Comments – A number of old NMCI SLAs that add cost out of proportion to their value or that overlap with new SLRs are contained in the DRFP. For example, the 'stop watch' time of log-on made sense on the old contract but not today...log on time is mostly affected by IA policies/posture and distance from log on servers...none of which are within the contractors' control. Another example, old SCIA probe tests now overlap with newer LAN, BAN, Server availability and performance SLRs. The probes should be done away with as an SLR device.</li> </ul>		<p>The Government is still reviewing this requirement and the final position will be reflected in the RFP. An updated matrix will be posted to reflect any changes.</p>
167	<p><b>Overhead Costs for Multi-Supplier Operations.</b> Industry analysis indicates that segmented service delivery models generate additional costs to the customer ranging from 4 to 30% of Total Contract Value in exchange for the opportunity to manage cost and quality more directly. Excluding any consideration of the DON's internal costs for administering multiple contracts, NGEN will represent a shift in the contractors' tooth to tail ratios in order to coordinate day to day operations between TXS and ES providers as well as support the cadence of oversight and coordination prescribed in the PWS.</p> <p><b>Recommend</b> the government simplify procurement and operations by competing NGEN as a single contract for both TXS and ES services.</p>		<p>The Government's approach allows Offerors to submit separate proposals for the ES and TXS segments and also submit a combined proposal for both segments. The NGEN source selection process will choose the lowest price proposal or combination of proposals.</p>
168	<p><b>Requirements Conflicts.</b> The DRFP introduces new performance requirements that conflict with established requirements for network services availability and security. Prominent among these is a requirement that core software (OS, IE, Office) development and DIACAP packaging be completed within 9 months of commercial release, with all workstations upgraded within 3 months of ATO. NMCI experience is that this aggressive scheduling will mean that the DON would be subjecting the NGEN environment and its users to the unidentified performance and security vulnerabilities common within the first year of commercial release, and the aggressive deployment model will drive substantial cost without a clear understanding of the potential gain. The PWS provides no guidance as to the mechanism for examining and adjudicating conflicts in advance of service disruption.</p> <p><b>Recommended Mitigation:</b> For this and other system changes, define government roles and responsibilities in ITIL processes evaluating tradeoffs among user benefit, security, system performance and cost, particularly as it relates to the introduction of new core software.</p>		<p>The Government will revise the PWS Section 3.3.1.2 Core Build Services to reflect a more executable timeline.</p>

Item	Issue/Comment	Question	Response
169	<p><b>Service Management Integration Governance:</b> Earlier descriptions of Service Management Integration roles and responsibilities indicated that the Government would perform as the Prime contractor with responsibility and authority to coordinate service delivery in a segmented environment and to oversee successful delivery of services, in addition to providing NETOPS C2. Best practice in multi-supplier services arrangements is that roles, responsibilities, authorities and accountabilities of all parties are defined at the outset along with mechanisms for implementation. In the case of NGEN, the added complexity of dependence on other government agencies, e.g. DISA, requires establishment of mechanisms for issue identification and resolution in order to preclude service disruption. Although RACI matrices are defined for the Marine Corps, this version of the PWS is silent on many of these matters for the Navy. What is the specific governance structure for addressing disputes between parties? What are the ramifications and indemnities when one of the parties fails to meet their contractual commitments and obligations?</p> <p><b>Recommend</b> the Government provide additional detail surrounding the Roles, Responsibilities, Accountabilities of each of the parties involved in a multi-contractor environment, as well as the governance structure that will be in place at contract award.</p>		<p>Information on roles, responsibilities, and accountabilities is provided in Attachment 11 NGEN Process Definition Model (NPDM).</p>
170	<p><b>Ordering Rules:</b> The current DRFP does not specify rules for ordering services to ensure all required components of services are included. At minimum, schedule delays may occur while the government and contractors resolve discrepancies in service orders.</p> <p><b>Recommend</b> the Government specify ordering rules in the DRFP.</p>		<p>Ordering rules pertaining to new seat delivery are in SLR 500. Ordering rules from NMCI/CoSC are provided in the TDR for historical reference. The Government will not constrain the NGEN Contractor by the ordering rules utilized in the current environment, to do so would limit the Offerors' ability to apply best practices.</p>