

Alliant 3 Government Responses to Request For Proposal (RFP) Feedback GR Set 02_09.27.24

Response #	RFP Paragraph Reference	Specific RFP Location	Comment/Question	Government Response
GR2-01	(Attachment J.P-5) A3 Small Business Engagement Template	J.P-5, Part III, L.5.2.4.4	Please clarify if tagged SOW, PWS, and/or SOO documents are required for both non-federal (Attachment J.P-5) and federal projects (Paragraph L.5.2.4.4) submitted for small business engagement credit ?	The government acknowledges receipt of your question. Please refer to Amendment 2, item 66.
GR2-02	(Attachment J.P-6) A3 Past Performance Rating Template	Section L.5.3.2	The past performance reference information section states: "SIGNATURE OF RATER: (Rating must be provided by a Warranted Contracting Officer or Corporate Officer with cognizance over the project for the ordering activity)" However, Section L.5.3.2 states that "The Past Performance Rating Template must be completed and signed by either a Contracting Officer, Contracting Officer's Representative, or Contracting Officer's Technical Representative with cognizance over the submitted Project." Could the Government please update the J.P-6 form so that these other Government officials may fill out the form if the Contracting Officer is not available?	The government acknowledges receipt of your question. Please refer to Amendment 2, item 68.
GR2-03	(Attachment J.P-8) A3 Price Template	J.P-8 Tab: 1_GovernmentWorksite, J-3.2 Table 13	In Attachment J.P-8 A3 Price Template, was it the government's intention to omit the following labor categories (which are referenced in RFP Section J-3.2)? Senior Data Scientist Senior Web and Digital Interface Designer	The government acknowledges receipt of your question. Please refer to Amendment 2, items 22 through 27 which reflect multiple changes to the J-3.2 Table 13 Individual Labor Categories. Changes were only made to the LCATs in J-3.2 and no changes were made to the LCATs in the Price Template.
GR2-04	(Attachment J.P-8) A3 Price Template	Tab: 1_GovernmentWorksite, Cell A18	A comment is provided within cell A18 for Labor ID 153, Labor Category Senior Computer Network Support Specialist that notes "Change to 123 Senior Computer and Information Systems Manager based on the usage data". Please clarify if row 18 should represent Labor ID 153 or 123?	The government acknowledges receipt of your question. Please refer to Amendment 2, item 2.
GR2-05	(Attachment J.P-8) A3 Price Template	Tab: 4_TotalPrice, Cell A18	There is a comment in cell A18 on Tab 4_TotalPrice in the Pricing Template indicating that the Labor Category should be changed from Senior Computer Network Support Specialist to Senior Computer and Information Systems Manager. Please advise.	The government acknowledges receipt of your question. Please refer to Amendment 2, item 2.
GR2-06	(Attachment J.P-9) A3 Model Individual Subcontracting Plan	Tab: 1_SubcontractingPlan, Cell A9	In attachment J.P-9 A3 Model Individual Subcontracting Plan Template V.2, the Offeror is instructed to "enter the name of your company name (in Cell B4)".... Cell B4 is locked. Can the government please provide a password to unlock the template or provide a template with Cell B4 unlocked?	The government acknowledges receipt of your question. Please refer to Amendment 2, item 4. A revised copy of J.P-9 has been provided with the referenced cell unlocked.
GR2-07	(Attachment J.P-9) A3 Model Individual Subcontracting Plan	Tab: FAR Elements, Cell A12	For Attachment J.P-9, Model Individual Subcontracting Plan Template, Tab: FAR Elements, Cell 12 is for entry of "Description of method used to identify potential sources per FAR 19.704(a)(5), etc....". However, the cell is locked to data entry. Please correct.	The government acknowledges receipt of your question. Please refer to Amendment 2, item 5.
GR2-08	(Attachment J.P-11) A3 Contractor C-SCRM Responsibility Questionnaire	J.P-11, L.4.1, Subsection L.5.5.2 and L.5.1.9	The J.P-11 is provided in Excel. Since the form requires a signature, may the Offeror return the document in PDF?	The government acknowledges receipt of your question. Please refer to Amendment 2, item 7. A new version of J.P-11 A3 Contractor C-SCRM Responsibility Questionnaire V.2.pdf has been provided as a fillable and signable PDF.
GR2-09	(Attachment J.P-16) A3 Self-Scoring Worksheet	J.P-16, L.5.4.1	Will the Government reconsider the scoring for Cognizant Federal Agency (CFA) for Accounting System and Audit Information, Approved Purchasing System, and Acceptable Estimating System. In some cases, non-DoD CFAs use DCAA audit reports to determine the adequacy of a vendor's accounting system or to approve a purchasing or estimating system system.	The government acknowledges receipt of your question. Please refer to Amendment 2, items 91 through 96.

Alliant 3 Government Responses to Request For Proposal (RFP) Feedback GR Set 02_09.27.24

Response #	RFP Paragraph Reference	Specific RFP Location	Comment/Question	Government Response
GR2-10	(Attachment J.P-16) A3 Self-Scoring Worksheet	L.5.7.1	The RFP released 28 Jun 2024 reduced the potential points scoring for Greenhouse Gas emissions public disclosure statements. With the DRFP, points were allowed for Scope 1 or 2 and Scope 3 Public Disclosure statements but in the final RFP the Scope 3 points were no longer available. We recommend that points be awarded for Scope 3 disclosure statements in addition to Scope 1 or 2.	The government acknowledges receipt of your question. Please refer to Amendment 2, item 87.
GR2-11	(Attachment J.P-18) A3 Labor Rate Attestation	J.P-18	Is the J.P-18 attestation form required when an Offeror does not have fully-burdened rates that exceed the A2 published rates? Is the J.P-18 attestation form required for all proposals? Please provide guidance on the naming conventions of the PDF copies of the awarded contracts used as supporting evidence (attestation) attachments to J.P-18.	The government acknowledges receipt of your question. Please refer to Amendment 2, item 88. Yes, the J.P-18 attestation form is required for all Offerors. The supporting evidence for an Offeror's attestation will be combined into one file and will follow the naming convention indicated in the proposal format table (L.4.1).
GR2-12	(B.4) Maximum Contract Ceiling and Minimum Contract Guarantee	B.4	GSA issued a class deviation for Alliant 3 in 2022, CD-2022-08_0. It states that it is only applicable to Alliant 3. Does this justify an unlimited ceiling for the Alliant 3 master contract and task order.	The government acknowledges receipt of your question. Please refer to Amendment 2, item 19. As authorized by CD-2022-08, there is no maximum dollar ceiling for the Master Contract or for each individual Task Order.
GR2-13	(B.4) Maximum Contract Ceiling and Minimum Contract Guarantee	B.4(c)	The RFP states there is no maximum ceiling value for Alliant 3 and cites CD-2023-01 as the authority to allow for this class deviation. FAR 16.504 requires a maximum ceiling value for an IDIQ contract. CD-2023-01 is a class deviation for this FAR clause approved by GSA for the OASIS+ contract. Does this same authority apply to the Alliant 3 contract, or should Alliant 3 have its own class deviation from FAR Clause 16.504?	The government acknowledges receipt of your question. Please refer to Amendment 2, item 19. Alliant 3 has its own class deviation, CD-2022-08. The RFP has been updated in Amendment 2.
GR2-14	(B.6.1) Three Labor Category Types	B.11.5.1 (a), J-3, J.P-8	Part 1: Attachment J.P-8 A3 Price Template form is only applicable to the Senior skill rate. How will the government determine the ceiling rates for the other three skill levels? Part II: Please confirm our understanding that the maximum ceiling rates established at the Master Contract Level only apply to the Senior skill level, meaning rates for the Subject Matter Expert (SME) skill level can exceed the Senior rates at the Task Order level.	Part 1: The A3 Price Template, attachment J.P-8 is only applicable to the Senior Skill rate. The ceiling rates for the other three skill levels (Junior, Journeyman, and Subject Matter Expert) were intentionally omitted to support customers in their adoption of GSA's CALC+ Pricing Intelligence Suite and GSA's Data to Decisions, Prices Paid tool. Customers can use these robust tools to develop their Independent Government Cost Estimates (IGCE), and gain insight into historical labor rates, sales trends, and occupational labor statistics. Part II: Yes, we confirm your understanding is correct. Maximum ceiling rates are established at the Master Contract Level and only apply to the Senior skill level for T&M and L-H Task Orders/CLINs. Task order LCAT selection and negotiated pricing, to include all non-Senior Skill Levels, will be at the full discretion of the issuing agency OCO. (RFP Para B.6.2 (b)). Please also refer to Amendment 2, item 20 which is related to this question.
GR2-15	(B.11.5) Time-and Material and Labor-Hour Contract Types	B.11.5.1(a)	Please confirm that the ceiling rates proposed for Senior-level LCATs in the J.P-8 do not establish a ceiling for SME-level Standard IT Service LCATs for T&M and L-H contract type Task Orders and proposals within the Contiguous United States with U.S. Government security classification up through the Secret level.	The government acknowledges receipt of your question. Please refer to Amendment 2, item 20.

Alliant 3 Government Responses to Request For Proposal (RFP) Feedback GR Set 02_09.27.24

Response #	RFP Paragraph Reference	Specific RFP Location	Comment/Question	Government Response
GR2-16	(H.1) Special Contract Requirement Provisions	H.1	Section H.1, Special Contract Requirement Provisions, states "The following provisions apply at the Master Contract (MC), as indicated by the 'X' in the table and on individual Task Orders if determined applicable by the OCO." However, unlike other similar tables throughout the RFP, Table 8 Special Contract Requirement Provisions contains no column for Master Contract (MC) applicability. Can the Government confirm which of the provisions contained in Table 8 are applicable at the MC level (MCL)?	The government acknowledges receipt of your question. Please refer to Amendment 2, item 21.
GR2-17	(J-3.2) Individual Labor Categories	Table 13	RFP Attachment J-3 - Alliant 3 Labor Categories lists Labor ID # 211 - 214 as the Data Scientist Family. In Attachment J.P-8, there is no labor category for a Data Scientist; Labor ID #213 is instead a Data Warehousing Specialist.	The government acknowledges receipt of your question. Please refer to Amendment 2, items 22 through 27 which reflect multiple changes to the J-3.2 Table 13 Individual Labor Categories. Changes were only made to the LCATs in J-3.2 and no changes were made to the LCATs in the Price Template.
GR2-18	(J-3.2) Individual Labor Categories	Table 13	In Attachment J.P-8, Labor ID #323 is a Senior Software Developer, Systems. This labor category / family is not listed in Attachment J-3 - Alliant 3 Labor Categories.	The government acknowledges receipt of your question. Please refer to Amendment 2, items 22 through 27 which reflect multiple changes to the J-3.2 Table 13 Individual Labor Categories. Changes were only made to the LCATs in J-3.2 and no changes were made to the LCATs in the Price Template.
GR2-19	(J-3.2) Individual Labor Categories	Table 13	RFP Attachment J-3 - Alliant 3 Labor Categories lists Labor ID # 401 - 403 as the Web and Digital Interface Developer. In Attachment J.P-8, there is no labor category for a Web and Digital Interface Developer; Labor ID #403 is instead a Web Developer (which is 413 in Attachment J-3).	The government acknowledges receipt of your question. Please refer to Amendment 2, items 22 through 27 which reflect multiple changes to the J-3.2 Table 13 Individual Labor Categories. Changes were only made to the LCATs in J-3.2 and no changes were made to the LCATs in the Price Template.
GR2-20	(J-3.2) Individual Labor Categories	Table 13	The Labor ID #s for The Senior Web and Digital Interface Designer and the SME Web and Digital Interface Designer are the same, both are # 403.	The government acknowledges receipt of your question. Please refer to Amendment 2, items 22 through 27 which reflect multiple changes to the J-3.2 Table 13 Individual Labor Categories. Changes were only made to the LCATs in J-3.2 and no changes were made to the LCATs in the Price Template.
GR2-21	(J-3.2) Individual Labor Categories	Table 13	LCAT #293 is listed as Senior Junior Information Technology Project Manager. Please confirm this labor category should be corrected to Senior Information Technology Manager.	The government acknowledges receipt of your question. Please refer to Amendment 2, items 22 through 27 which reflect multiple changes to the J-3.2 Table 13 Individual Labor Categories. Changes were only made to the LCATs in J-3.2 and no changes were made to the LCATs in the Price Template.
GR2-22	(J-3.2) Individual Labor Categories	Table 13	Labor IDs jump from 403 to 411, please confirm that there are no labor categories for possible Labor IDs 406-410.	The government acknowledges receipt of your question. Please refer to Amendment 2, items 22 through 27 which reflect multiple changes to the J-3.2 Table 13 Individual Labor Categories. Changes were only made to the LCATs in J-3.2 and no changes were made to the LCATs in the Price Template.
GR2-23	(L.3.2) Mergers, Acquisitions, Novations, and Change-of-Name Agreements, as Applicable	L.3.2	Section L.3.2 (Mergers, Acquisitions, Novations, and Change-of-Name Agreements, as Applicable) refers to "Primary NAICS Group Relevant Experience Projects under Section L.5.2.1". Section L.5.2.1 is "Relevant Experience Projects"; whereas section L.5.2.2 addresses "Primary NAICS Code Relevant Experience". Will the Government please confirm that this should refer to Section L.5.2.2?	The government acknowledges receipt of your question. Please refer to Amendment 2, item 29.

Alliant 3 Government Responses to Request For Proposal (RFP) Feedback GR Set 02_09.27.24

Response #	RFP Paragraph Reference	Specific RFP Location	Comment/Question	Government Response
GR2-24	(L.3.2) Mergers, Acquisitions, Novations, and Change-of-Name Agreements, as Applicable	L.3.2	L.3.2 allows for a Change of Name documentation to be submitted under L.5.2.1, L.5.2.4, and L.5.3. However, the language provided all relates to change of ownership or parent-child relationships. Please clarify that documentation from a Change of Name with no change in ownership or parent-child relationship (e.g. a change of name resulting from a trademark issue) is acceptable.	Yes, a Change of Name with no change in ownership or parent-child relationship is acceptable.
GR2-25	(L.4) Proposal Format	J.P-2, J.P-3, J.P-4, J.P-5	Please clarify file names for J.P-2, J.P-3, J.P-4, and J.P-5 indices.	In accordance with the last paragraph of L.3, the indexes can be attached as a cover page to the evidence document, therefore it will not have a separate filename as it will be incorporated in the document.
GR2-26	(L.4) Proposal Format	L.4	When adding headers/footers or tagging to an electronically signed document, it shows that the document was altered after it was signed. In addition, the file may become too large for upload to the Symphony portal.	The government acknowledges receipt of your question. Please refer to Amendment 2, item 32.
GR2-27	(L.4) Proposal Format	L.4.1, Subsection L.5.2.4.4	Can the Government provide the file name required for the SOW/PWS that must be tagged and submitted for a Small Business Emerging Technology Solutions Engagement (L.5.2.4.4)?	The government acknowledges receipt of your question. Please refer to Amendment 2, item 42.
GR2-28	(L.4) Proposal Format	L.5.2.4.2(e), L.4.1	Section L.5.2.4.2(e) states that Offerors may submit a CPARS or J.P-6 for an Emerging Technology project with a base period of less than one year. Can the Government add the naming structure for CPARS/J.P-6 Emerging Technology projects, if applicable?	The government acknowledges receipt of your question. Please refer to Amendment 2, item 40.
GR2-29	(L.4.1) Proposal Format Table	Table 22	Please clarify if Excel files may be submitted as a .xlsx file extension rather than .xls as indicated in the Proposal Format table L.4.1.	The government acknowledges receipt of your question. Please refer to Amendment 2, item 46.
GR2-30	(L.4.1) Proposal Format Table	Table 22 RFP Ref L.5.1.6	Please clarify if 10 pages for the Professional Employee Compensation Plan (PECP) is a "suggestion" or an actual maximum? Will a PECP greater than 10 pages be accepted and considered compliant?	The government acknowledges receipt of your question. Please refer to Amendment 2, item 33.
GR2-31	(L.4.1) Proposal Format Table	Table 22 RFP Ref L.5.2.4.2	J.P-3 is in all the file names for the other documents that aren't a J.P-3. Can the government confirm if the file name should include J.P-3, Offeror Name.ET1. 1of3.J.P-3.Award.pdf, or Offeror Name.ET1. 1of3.Award.pdf?	The government acknowledges receipt of your question. Please refer to Amendment 2, item 40.
GR2-32	(L.4.1) Proposal Format Table	Table 22 RFP Ref L.5.2.4.3	Section L.4.1 (Proposal Format Table) table 22 (Proposal Format Table) includes the following statement for L.5.2.4.3 (Breadth and Depth of Emerging Technology Relevant Experience): "For each ET Project submitted for Section L.5.2.3." Will the Government please confirm that these instructions apply to each ET Project submitted for Section L.5.2.4 (Emerging Technology Relevant Experience) and not L.5.2.3 (Primary NAICS Code Relevant Experience NAICS Areas)?	The government acknowledges receipt of your question. Please refer to Amendment 2, item 41.

Alliant 3 Government Responses to Request For Proposal (RFP) Feedback GR Set 02_09.27.24

Response #	RFP Paragraph Reference	Specific RFP Location	Comment/Question	Government Response
GR2-33	(L.4.1) Proposal Format Table	Table 22 RFP Ref L. 5.2.4.4	In the Proposal Format Table and in section L. 5.2.4.4, it is unclear whether a SOW or PWS is required for the Small Business Emerging Technology projects. In the J.P-5, there is reference to providing a narrative of how an emerging technology is integral to a project and to include an index, yet, it appears that the Government is indicating that a SOW or PWS is only required for non-federal projects. We request a clarification on this. We believe that including a SOW or PWS will be the only way for the Government to confirm any statements about the work being tied to an emerging technology.	The government acknowledges receipt of your question. Please refer to Amendment 2, item 66.
GR2-34	(L.4.1) Proposal Format Table	Table 22 RFP Ref L. 5.2.4.4	In the naming conventions in the row for L.5.2.4.4, the filenames do not seem to correspond to which ET they're related to. Recommend including the ET# in the filenames to indicate the related ET REP for the SBE.	The government acknowledges receipt of your question. Please refer to Amendment 2, item 42.
GR2-35	(L.4.1) Proposal Format Table	Table 22 RFP Ref L. 5.2.4.4	In Table 22 Proposal Format Table in RFP section L.4.1, row L.5.2.4.4 Small Business Emerging Technology Solutions Engagement (OTSB Only) the Sample File Name column does not identify what the numbering in the "SBE1" filename portion signifies. In row L.5.2.4.2 Verification of Emerging Technology Relevant Experience Submission the guidance is given "For example: ET1 Artificial Intelligence (AI) so ET1.1of3, ET1.2of3, ET1.3of3 are Artificial Intelligence Experience Examples." Does the same guidance apply for the Small Business Emerging Technology Solutions Engagement filenames, so that "For example: ET1 Artificial Intelligence (AI)" so SBE1.1of 5.J.P-5.pdf, SBE2.2of 5.J.P-5.pdf is Big Data, etc.?	The government acknowledges receipt of your question. Please refer to Amendment 2, item 42.
GR2-36	(L.4.1) Proposal Format Table	Table 22 Foot Note	The two footnotes under Table 22 on p. 253 are marked "****" and "+++", respectively. These markings appear nowhere within Table 22. Would the government please confirm that these footnotes are general warnings related to the upload of the required documents into Symphony and do not pertain to specific entries in the table?	The government acknowledges receipt of your question. Please refer to Amendment 2, item 48.
GR2-37	(L.5.1.2) A3 Self Scoring Worksheet	J.P-16, L.5.1.2	Instructions indicate that the only exception to the Yes or No answers in column C is row 128, "Total Primary NAICS Code Projects Submitted". Row 128 in the Self-Scoring Worksheet provided (Attachment J.P-16 Self Scoring Worksheet) is labeled "ET11-3". Under "ET11-Zero Trust Networks." A search for "Primary NAICS Code Project Submitted" yields no results. Will the government clarify the instructions?	The government acknowledges receipt of your question. Please refer to Amendment 2, item 49.
GR2-38	(L.5.1.3) Individual Small Business Subcontracting Plan (Required for Other than Small Business Offerors)	L.5.1.3	Offerors are instructed to "remove all instructional language" if they choose to use the Model Individual Subcontracting Plan. Does this mean offerors should delete those rows in their entirety, or just delete the text in those rows?	The government acknowledges receipt of your question. Please refer to Amendment 2, item 50.
GR2-39	(L.5.1.4) Existing Contractor Teaming Arrangement, if Applicable	L.5.1.4 (g)	Section L.5.1.4(g) states "...For unpopulated CTA, financial responsibility documents required must be submitted for each individual member of the CTA." Please confirm that financial responsibility documents means completion of Attachment J.P-10 GSA Form 527", which must be submitted for each member of the Joint Venture entity and not for the JV entity itself.	Please refer to Section L.5.1.4(g) for populated and unpopulated JV/CTA financial responsibility requirements.

Alliant 3 Government Responses to Request For Proposal (RFP) Feedback GR Set 02_09.27.24

Response #	RFP Paragraph Reference	Specific RFP Location	Comment/Question	Government Response
GR2-40	(L.5.1.5) Meaningful Relationship Commitment Letters, If Applicable	L.3.2, L.5.1.5	The MRCL instructions seem to allow the use of assets from an affiliate or subsidiary regardless of how they were formed. However, Section L.3.2 implies that proof of an acquisition is required. Could GSA confirm that an offeror is authorized to employ assets from an affiliate or subsidiary solely through the MRCL process, without distinction between acquired or parent company-formed entities?	Yes, the Parent can claim MRCLs with subsidiaries or subsidiary assets. The Offeror has to provide proof of ownership, whether through acquisition or parent-formed incorporation of the subsidiary entity. Note: mere proof alone of an Offeror's ownership of a subsidiary (ie: organizational chart, Articles of Incorporation, SEC filing) is insufficient to properly establish a MRCL. See RFP Paragraph L.5.1.5, Meaningful Relationship Commitment Letters, If Applicable, paragraphs (a) through (f)(5) for the proper method of demonstrating a meaningful and operational relationship within a corporate structure.
GR2-41	(L.5.1.5) Meaningful Relationship Commitment Letters, If Applicable	L.4.1, L.5.1.5, L.5.4.10	RFP Section L.5.1.5, Meaningful Relationship Commitment Letters (MRCLs) related to Facility Clearance Levels (FCL) seems to be in contradiction to the MRCL language related to FCLs in Section L.4.1. Can the Government please confirm that FCLs will be allowed under the MRCLs, per the specific instructions in RFP Section L.5.1.5?	The government acknowledges receipt of your question. Please refer to Amendment 2, item 43. In accordance with L.5.1.5, Facility Clearance Levels are acceptable under MRCLs.
GR2-42	(L.5.1.5) Meaningful Relationship Commitment Letters, If Applicable	L.5.1.5 (f)(5)	One of the content requirements for a MRCL is a "list and description of at least one project per capability, resource, or experience that the Offeror has previously performed with the Meaningful Relationship entity for which the Offeror claims a Meaningful Relationship credit. Please note: a Meaningful Relationship within a corporate structure and an offering entity CTA are distinct matters." When the parent company holds the system or certification and all corporate entities are required to use those systems and perform according to those certifications, is it sufficient to state that this is the case, or must we select a specific project as an example?	The government acknowledges receipt of your question. Please refer to Amendment 2, item 52. See RFP Paragraph L.5.1.5, Meaningful Relationship Commitment Letters, If Applicable, paragraphs (a) through (f)(5) for the proper method of demonstrating a meaningful and operational relationship within a corporate structure.
GR2-43	(L.5.1.5) Meaningful Relationship Commitment Letters, If Applicable	L.5.1.5 (f)(5)	One of the content requirements for a MRCL is a "list and description of at least one project per capability, resource, or experience that the Offeror has previously performed with the Meaningful Relationship entity for which the Offeror claims a Meaningful Relationship credit. Please note: a Meaningful Relationship within a corporate structure and an offering entity CTA are distinct matters." When using a relevant experience project from an affiliate or subsidiary, is it sufficient to provide examples of projects on which both corporate entities worked together? If not, what type of project would be an acceptable example?	The government acknowledges receipt of your question. Please refer to Amendment 2, item 52.
GR2-44	(L.5.1.5) Meaningful Relationship Commitment Letters, If Applicable	L.5.1.5(f)(5)	Please clarify how an Offeror, which is a parent company to a wholly-owned subsidiary and has acquired all of its contracts and personnel, should address the requirement in RFP paragraph L. 5.1.5 (f)(5) to provide a list and description of projects previously performed with the Meaningful Relationship entity.	The government acknowledges receipt of your question. Please refer to Amendment 2, item 52. The Meaningful Relationship requirements of L. 5.1.5(f) apply to all entities, including wholly-owned subsidiaries.
GR2-45	(L.5.1.5) Meaningful Relationship Commitment Letters, If Applicable	L.5.1.5(f)(5)	In L.5.1.5(f)(5), the Government requests offerors provide "a list and description of at least one project per capability, resource, or experience that the Offeror has previously performed with the Meaningful Relationship entity for which the Offeror claims a Meaningful Relationship credit." This could be interpreted multiple ways, so we request the Government clarify what at least one project per capability, resource or experience means. For large businesses with many different capabilities, this could be a large number of projects.	The government acknowledges receipt of your question. Please refer to Amendment 2, item 52.

Alliant 3 Government Responses to Request For Proposal (RFP) Feedback GR Set 02_09.27.24

Response #	RFP Paragraph Reference	Specific RFP Location	Comment/Question	Government Response
GR2-46	(L.5.1.7) Uncompensated Overtime Policy	L.5.1.7	Please clarify whether the Uncompensated Overtime Policy is to be submitted in the name of the Offeror, if the Offeror is a CTA (Joint Venture) or, if it's an unpopulated joint venture, whether each CTA member is to submit an Uncompensated Overtime Policy.	For Offerors proposing as an Unpopulated Joint Venture or Partnership, an Uncompensated Overtime Policy must be submitted for each member of the Joint Venture or Partnership. For a Populated Joint Venture, an Uncompensated Overtime Policy must be submitted for the Joint Venture and each member of the Joint Venture.
GR2-47	(L.5.1.10) Organizational Conflict of Interest (OCI) Plan	L.5.1.10, M.4(k)	Context: Section L.5.1.10 Organization Conflict of Interest (OCI) Plan states "The Offeror shall submit an OCI plan...". Section M.4.2 Acceptability Review bullet (k) denotes "Organizational Conflict of Interest Form" will be evaluated. Please clarify if there is an Organizational Conflict of Interest Form attachment that is part of the Solicitation for Offerors to complete or are Offerors to draft their OCI Plan per FAR 9.5 requirements.	The government will not be providing an OCI Form template. The Offeror is required to provide an OCI Plan. Please also refer to Amendment 2, item 90 for more information.
GR2-48	(L.5.2) Relevant Experience	L.5.2.1	Will the Government consider Other Transaction Agreements (OTA) task orders as a valid contract type for Relevant Experience Projects? Many OTAs employ emerging technologies that GSA is seeking on Alliant 3.	The government acknowledges receipt of your question. Please refer to Amendment 2, item 62.
GR2-49	(L.5.2) Relevant Experience	L.5.2.1(d)	For a collection of task orders, what should we use as the starting and ending dates for the period of performance?	The government acknowledges receipt of your question. Please refer to Amendment 2, item 53.
GR2-50	(L.5.2) Relevant Experience	L.5.2.1(d), L.5.2.2(d)	For a collection of task orders submitted as a single REP under section L.5.2.1 (d), does every task order require one year of performance?	The government acknowledges receipt of your question. Please refer to Amendment 2, item 53.
GR2-51	(L.5.2) Relevant Experience	L.5.2.3.1	RFP Section L.5.2.3.1, Verification of Primary NAICS Code Relevant Experience Submission (Federal Government Contracts), the Government allows additional contract documents to be submitted in order to substantiate Relevant Experience Project (REP) claims that can be verified within FPDS-NG. Can the Government please confirm that Contract Modifications can also be submitted with an FPDS-NG report to substantiate claimed elements (e.g. period of performance)?	The government acknowledges receipt of your question. Please refer to Amendment 2, item 54. Regarding contract modifications as evidence, please refer to the requirements of L.5.2.3.1, specifically the list in paragraph (c). L.5.2.3.1(c)(7) covers "items not identified above."
GR2-52	(L.5.2) Relevant Experience	L.5.2.3.1	The referenced section states, "The A3 Primary NAICS Code Relevant Experience Project Template (Attachment J.P-2) uploaded to Symphony must include a narrative statement clearly explaining how the project met the claimed NAICS code (Not to exceed 5,000 characters), signed by a Contracting Officer (CO) with cognizance over the submitted Project. I believe the government meant to state J.P-2 instead of J.P-4. The Attachment J.P-2 must include the CO's direct telephone number and direct email address."	The government acknowledges receipt of your question. Please refer to Amendment 2, item 55.
GR2-53	(L.5.2) Relevant Experience	L.5.2.3.1	Is an index required for Primary NAICS Code Relevant Experience - Federal contracts (Section L.5.2.3.1)?	An Index is not required for Primary NAICS Code Relevant Experience - Federal Contracts, however in accordance with section L.3.4, offerors are encouraged to utilize an index in their supporting documentation indicating the specific reference for verification purposes.

Alliant 3 Government Responses to Request For Proposal (RFP) Feedback GR Set 02_09.27.24

Response #	RFP Paragraph Reference	Specific RFP Location	Comment/Question	Government Response
GR2-54	(L.5.2) Relevant Experience	L.5.2.3.1, L.5.2.4.2	Will the Government confirm that, in support of task order projects, offerors need only provide the SOW and signed Award document for the task order itself, and are not required to also provide the SOW and signed Award document for the Master IDIQ contract?	Offerors are required to provide the SOW and Signed Award Document for the Task Order or BPA Call, but are not required to provide the SOW or the Award Document for the overarching IDIQ or BPA.
GR2-55	(L.5.2) Relevant Experience	L.5.2.3.2, L.5.2.4.2, L.3.4	L.5.2 indicated that validation of both NAICS and Emerging Technology relevance requires "an index to those specific written passages in the SOW that support the claim". Please clarify what is required here. Is tagging (as suggested by L.3.4) sufficient, or do we also need a separate index to the tagged passages in a Word or .pdf document?	The government acknowledges receipt of your question. Please refer to Amendment 2, items 31 and 28. Offeror's also have the option to utilize "tagging" within Symphony in addition to Indexing in accordance with Section L.3.
GR2-56	(L.5.2) Relevant Experience	L.5.2.3.6	Section L.5.2.3.6 (Foreign Location (Federal Government Contracts Only)) states that an "Offeror must provide an FPDS-NG," but in the event that an "FPDS-NG report indicates that the principal place of performance was not a foreign location, then the Offeror must provide a copy of the contract SOW or documents from the contract that detail the foreign location(s) at which work was performed, contract award form and an authorized signature as described in L.5.2.3.1 and L.5.2.3.2)." Will the Government please confirm that L.5.2.3.6 only pertains to Federal contracts; therefore, the reference to L.5.2.3.2 (Verification of Primary NAICS Code Relevant Experience Submission (Non-Federal Contracts)) will be removed?	The government acknowledges receipt of your question. Please refer to Amendment 2, item 61, removing L.5.2.3.6 reference to L.5.2.3.2.
GR2-57	(L.5.2) Relevant Experience	L.5.2.3.6 2nd to last paragraph, Table 22 RFP Ref L.5.2.3.6	Please clarify the proper filename for the SOW or other contractual evidence of performance in a foreign location and if a J.P-2 is required.	The government acknowledges receipt of your question. Please refer to Amendment 2, item 38. Additionally, in accordance with Section L.5.2.3.6, J.P-2 is required for verification of work performed in a Foreign Location.
GR2-58	(L.5.2) Relevant Experience	L.5.2.4.2(c)	If the SOO/SOW/PWS does not detail the emerging technology work, will the requirements of (a) and (b) suffice? Please clarify the format of the index. Is this separate from required "tagging" in Symphony?	The government acknowledges receipt of your questions. For the first question, please review to GR01-17 which was released on 8/23/24. For the 2nd question, please refer to Amendment 2, item 31.
GR2-59	(L.5.2) Relevant Experience	L.5.2.4.2(d)	This paragraph is identical to L.5.2.4 (e) except to refer to L.5.2.3.2 instead of L.5.2.4.2. It is duplicative and contradictory.	The government acknowledges receipt of your question. Please refer to Amendment 2, item 64.
GR2-60	(L.5.2) Relevant Experience	L.5.2.4.3	In the referenced paragraph, the RFP reads, "A maximum of eleven (11) Emerging Technology Projects may be submitted under L.5.2.4.1 for Emerging Technology points: one (1) different Emerging Technology Experience for each of the eleven (11) Emerging Technology Categories, for a maximum aggregate total of 1,500 points." This doesn't seem correct. A maximum of 33 Emerging Technology Projects can be submitted -- up to 3 for each of the 11 categories, earning up to 3,300 points.	The government acknowledges receipt of your question. Please refer to Amendment 2, item 65.
GR2-61	(L.5.3) Past Performance for Relevant Experience Projects	L.5.2.3.1	Question: Will the Government please confirm that the document referenced should be Attachment J.P-2, not Attachment J.P-4?	The government acknowledges receipt of your question. Please refer to Amendment 2, item 55.
GR2-62	(L.5.3) Past Performance for Relevant Experience Projects	L.5.2.3.2, L.5.3	For offerors planning to use a collection of Task Orders as one project, will the government please clarify whether a CPARS or J.P-6 is required for each Task Order in order to get points associated with Past Performance? Will a CPARS or J.P-6 from either one of the Task Orders or from the IDIQ still get the points associated with Past Performance for Relevant Experience Projects?	The government acknowledges receipt of your question. Please refer to Amendment 2, item 58.

Alliant 3 Government Responses to Request For Proposal (RFP) Feedback GR Set 02_09.27.24

Response #	RFP Paragraph Reference	Specific RFP Location	Comment/Question	Government Response
GR2-63	(L.5.3) Past Performance for Relevant Experience Projects	L.5.3	If an Offeror submits a combination of Task Orders from a Single Award IDIQ as a Primary NAICS Code REP but only has CPARS for one Task Order, we recommend the Government permit a J.P-6 to be submitted, at the IDIQ level, in lieu of Task Order CPARS.	Yes, when an Offeror submits a combination of Task Orders from a Single Award IDIQ as a Primary NAICS Code REP but only has CPARS for one Task Order, the Offeror may submit a J.P-6 attachment at the IDIQ level in lieu of a nonexistent CPARS for a single Task Order.
GR2-64	(L.5.4) Systems, Certifications, and Clearances	L.5.4.5(c)	The last line of paragraph (c.) states, "The Offeror must certify that there have been no material changes to the accounting system since the last audit of its accounting system." Since these instructions relate to the estimating system, please clarify if these instructions are correct.	The government acknowledges receipt of your question. Please refer to Amendment 2, item 81.
GR2-65	(L.5.4) Systems, Certifications, and Clearances	L.5.4.6	Will the Government please confirm the requirement for current/active CMMI certification approval of 'as of initial solicitation close date' should read 'as of the date the solicitation is released' to conform with the requirements for the other Volume 4 certifications?	The government acknowledges receipt of your question. Please refer to Amendment 2, item 82.
GR2-66	(L.5.4) Systems, Certifications, and Clearances	L.5.4.7	The RFP states that "[t]he official certification must be current (active, not expired) as of the date the solicitation is released." The Government should be concerned that certifications are recent and current so that they may benefit task order customers. We request that the government consider updating this language to "[t]he official certification must be current (active, not expired) as of the initial solicitation close date" for consistency with other systems, certifications, and clearance requirements.	The government acknowledges receipt of your question. Please refer to Amendment 2, item 83.
GR2-67	(L.5.4) Systems, Certifications, and Clearances	L.5.4.8	L.5.4.8 ISO/IEC 20000-1:2018 Certification notes that certification must be active as of the date the solicitation is released. Respectfully request that the Government consider ISO/IEC 20000-1:2018 be active upon contract award requiring proof of associated certificate upon award. However, allowing an Offeror to claim the points by providing a letter from an official auditing agent that an Offeror is undergoing the certification process, has audit dates scheduled, and is expected to have the necessary certificate in hand by award. Thank you in advance for your consideration.	The government acknowledges receipt of your question. Please refer to Amendment 2, item 84.
GR2-68	(L.5.4) Systems, Certifications, and Clearances	L.5.4.8	In the draft, the requirement was for "at time of proposal submission." Many companies have invested in and are scheduled for ISO 20000 audits. Will the Government consider reversing the requirement back to as it was in the draft?	The government acknowledges receipt of your question. Please refer to Amendment 2, item 84.
GR2-69	(L.5.4) Systems, Certifications, and Clearances	L.5.4.9	In the draft, the requirement was for "at time of proposal submission." Many companies have invested in and are scheduled for ISO 27001 audits. Will the Government consider reversing the requirement back to as it was in the draft?	The government acknowledges receipt of your question. Please refer to Amendment 2, item 85.
GR2-70	(L.5.4) Systems, Certifications, and Clearances	L.5.4.9	If it is GSAs intent to have contract holders who have current ISO 27001 at time of contract performance, it seems reasonable to change the requirement to active at time of proposal submission. Please change the requirement to current (active, not expired) as of the initial solicitation close date, as it is for CMMI Certification.	The government acknowledges receipt of your question. Please refer to Amendment 2, item 85.

Alliant 3 Government Responses to Request For Proposal (RFP) Feedback GR Set 02_09.27.24

Response #	RFP Paragraph Reference	Specific RFP Location	Comment/Question	Government Response
GR2-71	(L.5.8) Price	L.5.8.1	The RFP Attachment J-3 outlines 32 total LCATs, while the Pricing Worksheet (and associated instructions in Section L.5.8.1) requests rates for 31 LCATs. Web and Digital Interface Designer is excluded. Does the customer require pricing for Senior Web and Digital Interface Designer?	The government acknowledges receipt of your question. Please refer to Amendment 2, items 22 through 27 which reflect multiple changes to the J-3.2 Table 13 Individual Labor Categories. Changes were only made to the LCATs in J-3.2 and no changes were made to the LCATs in the Price Template.
GR2-72	(L.5.8.1) Price Proposal Template Instructions	General Comment	There are mismatches in labor categories between Attachment 3 and the Price Template. Attachment J-3 contains the following labor categories that are not included in the Price Template: Data Scientist, Web and Digital Interface Designer. The Price Template contains the following labor categories that are not included in Attachment J-3: Software Developer, Systems Software	The government acknowledges receipt of your question. Please refer to Amendment 2, items 22 through 27 which reflect multiple changes to the J-3.2 Table 13 Individual Labor Categories. Changes were only made to the LCATs in J-3.2 and no changes were made to the LCATs in the Price Template.
GR2-73	(L.5.8.2) Fully-Burdened Rate Evaluation	L.5.8.2, M.8.2	The RFP states, "The Government will verify and validate that the J.P-8, A3 Price Template has been completed in accordance with instructions provided in Section L.5.8. The Government will verify that Attachment J.P-18, A3 Labor Rate Attestation is signed, and verify that supporting evidence has been submitted and will validate that the supporting evidence meets the stated criteria. (See Section L.8.2)." RFP Section L.8.2 does not exist in the RFP. Did the Government intend to reference Section L. 5.8.2?	The government acknowledges receipt of your question. Please refer to Amendment 2, item 97.
GR2-74	(M.4.2) Acceptability Review	L.5.5.1, M.4.2	Please clarify if the GSA Form 527 as described in L.5.5.1, Financial Resources, is intended to be part of the "Acceptability Review" described in M. 4.2.	The government acknowledges receipt of your question. Please refer to Amendment 2, item 89.
GR2-75	(M.4.2) Acceptability Review	M.4.2(j)	Please clarify if the Cybersecurity Supply Chain Risk Management (C-SCRM) is scored (Paragraphs L.5.5.2 and L.5.1.9) and will be evaluated on a Pass/Fail (Paragraph M.4.2) basis.	The government acknowledges receipt of your question. Please refer to Amendment 2, item 17. This confirms that Cybersecurity Supply Chain Risk Management (C-SCRM) is evaluated on a pass/fail basis and is not a scored element.
GR2-76	(M.4.2) Acceptability Review	M.4.2(k)	Will the government provide an OCI Form template that should be submitted by the offeror?	The government will not be providing an OCI Form template. The Offeror is required to provide an OCI Plan. Please also refer to Amendment 2, item 90 for more information.
GR2-77	(M.4.2) Acceptability Review	M.4.2(k)	The list of elements included in the Acceptability Review includes an Organizational Conflict of Interest (OCI) Form. However, the requirement has been revised to require an OCI Plan. Will the government please correct the Acceptability Review language?	The government will not be providing an OCI Form template. The Offeror is required to provide an OCI Plan. Please also refer to Amendment 2, item 90 for more information.
GR2-78	(M.5.2) Past Performance	L.5.2.4.4.(b)	The RFP states that a signed copy of the original contract award document is required for a federal project only; however, item (9) in the list of award document types is a Non-Government Award Form. Should L.5.2.4.4 (b) apply to all projects, both federal and non-federal?	The government acknowledges receipt of your question. Please refer to Amendment 2, item 66.

Alliant 3 Government Responses to Request For Proposal (RFP) Feedback GR Set 02_09.27.24

Response #	RFP Paragraph Reference	Specific RFP Location	Comment/Question	Government Response
GR2-79	(M.5.3) Systems, Certifications, and Clearances	L.5.4.9	L.5.4.9 ISO/IEC 27001:2010 OR ISO/IEC 27001:2022 Certification notes that certification must be active as of the date the solicitation is released. Respectfully request that the Government consider ISO/IEC 27001:2010 OR ISO/IEC 27001:2022 be active upon contract award requiring proof of associated certificate upon award. However, allowing an Offeror to claim the points by providing a letter from an official auditing agent that an Offeror is undergoing the ISO/IEC 27001:2022 certification process, has audit dates scheduled, and is expected to have the necessary certificate in hand by award. Thank you in advance for your consideration.	The government acknowledges receipt of your question. Please refer to Amendment 2, item 85.