

Alliant 3 Government Responses to Request For Proposal (RFP) Feedback GR Set 04_11.08.24

Response #	RFP Paragraph Reference	Specific RFP Location	Comment/Question	Government Response
GR4-01	GENERAL/NOT LISTED/OTHER	General Comment	Can the government please clarify if there is a minimum number of awards that will be issued?	Per RFP Section L.2.2, the government anticipates that Multiple Awards shall be made up to a maximum of 76 awards.
GR4-02	GENERAL/NOT LISTED/OTHER	General Comment	Does the government have a projected minimum points threshold for vendors to meet to be considered for award?	No, there is not a minimum point threshold for Alliant 3. The Government intends to make 76 awards. In order to be considered for award the proposal must score amongst the top 76 (plus ties) Highest Technically Rated Offerors with Fair and Reasonable Price.
GR4-03	GENERAL/NOT LISTED/OTHER	General Comment	What is the estimated award date?	The estimated award date is October 1, 2025. See GR1-24 for more information.
GR4-04	GENERAL/NOT LISTED/OTHER	General Comment	Will the government please confirm the GSA address to include in any letters required for our proposal submission?	The address for GSA's headquarters for letterhead is 1800 F St NW, Washington, DC 20006. No physical mail will be accepted.
GR4-05	GENERAL/NOT LISTED/OTHER	General Comment	If an Offeror can go large or small, where exactly in the proposal response can an offeror designate whether they are submitting as a small business or large business?	The Offeror will not designate whether or not they are submitting as a small business or large business, Symphony will pull the information from SAM.gov.
GR4-06	GENERAL/NOT LISTED/OTHER	General Comment	Can an offeror submit project deliverables (either under new or existing projects) under the Alliant Program through the Master Contract and an Alliant Task Order?	An Offeror can submit a Relevant Experience Project when it conforms to RFP Section L.5.2 and L.5.2.1.
GR4-07	GENERAL/NOT LISTED/OTHER	General comment	You previously provided award data and statistics from Alliant 2 on the average number of completed tasks, their average value, and other statistics. Can you update this information so we can consider our ability to meet the performance standards on A3 if we were to win an award? We understand that competing for and winning a spot on A3 is challenging, we want to make sure that if we are fortunate enough to compete and win a spot, we will be successful on the contract and remain on it.	We understand that competing for an award on Alliant 3 is a significant undertaking and that every company must make a business decision on where to invest their bid and proposal resources. The Alliant 3 GWAC is a performance-based master contract. See RFP Sections F.6 Performance Standards and F.7 Performance and Deliverables.
GR4-08	GENERAL/NOT LISTED/OTHER	J.P-2, J.P-3	Please clarify which CTA member is required to sign the J.P-2 (Primary NAICS Code REP) and J.P-3 (Emerging Technology REP) when an offeror is claiming projects from an existing SBMP CTA. This would be similar to the instructions provided for the J.P-1 (CTA Template).	The Offering CTA member that is associated with the existing SBMP CTA is required to sign attachment J.P-2 and J.P-3. Offerors are required to submit their MRCL and business relationship information in Symphony. The Symphony configuration allows the offeror to identify all entities and UELs for which they will be claiming evidence and identify each evaluation element with the relationship information or entity for that element, when applicable. The cognizant government project official is required to sign J.P-2 or J.P-3 for a Federal contract and the cognizant corporate official is required to sign the J.P-2 or J.P-3 for Non-Federal contracts.
GR4-09	GENERAL/NOT LISTED/OTHER	J.P-2, J.P-3.	The J.P-2, J.P-3, and J.P-6 Forms contain fields for Offeror Name and Offeror UEI, but do not contain fields for the Prime Contractor name or UEI, which may be claimed but differ from that of the Offeror (e.g., where Prime Contractor for a specific contract is a wholly owned subsidiary of the Offeror). Will the government please update the form to include optional fields for this purpose.	Offerors are required to submit the MRCL and relationship information in Symphony. The Symphony configuration allows the offeror to identify all entities and UELs for which they will be claiming evidence and identify each evaluation element with a pulldown listing all the entities identified in the MRCL or relationship information for that element, when applicable. See L.5.1.5 Meaningful Relationship Commitment Letters, If Applicable for MRCL requirements.
GR4-10	GENERAL/NOT LISTED/OTHER	L.5.1.4	Will the government allow offerors to team with others in order to fulfill Relevant Experience requirements?	Please refer to RFP Section L.5.1.4 for more information regarding Contractor Teaming Arrangements.
GR4-11	GENERAL/NOT LISTED/OTHER	L.5.2.4.4, Symphony	Are Small Business Emerging Technology Solutions Engagement companies to be listed in the Symphony portal as Team Members?	No, per RFP Section L.5.2.4.4 under the Small Business Emerging Technology Solutions Engagement (OTSB Only) paragraph, "The OTSB Offeror need not have previous working experience or commit to future subcontracts with the SB to receive points for this engagement."
GR4-12	GENERAL/NOT LISTED/OTHER	L.5.8	Section L does not include instructions for a cost narrative. Is a cost narrative required? If a cost narrative is required, will the government provide instructions?	IAW FAR 15.404-1(a)(2) Price analysis shall be used when certified cost and pricing data are not required. The Alliant 3 evaluation will be based on price analysis, which does not require Certified Cost or Pricing Data at the Master Contract level, therefore, a cost narrative is not required.
GR4-13	(Attachment J.P-1) A3 Contractor Teaming Arrangement (CTA) Template	J.P-1	Previous GSA FSS CTA task orders are very common and will be used by CTA members for REP (e.g. the offeror performed as a member of the previous FSS CTA task order). The RFP does not clearly specify which forms are to be used when the offeror submits a REP where they performed as a member of a previous GSA FSS CTA task order. Please clarify if form J.P-1 is the correct form vs form J.P-4.	A previous task order awarded to a GSA FSS CTA is allowable as a Relevant Experience from an Existing or Previous CTA (L.5.1.4.1). The Offeror must use the A3 Contractor Teaming Arrangement (CTA) Template (Attachment J.P-1) for each Relevant Experience Project that was performed under an existing or previous CTA. Attachment J.P-4 exclusively applies to subcontractor experience projects. Please also see Amendment 3, items 47, 51, 52, 53, 55, 61, 63, 69, and 75.
GR4-14	(Attachment J.P-1) A3 Contractor Teaming Arrangement (CTA) Template	J.P-1, Part I	Part I table requires "CONTRACTOR TEAMING ARRANGEMENT UEI." Previous GSA FSS CTA task orders are very common and will be used by CTA members for REP (e.g. the offeror performed as a member of the previous FSS CTA task order). The table requires the UEI for the previous CTA itself. GSA FSS CTAs do not have a unique UEI for the CTA itself, but rather fall under the UEI of the CTA team lead. Please correct the table to indicate that for previous GSA FSS CTA task orders used as REP, the UEI of the team lead should be indicated.	GSA FSS CTA Task Orders are issued to each individual CTA member. Each team member is responsible for duties outlined in the CTA document, and each team member has privity of contract with the government. Each team member under a GSA FSS CTA operates as a prime contractor for the portion of the work they perform. Therefore, the change to J.P-1 for GSA FSS CTA REPs is not required.
GR4-15	(Attachment J.P-1) A3 Contractor Teaming Arrangement (CTA) Template	J.P-1, Part II	May we include the dollar value performed by the offeror in the J.P-1 narrative and validate it with the signed J.P-1 form? If not, please add a field for "Project Value Performed by Offeror."	Yes, the dollar value performed by the offeror may be included in the J.P-1 narrative and validated with a signed J.P-1 form.
GR4-16	(Attachment J.P-2) A3 Primary NAICS Code Relevant Experience Project Template	J.P-2	The Cost-Reimbursement field of Attachment J.P-2 states, "This form element is only applicable to Classified Federal Projects with no FPDS record as specified in Section L.5.2.3.5." Question: Can the Government please confirm that Offerors should leave this form section blank for projects that are not classified and do have FPDS records?	As stated on form J.P-2, COST-REIMBURSEMENT: This form element is only applicable to Classified Federal Projects with no FPDS record as specified in Section L.5.2.3.5. Offerors should leave this form section blank for projects that are not classified and have an FPDS records.
GR4-17	(Attachment J.P-2) A3 Primary NAICS Code Relevant Experience Project Template	J.P-2, J.P-3	The Project Title field on Attachments J.P-2 and J.P-3 does not wrap text and so cuts off longer project titles. Can the Government please provide versions of these forms that wrap text?	Adobe will allow input of text longer than the field. Reviewers will use arrow keys to get to the end of the text. Note that there is not a limit to characters anywhere except the narrative.
GR4-18	(Attachment J.P-2) A3 Primary NAICS Code Relevant Experience Project Template	J.P-2, J.P-3, J.P-4, J.P-5	Is Symphony tagging required on Part III of the form within the 5,000 character description of the J.P-2 (J.P-3, J.P-4, and J.P-5) or only on the other associated documentation we need to submit?	Symphony tagging or an index cover page is required for evidence documents other than the J.P forms. J.P forms themselves should not be tagged or indexed. Please refer to Amendment 3, item 19 for additional information.
GR4-19	(Attachment J.P-2) A3 Primary NAICS Code Relevant Experience Project Template	J.P-2, J.P-3, J.P-6	Can the Government confirm that "offeror" in the Relevant Experience Project and Emerging Technology J.P forms (e.g., J.P-2, J.P-3, J.P-6) should be the actual contractor performing the work. In the case that the parent company is the actual "offeror," they can include the note "see attached MRCL" for reference, to clearly show how the Offeror is related to the contractor company completing the form? We want to be sure the Government POCs filling out the J.P forms understand what company it's coming from, while making it clear to Alliant evaluators what "offeror" team the experience falls under. The same question applies for companies submitting work under a company within their Joint Venture team.	Offerors are required to submit the MRCL information in Symphony. The Symphony configuration allows the offeror to identify all entities and UELs for which they will be claiming evidence and identify each evaluation element with the MRCL information or entity in a pulldown, when applicable. Once a file or document is upload in Symphony the Offeror can access and use that file that corresponds with multiple elements in their proposal.
GR4-20	(Attachment J.P-2) A3 Primary NAICS Code Relevant Experience Project Template	J.P-2, L.5.2.3.1	Can the Government confirm that the J.P-2 Project Description only needs to address discrepancies on the FPDS Report?	Per RFP Section L.5.2.3.1, If the FPDS-NG Report is not available or the FPDS-NG Report does not substantiate all claimed scoring elements (e.g., an Offeror claims a different NAICS code than the NAICS code assigned in FPDS-NG), the following verification documents must be included: (a) FPDS Report and (b) a signed J.P-2 form - 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. In addition to all other verification documents required in RFP section L.5.2.3.1.

Alliant 3 Government Responses to Request For Proposal (RFP) Feedback GR Set 04_11.08.24

Response #	RFP Paragraph Reference	Specific RFP Location	Comment/Question	Government Response
GR4-21	(Attachment J.P-2) A3 Primary NAICS Code Relevant Experience Project Template	J.P-2, L.5.2.3.1, L.5.2.3.2	Our company has an SBA-approved Mentor-Protégé Joint Venture (JV), where we act as the mentor (a large company). Can we use the experience and total contract value from this JV to claim points for the NAICS Code, project size, and other scoring criteria? Additionally, should we submit the CTA as part of our submission?	An Other Than Small Business mentor in a Small Business Mentor Protege Joint Venture (MPJV) contract teaming arrangement (CTA) may outline the work performed in that existing CTA per RFP Section L.5.1.4, L.5.1.4.3-Alt. However, the Mentor is subject to the 13 CFR 125.9 and cannot submit a competing offer when their protégé is also an offeror, nor can mentors with multiple protégés submit competing offers through different MPJVs in response to this RFP.
GR4-22	(Attachment J.P-2) A3 Primary NAICS Code Relevant Experience Project Template	J.P-2, L.5.2.3.1(b)	For classified projects that do not have an FPDS but were awarded under one of the relevant NAICS codes, will a statement on the signed J.P-2 suffice stating, "The project is classified and does not have an FPDS but falls under relevant NAICS code 541519."	For classified projects that do not have an FPDS Report, a signed J.P-2 and relevant verification documents as stated in L.5.2.3.1 are required. If a project is classified and does not have an FPDS but falls under relevant NAICS code 541519, the cognizant government project official will confirm the applicability of the NAICS code through a signed J.P-2 template. Also see Section L.3 on instructions for classified information.
GR4-23	(Attachment J.P-2) A3 Primary NAICS Code Relevant Experience Project Template	J.P-2, Part I	In J.P-2, in the field that asks if the project was under an existing or previous teaming agreement, it should cite Section L.5.1.4.1.	The J.P-2 form references L.5.1.4 under which sections for each different type of relationship is specified, which includes the subparagraph L.5.2.4.1. No change to J.P-2 will be applied to the form.
GR4-24	(Attachment J.P-2) A3 Primary NAICS Code Relevant Experience Project Template	J.P-2, Part III	Will the Gov't clarify if the Offeror shall prepare a single, standalone index that corresponds to the SOW for each Relevant Experience Project (REP) that meets the criteria of Section L.5.2.3.2c or could the Offeror prepare one index that spans all SOWs for each REP meeting the criteria?	The government acknowledges receipt of your question. Please refer to Response# GR2-25 from the Attachment A3 GR Set 02_09.27.24.
GR4-25	(Attachment J.P-2) A3 Primary NAICS Code Relevant Experience Project Template	J.P-2, Part III	If a contract's primary NAICS code as shown in the FPDS report doesn't align with one in Table 26, does the Offeror also need to highlight and submit specific NAICS-related passages in the SOW/PWS? If a Primary NAICS code IS in the FPDS report and aligns with Table 26, please confirm if the highlighted/tagged SOW/PWS and index also need to be submitted.	If a contract's primary NAICS code as shown in the FPDS report doesn't align with one of the NAICS codes in RFP Section L.5.2.3, Table 26, the CO will need to sign the J.P-2 saying that the NAICS could have been one of the NAICS codes in Table 26 instead of what was listed in the PWS or FPDS-NG. L.5.2.2 (a) (2) states, "Offeror claims a different NAICS code than the NAICS code assigned in FPDS-NG. The NAICS being claimed is one of the five (5) NAICS codes listed in L.5.2.3 (a) (2) and can be verified in accordance with L.5.2.3.1 or L.5.2.3.2."
GR4-26	(Attachment J.P-2) A3 Primary NAICS Code Relevant Experience Project Template	J.P-2, Symphony	For J.P-2, When combining task orders for the REP, should we list the Periods of Performance separately? Related, how would we enter these series of POPs in Symphony?	For a collection of Task Orders or BPA Calls, the start of the Period of Performance would be the start date of the earliest awarded Task Order or BPA Call. The end date would be the end date of the latest Task Order or BPA Call. Any individual Task Order or BPA Call included in a collection, must have been active within the 5 year window. You may not use any Task Order or BPA Call where performance ended prior to the allowable period. Please refer to Amendment 3, item 21.
GR4-27	(Attachment J.P-2) A3 Primary NAICS Code Relevant Experience Project Template	L.5.2.3.1	Can the Government confirm that J.P-2 is only required if the FPDS Report does not contain all the relevant information for the elements being scored (NAICS, Size, Funding Agency, Cost Reimbursement, and Foreign Location)?	Per RFP Section L.5.2.3.1, if the FPDS-NG Report is not available or the FPDS-NG Report does not substantiate all claimed scoring elements (e.g., an Offeror claims a different NAICS code than the NAICS code assigned in FPDS-NG), the following verification documents must be included: (a) FPDS Report and (b) a signed J.P-2 form - 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. In addition to all other verification documents required in RFP section L.5.2.3.1.
GR4-28	(Attachment J.P-3) A3 Emerging Technology Relevant Experience Project Template	J.P-3	Part III of Attachment J.P-3 states: "The Offeror is required to pinpoint specific sections within the document(s) through Symphony Tagging that substantiate the claim." With reference to "document(s)", is the Government referring to the supporting documents (SOW, SOW, PWS etc.)?	Tags should be to the specific location in the evidence document for the scoring element being evaluated. The required documents are listed in L.5.2.4.2. Please refer to Amendment 2, item 28 for more information regarding tagging.
GR4-29	(Attachment J.P-3) A3 Emerging Technology Relevant Experience Project Template	J.P-3	For J.P-3, When combining task orders for the REP, should we list the Period of Performance separately? Related, how would we enter these series of POPs in Symphony?	The government acknowledges receipt of your question. Please refer to amendment 2, item 53.
GR4-30	(Attachment J.P-3) A3 Emerging Technology Relevant Experience Project Template	J.P-3 Part I	In J.P-3, in the field that asks if the project was under an existing or previous teaming agreement, it should cite Section L.5.1.4.1.	The J.P-2 form references L.5.1.4 under which sections for each different type of relationship is specified, which includes the subparagraph L.5.2.4.1. No change to J.P-2 will be applied to the form.
GR4-31	(Attachment J.P-3) A3 Emerging Technology Relevant Experience Project Template	J.P-3, J.P-2	In J.P-2 and J.P-3, will the Government consider using the Alliant 2 language to verify project details? "Signature below by a Contracting Officer, Contracting Officer's Representative, or Corporate Official for the ordering activity constitutes acceptance of the above project information to be accurate as ordered and received by the listed entity."	No adjustments to J.P-2 or J.P-3 will be made at this time. Please see Amendment 0003 for related edits made to the RFP to provide further clarity and alignment between the signatory requirements of the J.P attachments and the instruction in the RFP. Please refer to Amendment 3, item 49 and 71.
GR4-32	(Attachment J.P-3) A3 Emerging Technology Relevant Experience Project Template	J.P-3, L.5.2.4	Emerging Technology Relevant Experience Projects: (The submitted projects must meet the conditions listed in L.5.2.4.): Will the Government consider reducing the Individual Project Value to less than \$500k per project reference?	The government appreciates your feedback. After a careful review and analysis of your question or comment, we believe the RFP is well-defined in this area and supportive of a competitive proposal.
GR4-33	(Attachment J.P-3) A3 Emerging Technology Relevant Experience Project Template	J.P-3, L.5.2.4	Our company has an SBA-approved Mentor-Protégé Joint Venture (JV), where we act as the mentor (a large company). Can we use the experience from this JV to claim points for the Emerging Technology experience scoring criteria? Additionally, should we submit the CTA as part of our submission?	A member of a Mentor-Protégé Joint Venture (MPJV) may use the experience from projects previously performed by the MPJV to claim points for Emerging Technology Relevant Experience so long as the project meets the conditions listed at RFP Section L.5.2.4 and the Attachment J.P-1 is provided per RFP Section L.5.1.4.4-Alt.
GR4-34	(Attachment J.P-3) A3 Emerging Technology Relevant Experience Project Template	J.P-3, L.5.2.4.2	Since some government CO and CORs may not wish to sign a J.P-3 due to various reasons, for small ET projects can an offeror's Program/Project Manager sign the J.P-3 form as the Cognizant official?	The government acknowledges receipt of your question. Please refer to Amendment 3, item 71.
GR4-35	(Attachment J.P-3) A3 Emerging Technology Relevant Experience Project Template	J.P-3, L.5.2.4.2	If a form was signed by a COR or CO; however, is missing a piece of information including phone number, agency, or title, or if the phone number or email has been updated since the time of signature, can Offeror's leave a tag with the most up to date contact information for the COR and/or CO?	Yes, Offeror's can leave a tag with the most up-to-date contact information for the COR and/or CO.
GR4-36	(Attachment J.P-3) A3 Emerging Technology Relevant Experience Project Template	J.P-3, L.5.2.4.2	On the J.P-3 form it allows for a Cognizant Project Official, not specifically the COR, to sign. In the RFP section L.5.2.4.2, it states on the J.P-3 that "If the cognizant Contracting Officer's signature is unattainable, the Government will accept the signature of the Contracting Officer's Representative (COR) directly associated with the Project. The Attachment J.P-3 must include both cognizant CO's and COR's direct telephone numbers and email addresses." Will the government please update the solicitation so that it matches the J.P-3 form?	The government acknowledges receipt of your question. Please refer to Amendment 3, item 71.
GR4-37	(Attachment J.P-3) A3 Emerging Technology Relevant Experience Project Template	J.P-3, L.5.2.4.2	Will the government please consider removing the required CO/COR signature on J.P-3 for verification? We feel like requesting signature on so many ET project forms would cause an undue burden on our customers.	The government acknowledges receipt of your question. Please refer to Amendment 3, item 71.
GR4-38	(Attachment J.P-3) A3 Emerging Technology Relevant Experience Project Template	J.P-3, L.5.2.4.2	Instructions on J.P-3 requires information and signature of the "Cognizant Project Official" or "Contracting Officer (if not Cognizant Project Official)" Please advise what constitutes a "Cognizant Project Official" and why a Contracting Officer would not qualify as such.	The government acknowledges receipt of your question. Please refer to Amendment 3, item 71.
GR4-39	(Attachment J.P-3) A3 Emerging Technology Relevant Experience Project Template	J.P-3, L.5.2.4.2	The instruction in Section L does not match the instruction on form J.P-3. Section L.5.2.4.2 states that the form must be "signed by a Contracting Officer (CO) with cognizance over the submitted Project... If the cognizant Contracting Officer's signature is unattainable, the Government will accept the signature of the Contracting Officer's Representative (COR) directly associated with the Project." However, J.P-3 requires information and signature of the "Cognizant Project Official" or "Contracting Officer (if not Cognizant Project Official)". Please clarify roles and requirements or revise the Section L instruction and/or the J.P-3 instruction to be consistent.	The government acknowledges receipt of your question. Please refer to Amendment 3, item 71.

Alliant 3 Government Responses to Request For Proposal (RFP) Feedback GR Set 04_11.08.24

Response #	RFP Paragraph Reference	Specific RFP Location	Comment/Question	Government Response
GR4-40	(Attachment J.P-3) A3 Emerging Technology Relevant Experience Project Template	J.P-3, L.5.2.4.2	In the case of a completed contract or task order where the Cognizant Project Official has changed positions, please confirm or correct our assumption that form J.P-3 must be signed by an individual who was the Cognizant Project Official at the time the offeror performed the work being attested.	A signature is required from a Cognizant Government Official who can attest to the accuracy of the information. An explanation of name, agency, and title changes should be provided as part of the narrative on J.P-3.
GR4-41	(Attachment J.P-3) A3 Emerging Technology Relevant Experience Project Template	J.P-3, L.5.2.4.2	In cases where Cognizant Project Officials have changed positions within the Federal Government, their information (agency and title) may not match the work being attested on J.P-3. Please advise how offerors should account for any discrepancy between the Cognizant Project Official's current agency and title and the agency and title that constitute cognizance over the relevant experience being attested.	A signature is required from a Cognizant Government Official who can attest to the accuracy of the information. An explanation of name, agency, and title changes should be provided as part of the narrative on J.P-3.
GR4-42	(Attachment J.P-3) A3 Emerging Technology Relevant Experience Project Template	J.P-3, Part I	Under "Offeror Name," should this be the name of the Alliant 3 Prime Offeror or the name of the company whose relevant experience is being submitted?	"Offeror Name" should always be the name of the offering entity. Offerors are required to submit mergers, acquisitions, novations, name-change agreements, and MRCL information in Symphony. Symphony allows the Offeror to select the associated entities and UEs to an evaluation element to claim points, when applicable. Once a file or document is uploaded in Symphony the Offeror can use the file that corresponds with the elements in their proposal.
GR4-43	(Attachment J.P-3) A3 Emerging Technology Relevant Experience Project Template	J.P-3, Part III	The narrative text box in the J.P-3 form limits the visible text to 3,000 characters, before generating a scrollbar for the remaining narrative. These forms risk losing the ability to access the non-visible characters, up to 2/5 of the narrative, when physically signed or made static in PDF. May offerors reformat the text box to shrink the narrative font size to show all 5,000 characters before the form is digitally signed?	Adobe will allow input of text longer than the field. Reviewers will use arrow keys to get to the end of the text. Note that there is not a limit to characters anywhere except the narrative.
GR4-44	(Attachment J.P-3) A3 Emerging Technology Relevant Experience Project Template	J.P-3, Part III	We respectfully recommend the Government add Tags in Symphony specific to emerging technology claims or clarify the requirement in the J.P-3 instructions. No tags are available consistent with form J.P-3's instruction to "pinpoint specific sections within the document(s) ... that substantiate the claim" that "the selected Emerging Technology [ET] was integral to performance of the project..."	As stated in L.3 Proposal Submission Instructions, For each scoring element, an index can be attached as a cover page to the evidence document pdf file to direct evaluators to the specific page, paragraph number, and line number within the document. Alternatively, offerors can use Symphony's Evidence Document Tagging Feature as described at the following Apex Logic Link: https://industry.support.apexlogic.com/support/solutions/articles/35000255900-tagging-for-alliant-3 to point to the exact location of the scoring element evidence within the document.
GR4-45	(Attachment J.P-3) A3 Emerging Technology Relevant Experience Project Template	J.P-3	Will the government accept images or diagrams within the J.P-3 narratives so long as they further illustrate the vendor services provided in the given emerging technology category?	No, Adobe will not accept diagrams or images inside the narrative section.
GR4-46	(Attachment J.P-4) A3 Subcontractor Experience Project Template	J.P-4	Attachment J.P-4 requests that a pull-down selection be made for the NAICS Group Project Identifier. Please define NAICS Group Project Identifier and explain how to make an accurate selection for the J.P-4 form.	Attachment J.P-4 lists a dropdown for both NAICS and ET so that the Offeror will only have to submit one (1) form if they're submitting the same project for both NAICS & ET credit. Please note, the drop downs are listed as "if applicable".
GR4-47	(Attachment J.P-4) A3 Subcontractor Experience Project Template	J.P-4	If the subcontractor is unable to obtain and validate the prime's project value, is it permissible to leave this field blank?	No, the prime's project value must be included on the (Attachment J.P-4) A3 Subcontractor Experience Project Template. In most instances, the project value can be obtained via the FPDS report.
GR4-48	(Attachment J.P-4) A3 Subcontractor Experience Project Template	J.P-4	Can the Government clarify if the Total Period of Performance required in Part I of the J.P-4 is for the Prime's award or the Offeror's subcontract?	The project period of performance for an Offeror claiming a project with experience performed as a subcontractor should reflect the period of performance, including any option(s), associated with the prime contract on the A3 Subcontractor Experience Project Template (J.P-4).
GR4-49	(Attachment J.P-4) A3 Subcontractor Experience Project Template	J.P-4, L.5.2.3, L.5.2.4	If we are using the federal subcontract and using this subcontract experience for NAICS and Emerging Technology Experience, can we submit one J.P4 including NAICS and ET experience, or do we have to submit a separate J.P4 for NAICS and ET experience?	Attachment J.P-4 provides Offerors a pulldown option to select both NAICS & ET Project identifiers for a single attachment signature. Once a file or document is uploaded in Symphony the Offeror can use the file that corresponds with the elements in their proposal, as applicable.
GR4-50	(Attachment J.P-4) A3 Subcontractor Experience Project Template	J.P-4, Part I	In J.P-4, in the field that asks if the project was under an existing or previous teaming agreement, it should cite Section L.5.1.4.1.	The J.P-2 form references L.5.1.4 under which sections for each different type of relationship is specified, which includes the subparagraph L.5.2.4.1. No change to J.P-2 will be applied to the form.
GR4-51	(Attachment J.P-4) A3 Subcontractor Experience Project Template	J.P-4, Part I	When using a subcontract from an affiliate, subsidiary, or acquired company, where should offerors record the name and UEI of the affiliate, subsidiary, or acquired company to which the subcontract was issued? Is it permissible to include both the offeror and the affiliate, subsidiary, or acquired company in the same field (e.g., for Offeror Name: XYZ Company via its affiliate ABC company, for UEI: XWZ Company: XXXXXXXXXXXX, ABC company: YYYYYYYYYYYYYY)?	The J.P-4 form has a field to enter the name and UEI of the Offeror as well as the Prime Contractor. Symphony allows the Offeror to select the associated entities and UEs to an evaluation element to claim points, when applicable. Once a file or document is uploaded in Symphony the Offeror can use the file that corresponds with the elements in their proposal.
GR4-52	(Attachment J.P-5) A3 Small Business Engagement Template	J.P-5	If the J.P-5 form is fully filled in and signed by the small business company officer as instructed, does the offeror still need to obtain and submit a copy of the original award form from the small business? Some companies are not willing to provide an award document to another contractor for any reason.	Yes, the offeror needs to obtain and submit a copy of the original award form from the small business to be compliant with RFP instructions in Section L.5.2.4.4.
GR4-53	(Attachment J.P-5) A3 Small Business Engagement Template	J.P-5	Where should the offeror put the Small Business Prime Contractor Representative that performed the SB emerging technology project J.P-5 Template?	Attachment J.P-5, Part I, Small Business Contractor Name, Small Business Contractor UEI, Engagement Under this NAICS code. Part II, Name, Title, Small Business Contractor Name, Phone, Email, Part IV, Name, Date, Signature are for the Small Business that performed the SB emerging technology project.
GR4-54	(Attachment J.P-5) A3 Small Business Engagement Template	J.P-5	May tags be labeled PART I, PART II, PART III, PART IV, or are separate tags required for relevant rows?	Tags should be to the specific location in the evidence document for the scoring element being evaluated.
GR4-55	(Attachment J.P-5) A3 Small Business Engagement Template	J.P-5, L.5.2.4.4	Please modify J.P-5 and only require document tagging for non-Federal projects per L.5.2.4.4 item (c)."	The government acknowledges receipt of your question. Please refer to Amendment 2 item 66.
GR4-56	(Attachment J.P-5) A3 Small Business Engagement Template	J.P-5, L.5.2.4.4	Will the Government please clarify whether Attachment J.P-5 Part I should describe the "one on one" OTSB and SB engagement information or the SB's project experience in support of one of the ETs listed in section L.5.2.4.1 (Emerging Technology Listing)?	Yes, Attachment J.P-5, Part I should describe the "one on one" OTSB and SB engagement information and the SB's Emerging Technology Solution project for any single Emerging Technology listed in L.5.2.4.1.
GR4-57	(Attachment J.P-5) A3 Small Business Engagement Template	J.P-5, L.5.2.4.4	Part III of this form states that "The Offeror is required to pinpoint specific sections within the document(s) through Symphony Tagging that substantiate the claim." However, Section L.5.2.4.4 (c) doesn't ask for a PWS or SOW for federal projects for SB Engagement substantiation. Should the Symphony Tagging requirement be only for non-federal projects?	The government acknowledges receipt of your question. Please refer to Amendment 2, items 66, 28.
GR4-58	(Attachment J.P-5) A3 Small Business Engagement Template	J.P-5, L.5.2.4.4(a)	Can an attestation on the J.P-5 that the SB is a Small Business at time of submission be included in the Part III Project Description since that is the only free form field provided?	An attestation on the J.P-5 that the SB is a Small Business at time of submission may be included in the Part III Project Description.
GR4-59	(Attachment J.P-5) A3 Small Business Engagement Template	J.P-5, Part I	The Small Business Emerging Technology Solution Verification Form (J.P-5) includes a field that states "ENGAGEMENT IS WITH SMALL BUSINESS UNDER THIS NAICS CODE". The corresponding instructions in section L.5.2.4.4 (Small Business Emerging Technology Solutions Engagement) does not state which NAICS codes are acceptable for this field. Will the Government please provide instructions for which NAICS codes are to be added by offerors and evaluated for acceptance by the Government?	The NAICS code requested on the Attachment J.P-5 is the NAICS Code assigned to the Small Business Engagement Project claimed per RFP Section L.5.2.4.4.
GR4-60	(Attachment J.P-5) A3 Small Business Engagement Template	J.P-5, Part II	We are unable to enter text in J.P-5, Part II.	The government was unable to replicate this issue. No revision has been made to the form.
GR4-61	(Attachment J.P-5) A3 Small Business Engagement Template	J.P-5, Part II	Attachment J.P-5 does not appear to align with the instructions in L.5.2.4.4 (Small Business Emerging Technology Solutions Engagement). Part II requires "PROJECT REFERENCE INFORMATION" but it is unclear if the information should represent a cognizant official from the Small Business OR a cognizant official of the customer who can verify the SB's performance. Will the Government please clarify whether Part II should describe the cognizant official of the 1) Small Business, a 2) Government official (as in J.P-3 and J.P-5), or a 3) Prime (when J.P-4 applies)?	J.P-5 form Part II: PROJECT REFERENCE INFORMATION Cognizant Project Official (For Federal or Commercial Projects) contains fields for the Name, Title and Company Name for the Small Business demonstrating the Emerging Technology.

Alliant 3 Government Responses to Request For Proposal (RFP) Feedback GR Set 04_11.08.24

Response #	RFP Paragraph Reference	Specific RFP Location	Comment/Question	Government Response
GR4-62	(Attachment J.P-5) A3 Small Business Engagement Template	J.P-5, Part II	Please confirm the name and title of the Small Business' Cognizant Project Official is what is required in this section.	Yes, for attachment J.P-5, Part II, the name and title of the Small Business Cognizant Project Official is what is required in this section. See GR3-21 under attachment A3 GR Set 03_10.25.24.
GR4-63	(Attachment J.P-5) A3 Small Business Engagement Template	J.P-5, Part III	It is our recommendation to have a single index for the entire Small Business Emerging Technology Solutions Engagement section.	The government acknowledges receipt of your question. Please refer to Amendment 2, item 28.
GR4-64	(Attachment J.P-5) A3 Small Business Engagement Template	J.P-5, Part III	Part III. Project Description of Attachment J.P-5 Small Business Engagement Template indicates, "Note that the character limit does not encompass the required Index, which is to be presented separately and is not a part of this narrative section." Does the Government have a preferred format and location for the Index?	The government acknowledges receipt of your question. Please refer to Amendment 2, item 28.
GR4-65	(Attachment J.P-6) A3 Past Performance Rating Template	J.P-6	The provided template does not contain a signature block for the Government Assessing Official. Please indicate where/how the Assessing Official should sign to validate the information?	Please see signature box provided on RFP Attachment J.P-6 page 1. Rating must be provided by a Warranted Contracting Officer or Corporate Officer or cognizant government official for Federal Projects or a Corporate Officer with cognizance over the project for the ordering activity for Non-Federal Projects. If the rating is not supplied by the Contracting Officer, the cognizant government official that provided the rating must fill out the Contract Officer information box (provided on RFP Attachment J.P-6 page 1) for Federal Projects.
GR4-66	(Attachment J.P-6) A3 Past Performance Rating Template	J.P-6, L.5.2.4(c)	Regarding Solicitation Section L.5.2.4(c) states that "If the relevant experience project was not fully completed, but at least one year of performance was not completed in the base period, then either an interim or final CPARS report, or a completed Award Fee Determination document or signed Attachment J.P-6 must be submitted with the proposal." On the government form it has two sections that are relevant to NAICS Relevant Experience Projects, the line for "NAICS CODE" and the line "NAICS CODE RELEVANT EXPERIENCE PROJECT." Can the government please confirm that if the project is only being used for an Emerging Technology project, not one of the 7 NAICS projects, that these areas may be left blank?	The government confirms that if a project is being used exclusively for an Emerging Technology project, not for, or with one of the Primary NAICS Code Relevant Experience projects in L.5.2.2, the following lines in Attachment J.P-6 can be left blank: NAICS CODE and NAICS CODE RELEVANT EXPERIENCE PROJECT.
GR4-67	(Attachment J.P-7) A3 Federal Contract FPDS Crosswalk Sample	J.P-7	Please clarify if fields that are in an orange/yellow font and contain an asterisk at the end of the field name in the Sample Indefinite Delivery Vehicle FPDS report and the Sample Contract/Order FPDS report will have any bearing on the Offeror's response. Additionally please clarify if in the J.P.7 Crosswalk Table 1) For Order Number, should FPDS field "Award ID" be "Referenced IDV ID", 2) For Project Value, should FPDS field "Based and Exercised Options Obligated Value" be "Base and Exercised Options Value", 3) FPDS field "Base and All Options Estimated Value" should be "Base and All Options Value (Total Contract Value)", and 4) FPDS field "Contract Type" should be "Type of Contract"?	The screenshot of the FPDS report containing the yellow text with asterisks is a function the FPDS website. Those are the mandatory fields a CO completes when entering contract data in the program. Since this sample is blank, they remain yellow with an asterisk. 1. For "Order Number", this is in reference to the second FPDS Sample Contract/Order Report specific to starting on Page 6, and the correct field to reference for this is "Award ID". "IDV ID" is referenced in the first sample on page 3 for an Indefinite Delivery Vehicle. 2 and 3. "Project Value" depends on the status of a project, ongoing or complete. Please refer to Amendment 3, item 1. 4. Type of Contract is synonymous with Contract Type. To provide evidence of a cost type contract in J.P-2, the "Type of Contract" field will/must contain one of the following: Cost No Fee, Cost Plus Award Fee, Cost Plus Fixed Fee, Cost Plus Incentive Fee, or Cost Sharing.
GR4-68	(Attachment J.P-7) A3 Federal Contract FPDS Crosswalk Sample	J.P-7	For completed projects, can we consider the contract value displayed for Base And Exercised Options Value in FPDS as all the option years exercised.	Yes, for completed projects the "Base and Exercised Options Value" in FPDS is used to report the contract value. As stated in L.5.2.2, Project value for completed federal Projects is determined by the total obligated dollars. For ongoing projects the "Base and All Options Value (total contract value)" in FPDS is used to report the contract value. As stated in L.5.2.2, Project value for ongoing federal projects is determined based on the total estimated dollars. Please refer to Amendment 3, item 1.
GR4-69	(Attachment J.P-9) A3 Model Individual Subcontracting Plan	J.P-9	We request instructions on how to complete the J.P-9 Subcontracting Plan Template.	Please refer to instructions provided in the first tab of Attachment J.P-9 A3 Model Individual Subcontracting Plan Template V.3 for steps to complete the attachment. Additionally, as stated in RFP Section L.5.1.3, Attachment J.P-9 is designed as a tool to help contractors meet the subcontracting plan requirements by offering a structured format for presenting their subcontracting goals.
GR4-70	(Attachment J.P-9) A3 Model Individual Subcontracting Plan	J.P-9	Offerors are instructed to enter \$ amounts in cells B22, B23, B26, and B27. Since the value of Task Orders to be completed/won in the Base Period are unknown, how will offerors know the amount to use? Will the Government consider that offerors merely provide the percentages instead of an actual \$ amount?	GSA expects the Offeror's small business subcontracting plan to be compliant with FAR Clause 52.219-9. The Offeror's Subcontracting Plan should only contain realistic goals that are attainable to the Offeror's individual circumstances. This includes the Total Contract Value and Total Planned Subcontracted Dollars. Below is historical information from Alliant 2's completed task orders for a six year period: 1. An average of 67.33 completed task orders per contract year. 2. The average value of completed task orders was \$143.7M For more information on Alliant 2 historical sales data and trends please see: https://d2d.gsa.gov/report/gsa-fas-gwac-sales-dashboard
GR4-71	(Attachment J.P-9) A3 Model Individual Subcontracting Plan	J.P-9, Tab 1	Goals are not generated correctly from this tab to Tab 2. Example, if 50% of total contract is to be subcontracted and 70% of said 50% is for Socio Economic concerns, Tab 2 shows the total subcontracting as 50% of the contract total. This makes the formulas in the Socio Economic breakdown incorrect.	The government acknowledges receipt of your question. Please refer to Amendment 1, item 1.
GR4-72	(Attachment J.P-10) A3 GSA Form 527 Contractor Qualification and Financial Information	J.P-10	GSA Form 527 will not open on SAM.gov. It shows an error message stating: "We can't open this file. Something went wrong."	The government acknowledges receipt of your question. Please refer to Amendment 1, item 2.
GR4-73	(Attachment J.P-10) A3 GSA Form 527 Contractor Qualification and Financial Information	J.P-10	Please add fillable fields to all "totals" cells/boxes for offerors to properly complete the form.	If the offeror downloads the form and saves it on their desktop the total will auto-calculate after they fill in the fields. If the auto-calculation does not occur, the offeror may print the form and manually fill in the total fields, and scan the document to their computer to be able to upload it to Symphony.
GR4-74	(Attachment J.P-11) A3 Contractor C-SCRM Responsibility Questionnaire	J.P-11	Attachment J.P-11 requires completion by each member of a Joint Venture, if a Joint Venture is submitting as the Offeror. When completing the information in the form for the Offeror (i.e., "Name of the Offeror"), should a JV member include its legal name, as well as the name of the Joint Venture Entity? For example, "Company X, member of Joint Venture X"?	Yes, a joint venture member should include its legal name, as well as the name of the Joint Venture Entity in Attachment J.P-11.
GR4-75	(Attachment J.P-11) A3 Contractor C-SCRM Responsibility Questionnaire	J.P-11	Is it mandatory to submit the J.P-11 A3 Contractor C-SCRM Responsibility Questionnaire form?	Yes, it is mandatory to submit attachment J.P-11, A3 Contractor C-SCRM Responsibility Questionnaire. Cybersecurity Supply Chain Risk Management (C-SCRM) is evaluated on a pass/fail basis and is not a scored element. Please refer to Amendment 2, item 17.
GR4-76	(Attachment J.P-12) A3 C-SCRM References	J.P-12	Will the government confirm what change occurred to J.P-12 document between RFP and Amendment 1? Documents appear to be identical.	RFP Attachment J.P-12, C-SCRM References was updated to correct a file property error that affected the way the intended title was displayed. This amendment corrects the file title's property in the PDF. (See Amendment 1, item 3)
GR4-77	(Attachment J.P-12) A3 C-SCRM References	J.P-12, J.P-13, G.20.4, L.5.5.2	Will the Government please confirm that J.P-12 and J.P-13 are files that are not required to be included in the final Proposal submission?	Yes, the government confirms that J.P-12, C-SCRM References and J.P-13, C-SCRM Plan Template are not required to be included in the final Proposal submission.
GR4-78	(Attachment J.P-16) A3 Self-Scoring Worksheet	J.P-16	The 6th NAICS Project has different values from the other Projects (\$35M, \$100M, \$275M) as opposed to \$7.5M, \$35M, \$275M.	The government acknowledges receipt of your question. This information may have been on a draft version of the RFP issued during a Request for Information (RFI). The official solicitation of the Alliant 3 RFP, attachment J.P-16 does not contain this information.
GR4-79	(Attachment J.P-16) A3 Self-Scoring Worksheet	J.P-16, L.5.1.9, L.5.5.2	Will the Government please confirm that while the topic of C-SCRM is addressed in two separate sections (L.5.1.9 and L.5.5.2), Offerors are ONLY required to submit a completed J.P-11?	Yes, Offerors are only required to submit a completed J.P-11 attachment in their proposal for C-SCRM. The C-SCRM plan (J.P-13) is a post award deliverable. Please refer to Amendment 2, item 7 and 10.

Alliant 3 Government Responses to Request For Proposal (RFP) Feedback GR Set 04_11.08.24

Response #	RFP Paragraph Reference	Specific RFP Location	Comment/Question	Government Response
GR4-80	(Attachment J.P-16) A3 Self-Scoring Worksheet	J.P-16, Rows 151-157	The scoring value in Attachment J.P-16 is listed as 2500 for all drop-down options (Positive, Neutral, Negative with Narrative) except Negative. Could you please clarify if this is the intended scoring approach?	Attachment J.P-16 is corrected to show 2500 points for drop-down options Positive and Neutral. The drop-down options Negative and Negative with Narrative are assigned 0 points. See RFP Section L.5.3.3 for more information. Please refer to Amendment 3, item 2.
GR4-81	(Attachment J.P-16) A3 Self-Scoring Worksheet	L.5.2, L.5.2.2(e)	Can you please confirm that these numbers for the GSA Alliant 3 Relevant experience are correct. Each project that we submit as Relevant Experience must be more than \$35m each, with several being more than \$100m.	Per RFP Section L.5.2.2 (e) the minimum "Individual Project Value must be equal to or greater than seven million five hundred thousand dollars (\$7,500,000)." Additional points may be earned for projects over \$7.5M, see RFP section M.6 and Attachment J.P-16 for additional information.
GR4-82	(Attachment J.P-16) A3 Self-Scoring Worksheet	L.5.2.2	Recommend the Government consider reserving a certain % of awards for OTSB that are under \$200M in 5 year annual revenue. This would allow this group to compete on scoring against each other vs competing against companies with more than >\$1B revenue companies.	The government appreciates your feedback. After a careful review and analysis of your question or comment, we believe the RFP is well-defined in this area and supportive of a competitive proposal.
GR4-83	(Attachment J.P-18) A3 Labor Rate Attestation	J.P-18, L.5.8.2	Can the Government confirm that the referenced Alliant 2 rates are to be used in comparison to Base Year proposed rates only for the Attachment J.P-18 Labor Rate Attestation?	Per RFP section L.5.8.2 "Proposed labor-hour rates that exceed the Government referenced Alliant 2 published labor-hour rates must be supported with evidence showing that the proposed higher rates have been accepted on a T&M/L-H Federally awarded Government Contract (Attachment J.P-8, Tab 3a and Tab 3b). Offeror will submit Attachment J.P-18 to attest to the validity and accuracy of the provided evidence."
GR4-84	(A) Solicitation/Contract Form SF-33	L.5.4.10	Will the Government accept any FCL Verification date after the RFP release date? Or does the Government require the verification report be dated closer to the submit date?	The government acknowledges receipt of your question. Please refer to Amendment 3, item 83.
GR4-85	(B.11.5) Time- and Material and Labor-Hour Contract Types	B.11.5.1	RFP Section B.11.5.1 establishes that the Alliant 3 rates establish maximum labor rates for all Standard IT Services LCATs in the Master Contract, applicable to all T&M and L-H task orders up to a Secret Clearance. However, the Alliant 3 labor rates are proposed only for the 'Senior' Skill Level. The language in section B.11.5.1 does not create an exception to the maximum labor rates for the SME level. It is reasonable and expected that the SME should be a higher rate than the Senior level. Would the Government consider changing the Pricing spreadsheet to request rates for the SME level of every labor family, such that the Alliant 3 rates can establish maximum labor rates for T&M and L-H task orders, inclusive of all labor category skill levels?	The government acknowledges receipt of your question. Please refer to GR2-14 located in attachment A3 GR set 02_09.27.24.
GR4-86	(B.11.5) Time- and Material and Labor-Hour Contract Types	B.11.5.1	Periodic assessments of the BLS ECI for Escalation Rates will occur on Years 5 and 10. Will the government allow a performer (contractor) to show BLS ECI escalation evidence warranting an adjustment outside of the 5 and 10 year cycle? What would that process look like?	Per RFP section B.11.5.1 "Periodically GSA may assess the prevailing BLS ECI and update the escalation rate to mitigate effects of inflation on out-year pricing. Assessments may occur at Year 5 and at Year 10 of the Master Contract. At time of assessment, the escalation rate will be evaluated and compared to the ECI of CY1 or CY5, as applicable, to determine if an increase to the escalation rate is warranted."
GR4-87	(B.12) Travel Pricing (All Order Types)	B.12	Would the government differentiate Task Orders that are required to be managed from Contiguous United States CONUS and those that can be managed from OCONUS areas and handled remotely?	In order to get the points for Foreign Experience as defined in Section L.5.2.3.6, the principal location of contract performance has to be a foreign location. This section requires evidence that it is coded as such in FPDS or the J.P-2 form must have that field checked and be signed by the Contracting Officer or Cognizant Project Official.
GR4-88	(B.13) Work Outside the Contiguous United States (OCONUS)	B.13	Section B.13 notes that work at the Task Order level may be performed outside the United States and that offerors will be compensated in alignment with the U.S. Department of State's Bureau of Administration, Office of Allowances reporting indexes and the Department of State Standardized Regulations. Given that work performed outside the U.S. contains pricing uplifts in excess of typical indirect costs, will offerors have the ability to exceed the maximum rates proposed at the IDIQ level to accurately price all allowable costs at the Task Order level for OCONUS work?	Per RFP Section B.11.5.1(b)(3) "Based on the specific Task Order requirements, only the agency OCO is authorized to exceed the Master Contract Maximum Rates for those Labor Categories, if necessary, for example, Top Secret/SCI labor and/or OCONUS locations, etc."
GR4-89	(B.14) GWAC Contract Access Fee (CAF)	B.14	Section B.14 GWAC Contract Access Fee states "The CAF rate, which is .75% at the Master Contract Award, is applied to the total amount reported on each invoice." Will the CAF be capped at a certain \$ amount per Task Order?	Per RFP section B.14 "The total CAF collected per Order may be capped at a set amount to be determined by the Alliant 3 GWAC Program Office."
GR4-90	(C.7) Performance Work Statement (PWS)	General Comment	It is unclear how the Government would evaluate the degree to which an offeror's proposal ensures continuity of critical operations and existing projects without requiring detailed information concerning planning for the transition period. Therefore, if it is not already the Government's intent to do so, will the Government request that an initial version of the Transition Plan be submitted with proposals and then review this Plan as part of evaluating offeror capabilities to satisfy the requirements of SOW Section 8.2?	The Government is not requesting the submission of a Transition Plan proposals.
GR4-91	(E.1) Inspection and Acceptance Clauses	E.1, F.1, H.1	Would the government please clarify how the clauses IBR apply at the MCL? E.g. 52.246-2 Inspection of Supplies-Fixed-Price.	Clauses are included at the master contract level to ensure that the solicitation meets regulatory requirements and provides sufficient coverage to task orders issued under the contract by agency customers. As stated in RFP C.5 Ancillary Services, Supplies and Construction the Contractor may provide IT equipment such as server racks, mounts, or similar items. Since future task orders may require such supplies, the clause is included as it is prescribed in FAR 46.302, which states, "the contracting officer shall include FAR 52.246-2, Inspection of Supplies—Fixed-Price, in solicitations and contracts for supplies or services that involve the furnishing of supplies."
GR4-92	(G.14) Electronic Government Ordering System	G.14(a)	Is it mandatory to register in eBuy before submitting the proposal?	No, it is not mandatory to register in eBuy before submitting a task order proposal. The shared Contractor email address will be due to the GWAC Program within five (5) calendar days after the Notice to Proceed (see RFP sections G.14.1 and F.7.3).
GR4-93	(G.20.2) GWAC Transactional Data	G.20.2	Third paragraph states: "If during any respective month(s), the Contractor doesn't report a Paid Invoice on an active Task Order," Please change 'month' to 'quarter' and 'Paid Invoice' to 'Remitted or Paid Invoice' as stated in other sections of the RFP (i.e. Table 5, ID #10, Frequency 1. All Invoices).	The government acknowledges receipt of your question. Please refer to Amendment 3, item 6.
GR4-94	(G.20.5) C-SCRM Incident Reporting	G.20.5	Per RFP Section G.20.5, "Prime contractors are required to report any C-SCRM security incident(s) that involves a potential compromise of the supply chain for any GSA system or data or related stakeholder's systems within 72 hours of knowledge of the event." Please clarify that reporting a "confirmed" compromise rather than a "potential" compromise will meet the requirements of this provision. Please also clarify what a 'potential' incident means. Cio-IT Security-01-02 defines "incident" using the verbiage 'imminent threat of violation'. Would the government modify this section to require reporting of 'incidents' understanding that the definition includes imminent threats of violations (as opposed to using duplicative terms of 'potential' and 'imminent')?	The government acknowledges receipt of your question. Please refer to Amendment 3, items 7, 8 and 9.
GR4-95	(G.20.5) C-SCRM Incident Reporting	G.20.5	If there is a new cyber government regulation or rule conflict with these Alliant-3 rules, unless the Alliant 3 master contract and/or relevant Task Order is otherwise updated, the existing Alliant-3 requirements will continue to apply. In the event a new requirement is added via contract modification, will primes have the opportunity to seek equitable adjustment per FAR regulations?	The government appreciates your feedback. After a careful review and analysis of your question or comment, we believe the RFP is well-defined in this area and supportive of a competitive proposal.

Alliant 3 Government Responses to Request For Proposal (RFP) Feedback GR Set 04_11.08.24

Response #	RFP Paragraph Reference	Specific RFP Location	Comment/Question	Government Response
GR4-96	(G.22) Individual Small Business Subcontracting Plan	G.22	As Alliant 3 has no maximum contract ceiling value to treat as the total contract value, please either provide the dollar figure that should be used as the total contract value or confirm that the Individual Small Business Subcontracting Plan should be expressed as percentages of total subcontract dollars only.	GSA expects the Offeror's small business subcontracting plan to be compliant with FAR Clause 52.219-9. The Offeror's Subcontracting Plan should only contain realistic goals that are attainable to the Offeror's individual circumstances. This includes the Total Contract Value and Total Planned Subcontracted Dollars. Below is historical information from Alliant 2's completed task orders for a six year period: 1. An average of 67.33 completed task orders per contract year. 2. The average value of completed task orders was \$143.7M For more information on Alliant 2 historical sales data and trends please see: https://d2d.gsa.gov/report/gsa-fas-gwac-sales-dashboard
GR4-97	(G.22) Individual Small Business Subcontracting Plan	G.22	Since this is an IDIQ and we are unable to forecast total contract dollars, please remove the requirement to express goals as a percentage of total contract dollars.	GSA expects the Offeror's small business subcontracting plan to be compliant with FAR Clause 52.219-9. The Offeror's Subcontracting Plan should only contain realistic goals that are attainable to the Offeror's individual circumstances. This includes the Total Contract Value and Total Planned Subcontracted Dollars. Below is historical information from Alliant 2's completed task orders for a six year period: 1. An average of 67.33 completed task orders per contract year. 2. The average value of completed task orders was \$143.7M For more information on Alliant 2 historical sales data and trends please see: https://d2d.gsa.gov/report/gsa-fas-gwac-sales-dashboard
GR4-98	(G.22.1) Minimum Subcontracting Goals	J.P-9	Table 6 - Small Business Subcontracting Goals within the RFP show a percentage of 15% for a Small Disadvantage Business (SDB). The J. P-9 A3 Model Individual Subcontracting Plan Template has the percentage for an SDB as 7%. What is the correct percentage for an SDB?	The government acknowledges receipt of your question. Please refer to Amendment 1, item 1.
GR4-99	(G.22.1) Minimum Subcontracting Goals	Table 6	Per RFP, "The small business subcontracting goals in Table 6 are an aggregate of subcontracted dollars for Task Order(s) that a Contractor will remit to subcontractors for work performed under the Alliant 3 GWAC." RFP falls silent on whether the Master Contract SB goals are to be duplicated at TO level. Please clarify if only best effort of SB utilization is required at TO level, and/or cumulatively, all TOs should equate to prescribed Master Contract SB goals.	In the context of a GWAC (Government-Wide Acquisition Contract), the subcontracting goals outlined at the master contract level represent the overall objectives for the entire contract and are a responsibility determination factor per FAR 19.702(a)(1). These goals aim to ensure that small businesses concerns have opportunities to participate in government contracts as subcontractors. However, for task order-level contracts under the GWAC, the focus shifts to realistic, task-specific goals. Each task order may present different opportunities for subcontracting based on the nature of the work, the complexity of the requirements, and the capabilities of the prime contractor. In some cases, a task order might present significant opportunities for subcontracting that exceed the overall goals set at the master contract level. In other cases, the nature of the task order might not provide any subcontracting opportunities at all. Thus, while the overall goals at the master contract level set the framework for small business subcontracting plan responsibility determination, it is important to tailor subcontracting plans at the task order level to the specific scope and requirements of each order, ensuring that they are both realistic and appropriate for the work being performed. This approach maintains flexibility and ensures that subcontracting expectations align with the specific needs and opportunities of each task order per FAR 19.705.
GR4-100	(G.23) Subcontractors	G.23	Is this RFP for Large Businesses that can have a Small Business as a Subcontractor?	Alliant 3 is an unrestricted GWAC. As such, Alliant 3 Prime Contractors (Large or Small Business) may propose on resulting task orders with a small business subcontractor. Per RFP Section L.5.1.3, a small business concern is not required to submit an Individual Subcontracting Plan.
GR4-101	(G.25) Environmental Objectives and Requirements	G.25	Clause G.25 contains requirements that in several ways are substantially the same as those in a proposed rule issued by the FAR Council in November 2022 (FAR Case 2021-015). That proposed rule garnered thousands of comments from industry and prompted Congress, in Section 318 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2024, to exempt certain contractors from disclosing greenhouse gas (GHG) inventories or making other reports on GHG emissions. Because of the broad implications of the clause and significant concerns raised by industry in response to the proposed rule, and given that the FAR Council has not yet reached a final determination as to GHG disclosure requirements for contractors, we recommend that GSA remove or substantially revise Clause G.25.	The government appreciates your feedback. After a careful review and analysis of your question or comment, we believe the RFP is well-defined in this area and supportive of a competitive proposal.
GR4-102	(H.1) Special Contract Requirement Provisions	H.1	We recommend the government clarify which clauses in H.1 Table 8 apply to the MCL by adding a column similar to E.1, F.1, and I.2. Or specify that H.1 Table 8 "FAR Provisions apply at the Task Order level, as applicable, depending upon the contract type of the Order, or as specifically referenced in the applicable Order" per H.1 in Alliant 2.	The government acknowledges receipt of your question. Please refer to Amendment 2, item 21.
GR4-103	(H.1) Special Contract Requirement Provisions	H.1	We recommend the government remove the X from clauses in Table 8 with fill-ins for Master Contract (e.g. 52.216-6, -7, -16, -17, etc.), or provide fill-in data.	RFP Section H.1, Table 8, provisions marked with an 'X' apply to the Master Contract (MC) and may also apply to individual Task Orders (TO) based on the contract type and the OCO's decision. Clauses marked with an asterisk (*) require specific details from the OCO, which must be included in full text in a resulting Task Order.
GR4-104	(H.1) Special Contract Requirement Provisions	Table 8	Section H, Table 8 lists provisions, some of which have an asterisk (*) after the clause number. QUESTION: Would the Government please clarify the meaning of the asterisk (*)?	As stated in Section H.1, first paragraph, Clause numbers followed by an asterisk (*) would require fill-ins by the OCO and would need to be incorporated into the Task Order Request and resulting Order as full text if deemed applicable by the OCO.
GR4-105	(H.3) Marketing	H.3	H.3 states "GSA requires the review and approval of any Press/News Releases for Master Contracts, Marketing/Promotional Materials and Brochures by a Contractor that is GSA GWAC related, including information on the Contractor's GWAC Web Page." Can the Government please provide more detail on how the process for Marketing/Publicity approvals are requested/approved?	See GSA Star Mark Logo Policy via: https://www.gsa.gov/reference/gsa-logo-policy#:~:text=The%20GSA%20Star%20Mark%20is,%2C%20service%2C%20product%20or%20activity .
GR4-106	(H.3) Marketing	H.3	"The GWAC Program will periodically provide GWAC Sales Training." Please clarify if this is the only use case GSA GWAC's co-branded use cases of the Contractors Marketing and Promotional Materials, or otherwise please provide scope and clarity as to other use cases of the Contractors Marketing and Promotional Materials.	No, this is not the only GSA GWAC's co-branded use case of the Contractors Marketing and Promotional Materials. The Program Team will provide Sales Training to Alliant 3 Awardees periodically. In addition, Alliant 3 Placards and contract information slip sheets will be available in GSA's Customer Marketing Library Service. Additional information will be discussed with Industry Partners at post-award meetings.
GR4-107	(H.4) Organizational Conflict of Interest	H.4	Would the Government accept statements from offerors that they do not have an OCI at the MCL in lieu of an OCI Plan?	No, the Government will not accept statements from offerors that they do not have an OCI at the MCL in lieu of an OCI Plan.
GR4-108	(H.6) Cybersecurity Supply Chain Risk Management (C-SCRM): Required IT Security Policies	General Comment	Please confirm GSA intends to compensate contractors for any cost and schedule impacts resulting from unilateral changes made by the government, including but not limited to those identified in the RFP (C-SCRM, GHG, contract data calls, deliverables, MCL business systems, etc.). Will that be accomplished through the minimum guarantee task order. If that is not GSA intention, we recommend that the GSA remove the language in these areas to ensure reciprocal consideration in accordance FAR and GSAR changes clauses 52.243-x & 552.270-14 respectively.	The government appreciates your feedback. After a careful review and analysis of your question or comment, we believe the RFP is well-defined in this area and supportive of a competitive proposal.

Alliant 3 Government Responses to Request For Proposal (RFP) Feedback GR Set 04_11.08.24

Response #	RFP Paragraph Reference	Specific RFP Location	Comment/Question	Government Response
GR4-109	(I.2) Contract Clauses	I.2	To avoid confusion over which data rights clauses are applicable to a task order and which must flow down to subcontractors, we recommend that the Government remove 52.227-17 and Alt IV and V of 52.227-14 and DFARS 252.227-2 at the IDIQ level and require OCOs to include those on Task Orders where they are applicable. For the DFARS attachment, DFARS 252.227-7020 Rights in Special Works should also be removed from the IDIQ level clauses.	A Certification of Final Indirect Cost Rates is not required at the Master Contract Level. I Per RFP Section I.2 clauses 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. Including clauses at the master contract level provides agency customers flowdown coverage and convenience, when applicable, for issuing task orders.
GR4-110	(I.2) Contract Clauses	I.2	To simplify invoicing and because firm fixed price Task Orders would primarily be for services, would the Government please confirm that FAR 52.232-1 Payments is to be used by contractors to submit invoices in accordance with that clause rather than under 52.232-16 Progress Payments? Alternately, please remove the progress payments clause at the MC level and require that OCO's add it on a task order basis.	Including clauses at the master contract level provides agency customers flowdown coverage and convenience, when applicable, for issuing task orders.
GR4-111	(I.2) Contract Clauses	I.2	52.227-11 gives patent ownership rights to the contractor and 52.227-13 required the contractor to assign patent rights to the Government. The Government needs to select one of these clauses to be applicable. To avoid confusion over the governing clause, we recommend that any patent rights clauses be added by the OCO on a TO basis.	Including clauses at the master contract level provides agency customers flowdown coverage and convenience, when applicable, for issuing task orders.
GR4-112	(I.2) Contract Clauses	I.2	FAR 52.207-3 Right of First Refusal clause is only applicable if there is an expectation of that there will be a conversion from Government performance to contractor performance, per 7.305. Recommend this clause be removed at the master contract level and be added at the task order level where applicable.	Including clauses at the master contract level provides agency customers flowdown coverage and convenience, when applicable, for issuing task orders.
GR4-113	(I.2) Contract Clauses	I.2	Please confirm that FAR 52.223-15, Energy Efficiency in Energy-Consuming Products, which was removed from the FAR as of May 22, 2024, is to be included in the Alliant 3 RFP# 47QT0B24R0009.	The government acknowledges receipt of your question. Please refer to Amendment 3, item 11.
GR4-114	(I.2) Contract Clauses	I.2	Table 9 Contract Clauses in Section I.2, Contract Clauses, lists Federal Acquisition Regulation (FAR) 52.223-3 and its corresponding Alternate I as applicable at the MCL. Given this clause requires offerors to identify whether they are providing any hazardous material or state "None," can the Government confirm this clause should only be applicable at the task order level as no hazardous material will be provided at the GWAC level? If this fill-in will be required, please provide in full text.	Yes, confirming no hazardous material will be provided at the master contract level. Per RFP Section I.2 clauses 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.
GR4-115	(I.2) Contract Clauses	I.2	Table 9 Contract Clauses in Section I.2, Contract Clauses, lists FAR 52.242-4 Certification of Final Indirect Costs as applicable at the MCL. Given this clause requires offerors to identify whether any unallowable costs are included in their indirect rates and offerors for Alliant 3 are only providing fully burdened T&M/LH rates, can the Government confirm this clause should only be applicable at the task order level? If this fill-in will be required, please provide in full text.	Yes, confirming indirect rates is not requested of Offerors for an Alliant 3 GWAC base contract award. Per RFP Section I.2 clauses 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. Including clauses at the master contract level provides agency customers flowdown coverage and convenience, when applicable, for issuing task orders.
GR4-116	(J-1.3) Clauses Incorporated by Reference	J-1.3. DFARS 252.204-7012	In May 2024, OUSD issued a class deviation for DFARS 252.204-7012 that remains in effective until rescinded. Please update J.1.3 to reflect 252.204-7012 Safeguarding Covered Defense Information and Cyber Incident Reporting. (May 2024) DEVIATION 2024-O0013) in place of the Jan 2023 version.	The government acknowledges receipt of your question. Please refer to Amendment 3, item 15.
GR4-117	(J-1.3) Clauses Incorporated by Reference	J-1.3. DFARS 252.209-7009	Would the Government remove DFARS 252.209-7009, as it would be applicable on Task Order basis and should be added by OCOs if applicable.	Including clauses at the master contract level provides agency customers flowdown coverage and convenience, when applicable, for issuing task orders.
GR4-118	(J-1.3) Clauses Incorporated by Reference	J-1.3. DFARS 252.209-7009	DFARS 252.239-7009 is not included in the RFP, will the Government clarify why 252.239-7010 is included because they should go together and should be included in contracts for acquisition of cloud computing, including SaaS, PaaS, etc.	The government acknowledges receipt of your question. Please refer to Amendment 3, item 14.
GR4-119	(L.1) FAR 52.252-1 Solicitation Provisions Incorporated by Reference (FEB 1998)	L.1, FAR 52.252-1	FAR 52.215-1, included by reference in Section L, instructs offerors to include specific language on the proposal title page and proposal page footers to indicate confidentiality of proposal content. May offerors include a title page with their submissions, and if so, where in the proposal (and in Symphony) should we include them?	Offerors may include a title page with their file submission. The title page should be the first page in the file submission.
GR4-120	(L.3) Proposal Submission Instructions	L.3	Are Offerors allowed to submit UNCLASSIFIED/FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY and/or CONTROLLED, UNCLASSIFIED INFORMATION? If so, please confirm if any of this information needs to be redacted, sanitized, or have government official authorization.	Per RFP Section L.3, please see the paragraph entitled "REDACTED PROPOSAL DOCUMENTS" for more information regarding submitting redacted information.
GR4-121	(L.3) Proposal Submission Instructions	L.3	May offerors include an Alliant 3 proposal cover page as a separate file to provide a non-disclosure statement that applies to proposal file submissions?	Yes, offerors may include an Alliant 3 proposal cover page as a separate file to provide a non-disclosure statement that applies to proposal file submissions.
GR4-122	(L.3) Proposal Submission Instructions	L.3, L.5.2.3.1	For any scoring elements requiring contract award documents as verification, will the Government please confirm that Offerors need only provide the first page of the award document as well as any other pages that verify claimed points?	Yes, the first page of an award document with any other pages that verify claimed points is acceptable if it contains the following elements per RFP Section L.5.2.3.1 (c)(7): Contractor, Government Agency, Order Number, Dollar Value, and the date the Contracting Officer awarded/signed.
GR4-123	(L.3) Proposal Submission Instructions	L.3.2	Will the Government allow Offerors to submit our Mergers, Acquisitions, Novations, and Change-of-Name Agreements evidence in one index document that maps to each possible relevant experience submissions instead of needing to provide separate documents with the same or similar information?	Offerors are required to submit each Merger and Acquisition, Novation, and Change-Of-Name Agreement separately and index each entity to the relevant experience, past performance, system, certification, or clearance when not in the Offering Entity's name.
GR4-124	(L.3) Proposal Submission Instructions	L.5.2.3.2, L.5.2.4.2, L.5.2.4.4	Please confirm for any submissions requiring an index, that Offerors should make that index as a first page in the PDF file that contains the SOW.	As stated in L.3 Proposal Submission Instructions, the offeror can either provide an index to the evidence for the evaluation element as a cover page to the document or use the Symphony's tagging feature. See L.3 for a link to an instructional video from Apex Logic on tagging. Please also see Amendment 3, item 19 for additional assistance.
GR4-125	(L.3) Proposal Submission Instructions	L.5.2.4.4	For verification of engagements with Small Businesses, may offerors provide an FPDS report for the cited Small Business project as opposed to requiring the Small Business to share their signed contract award forms, which they might consider to be proprietary information?	An FPDS report is not allowed for Small Business Emerging Technology Solutions Engagement verification. For federal projects, a signed copy of the original award document is required as listed in RFP Section L.5.2.4.4(c).
GR4-126	(L.3.2) Mergers, Acquisitions, Novations, and Change-of-Name Agreements, as Applicable	L.3.2	Please confirm that in instances where transferees retain the key personnel, management, and other resources or assets, the transferee may claim the total contract value from original award.	Per RFP L.3.2, "In the event of a Government approved novation of a U.S. Federal contract from one Contractor to another, the transferor Contractor may claim credit for the above mentioned projects in as much as that contractor was awarded and assumed responsibility for that project up until the novation. The transferee may claim credit for the same project in as much as that contractor has assumed responsibility for that project from the point of the novation." Once the contract has been novated, the transferee may claim credit for the relevant experience work performed by the transferor from contract inception, as well as credit for the post novation relevant experience work performed by the Offeror.
GR4-127	(L.3.2) Mergers, Acquisitions, Novations, and Change-of-Name Agreements, as Applicable	L.3.2	RFP Section L.3.2, Offerors are required when applicable to "provide evidence of the merger, acquisition, novation, or change-of-name agreement, as well as a justification demonstrating how the evaluation element being claimed is applicable to the Offeror." Please confirm that Offerors may include justification as part of the Meaningful Relationship Commitment Letter.	Yes, per RFP Section L.3.2. Offerors may include justification demonstrating how the evaluation element is being claimed as part of the Meaningful Relationship Commitment Letter.

Alliant 3 Government Responses to Request For Proposal (RFP) Feedback GR Set 04_11.08.24

Response #	RFP Paragraph Reference	Specific RFP Location	Comment/Question	Government Response
GR4-128	(L.3.2) Mergers, Acquisitions, Novations, and Change-of-Name Agreements, as Applicable	L.3.2	Are Offerors allowed to submit one file that includes relevant Mergers, Acquisitions, Novations, and Change-of-Name Agreements evidence as part of that file—and include explanatory information within the index to identify applicability to various proposal elements—as opposed to needing to include that evidence for each applicable Relevant Experience project (potentially the same or similar information 40 different times)?	Offerors are required to submit the Mergers, Acquisitions, Novations, and Change-of-Name Agreements in Symphony. The Symphony configuration allows the offeror to identify all entities and UELs for which they will be claiming evidence and identify each evaluation element with the Mergers, Acquisitions, Novations, and Change-of-Name Agreements, when applicable. Once a file or document is upload in Symphony the Offeror can access and use that file that corresponds with multiple elements in their proposal.
GR4-129	(L.3.2) Mergers, Acquisitions, Novations, and Change-of-Name Agreements, as Applicable	L.3.2	Could GSA specify what constitutes acceptable evidence of an acquired entity? For example, would financial statements available on the SEC filing or SAM registration suffice as proof?	Examples of adequate evidence provided in support of entity acquisition includes the completed acquisition agreement, state incorporation filings, SEC filings and/or the SAM registration.
GR4-130	(L.3.2) Mergers, Acquisitions, Novations, and Change-of-Name Agreements, as Applicable	L.3.2	Is a MRCL document expectable to show the relationship between the Offer and its wholly owned subsidiary, meaning and referring to L.3.2?	All MRCLs, including those within any corporate structure, require the information listed in L.5.1.5(a) through (f). Common corporate ownership alone is insufficient to demonstrate a MRCL. A MRCL must include detailed explanations describing how the Offeror will access the Meaningful Relationship entity's capabilities per RFP Section L.5.1.5(f).
GR4-131	(L.3.2) Mergers, Acquisitions, Novations, and Change-of-Name Agreements, as Applicable	L.3.2	L.3.2 states that "Furthermore, it is important that source documents maintain the original name of the company awarded the contract, without substitutions. The Government will assess the transferability of credit by reviewing the evidence provided by the Offeror. Is the government referring to the original name of the acquired entity?	Yes, the original name of an acquired entity is the legal name of the business that was acquired in a merger or acquisition.
GR4-132	(L.3.2) Mergers, Acquisitions, Novations, and Change-of-Name Agreements, as Applicable	L.3.2	By providing evidence of an acquisition, is an Offeror entitled to claim the full period of performance of the claimed evaluation element (Relevant Experience Project, Emerging Technology Relevant Experience and/or Past Performance Project) which identifies a different name other than that of the Offeror?	Per RFP L.3.2, "In the event of a Government approved novation of a U.S. Federal contract from one Contractor to another, the transferor Contractor may claim credit for the above mentioned projects in as much as that contractor was awarded and assumed responsibility for that project up until the novation. The transferee may claim credit for the same project in as much as that contractor has assumed responsibility for that project from the point of the novation." Once the contract has been novated, the transferee may claim credit for the relevant experience work performed by the transferor from contract inception, as well as credit for the post novation relevant experience work performed by the Offeror.
GR4-133	(L.3.2) Mergers, Acquisitions, Novations, and Change-of-Name Agreements, as Applicable	L.3.2	Will the Government please confirm that a Subcontractor who performed the majority of work on a contract and to whom the contract was later novated may claim both the value and Period of Performance for both the pre- and post-novation work?	Per RFP Section L.3.2, by the closing date of this solicitation, if a company has acquired by another company, the transferor and transferee company may claim credit for the same Primary NAICS Code Relevant Experience Projects under Section L.5.2.2, the Emerging Technology Relevant Experience under Section L.5.2.4, and the Past Performance Projects under Section L.5.3 under the conditions listed in the subsequent paragraphs.
GR4-134	(L.3.2) Mergers, Acquisitions, Novations, and Change-of-Name Agreements, as Applicable	L.3.2	Will a global change of name letter be acceptable to cover a Change of Name? Or would the documentation need to be specific and tagged/uploaded each time the previous name appears in documentation (e.g., in each set of REP documentation that is affected)?	Offerors are required to submit mergers, acquisitions, novations, name-change agreements, and MRCL information in Symphony. Symphony allows the Offeror to select the associated entities and UELs to an evaluation element to claim points, when applicable. Once a file or document is uploaded in Symphony the Offeror can use the file that corresponds with the elements in their proposal.
GR4-135	(L.3.2) Mergers, Acquisitions, Novations, and Change-of-Name Agreements, as Applicable	L.3.2	Please confirm that in circumstances where an offeror received a contract through novation because it acquired the personnel, resources and assets of the business performing the work under that novated contract, the offeror may claim credit for the project from contract inception, not from the point of novation.	Per RFP L.3.2, "In the event of a Government approved novation of a U.S. Federal contract from one Contractor to another, the transferor Contractor may claim credit for the above mentioned projects in as much as that contractor was awarded and assumed responsibility for that project up until the novation. The transferee may claim credit for the same project in as much as that contractor has assumed responsibility for that project from the point of the novation." Once the contract has been novated, the transferee may claim credit for the relevant experience work performed by the transferor from contract inception, as well as credit for the post novation relevant experience work performed by the Offeror.
GR4-136	(L.3.4) Proposal Due Date and Proposal Intake System Location	L.3.4	In Section L.3.4, the Government indicated stated, "Offerors must provide all documentation and proposal contents exclusively via Symphony." The instance of Symphony used for this procurement also includes prior Offeror's OASIS+ documents and includes fields under the My Company area that are exclusively relevant to other procurements. Would the Government be able to provide a list of which submission elements in Symphony are relevant to Alliant 3? This will allow bidders to ensure they upload to the correct scoring elements in their submission.	The Symphony tool allows Offerors the option to utilize proposal documents from a previous GSA solicitation (such as OASIS+), for your Alliant 3 proposal submission. Offerors bear sole responsibility to ensure their ALLIANT 3 proposal contains correct and complete information, including all required documents. Offerors exclusively assume any and all risks arising from their use of the Symphony document option, including but not limited to: inaccuracy, inadequacy and other discrepancies within the Symphony documents, and potential proposal submission failures. The option to leverage documents and data from a previous solicitation made through Symphony is not an indication that GSA has deemed these documents adequate or appropriate for submission on ALLIANT 3. Neither the Government nor Symphony warrant the suitability, accuracy or reliability of the Symphony tool, and are not liable for any aspect of the Offeror's use of Symphony's previous solicitation documents for their proposal submission.
GR4-137	(L.3.5) Solicitation Questions	L.3.5	Please extend the deadline for questions from July 26 to July 31. NASA SEWP proposals are due July 25, and our teams need a few more days to ensure we have reviewed every detail of the Alliant 3 RFP.	The government acknowledges receipt of your question. As visible in Sam.gov, the deadline was extended to August 2, 2024.
GR4-138	(L.3.5) Solicitation Questions	L.3.5	In some cases, after Q&As are released, the answer to a question or change to the RFP might be unclear or raise issues on which offerors need to follow up. In addition, sometimes answers to multiple or similar questions in a large Q&A set conflict. There may also be ambiguities identified late in the process that offerors would need to share with GSA. What is the mechanism for asking follow-up questions after the Q&As are released in late August?	Thank you for question. No follow-up questions will be received after the question period end date of August 2, 2024. The government will provide a pre-recorded pre-proposal conference to the public.
GR4-139	(L.4) Proposal Format	L.4	Should the Offeror Name and solicitation number be placed on the cover page or header of documents?	The government acknowledges receipt of your question. Please refer to Amendment 2, item 32. Symphony allows the Offeror to select the associated entities and UELs to an evaluation element to claim points, when applicable. Once a file or document is uploaded in Symphony the Offeror can use the file that corresponds with the elements in their proposal.
GR4-140	(L.4) Proposal Format	L.4	L.4 states, "All files shall contain the solicitation number and the Offeror's name in the header of each uploaded document." For some required verification documents listed in Table 22 (L.5.4.1-L.5.4.10), the page limit and format are described as "PDF" and "Limited to the verification document." Considering that many of these certification documents originate from third parties, are Offerors permitted to include a cover page that contains the offeror name and solicitation number to introduce the certification document(s)? Note: Section L.3 permits "Offerors may make minor formatting changes to Section K and Section J templates used in proposal submission. For example, minor formatting changes include such things as adjusting page breaks, adding corporate identification logos, adding identifiers in the headers and footers, including disclaimers of proprietary information." This language excludes other certifying documents that may come from a third party.	Yes, offerors are permitted to include a cover page that contains the offeror name and solicitation number to introduce the certification document(s). Please refer to Amendment 2, item 28.
GR4-141	(L.4) Proposal Format	L.4	Is there an attestation in Symphony to indicate that all the files have been scanned, and are virus free?	Symphony does not provide a virus free attestation form for files. All uploaded files must first pass virus detection. If a virus is found, the Symphony administrator is notified. Symphony is hosted on cloud.gov with a FISMA Moderate 3-year ATO.
GR4-142	(L.4) Proposal Format	L.4	The second paragraph of L.4 states, "All files shall contain the solicitation number and the Offeror's name in the header of each uploaded document." Most of the J-P-X attachments provided by the Government are Adobe forms and can only be edited within the fields. Would the Government provide forms that populate the Offeror's name in the header of these forms so we can meet this requirement?	The Offeror's name in the header of each uploaded document is no longer required. However, Offerors may mark pages containing sensitive or proprietary information with an appropriate legend in the header or footer. Please refer to RFP Section L.3 and Amendment 2, item 32. Symphony allows the Offeror to select the associated entities and UELs to an evaluation element to claim points, when applicable. Once a file or document is uploaded in Symphony the Offeror can use the file that corresponds with the elements in their proposal.
GR4-143	(L.4) Proposal Format	Table 22 RFP Ref L.5.6	Where can Offerors find the JV/PT file format referenced in Table 22, row L.5.6?	The government acknowledges receipt of your question. Please refer to Amendment 3, item 39.

Alliant 3 Government Responses to Request For Proposal (RFP) Feedback GR Set 04_11.08.24

Response #	RFP Paragraph Reference	Specific RFP Location	Comment/Question	Government Response
GR4-144	(L.4) Proposal Format	Table 22 RFP Ref L. 5.6	Please clarify if the "PT" in JV/PT, referenced in Table 22 is a reference to an Offeror that is an established, individual company and not part of a JV.	The acronym PT is in reference to a "Partnership." Please refer to Amendment 3, item 5.
GR4-145	(L.4) Proposal Format	Table 22 RFP Section L.5.1.8	Table 22's Document column states that Representations and Certifications (L.5.1.8) will be completed in Symphony. However, the only place to provide Section K's Representations and Certifications in Symphony is a document upload under Business Factors. Can the Government please update Table 22 to include the file name for Section K?	The government acknowledges receipt of your question. Please refer to Amendment 3, item 22.
GR4-146	(L.4.1) Proposal Format Table	J.P-11, L.5.1.9, L.5.5.2, Table 22 RFP Ref L. 5.5.2/L.5.1.9	Please clarify where the J.P-11 form is to be uploaded in Symphony.	Offerors will upload the J.P-11 attachment in the business factors section of Symphony.
GR4-147	(L.4.1) Proposal Format Table	J.P-3, L.4.1	There are no references to the required J.P-3 Index(s) in the Proposal Format Table. We request the Government correct this omission by adding index requirements to the Proposal Format Table that define Page Limit & Type; provide the Sample File Name/Supporting Data Attachment for Symphony.	The government acknowledges receipt of your question. Please refer to Amendment 2, item 28.
GR4-148	(L.4.1) Proposal Format Table	J.P-5, L.4.1	There are no references to the required J.P-5 Index(s) in the Proposal Format Table. We request the Government correct this omission by adding index requirements to the Proposal Format Table that define Page Limit & Type; provide the Sample File Name/Supporting Data Attachment for Symphony.	The government acknowledges receipt of your question. Please refer to Amendment 2, item 28.
GR4-149	(L.4.1) Proposal Format Table	L.4.1	Most but not all the identified file names include a period between the OfferorName and the element name. Will the Government please confirm that Offerors should include a period between these items in all file names?	Per L.4, all proposals and supporting documents must adhere to the prescribed format, file size, page limit, and naming convention delineated in Section L.4.1, Proposal Format Table, and in accordance with the instructions in Section L.5.
GR4-150	(L.4.1) Proposal Format Table	L.4.1	RFP Section L.4.1, Proposal Format Table provides specific instructions on permissible file names for claimed scoring elements. Can the Government please confirm that additional file names can be used when providing substantiating documents for claimed Relevant Experience Project (REP) elements? For example, if the offeror has a Federal Contract Modification to substantiate the Period of Performance (POP), can the offeror provide a file name such as "OfferorName.NAICS10t7.MODPOP.pdf"? If there is a specific file name format for the files outside of FPDS, J.P-2, Award, Name Change, J.P-1 CTA, J.P-4 Sub, can the Government please specify what those would be?	The Proposal Format Table provides specific instructions on permissible file names for claimed scoring elements. Any submissions that are not included in the file format table do not have a specific filename. Per L.4.1 (b) and (d), Offerors should use file names that relate to the attachments. Incomplete files and files other than those listed as evidence for each scoring element should not be submitted and will not be evaluated or considered for scoring.
GR4-151	(L.4.1) Proposal Format Table	L.4.1	RFP Section L.4.1, Proposal Format Table provides specific instructions on permissible file names for claimed scoring elements. If a specific file name format is not noted for a document (for example a certification), can the Government please provide what those should be?	Per L.4.1 (b), Offerors should use file names that relate to the attachments. The Proposal Format Table provides specific instructions on permissible file names for claimed scoring elements. Any submissions that are not included in the file format table do not have a specific filename.
GR4-152	(L.4.1) Proposal Format Table	L.4.1	The proposal format table provides distinct file names for "NAICS" and "ET" projects. If offerors use the same project as both a NAICS and an ET project, should offerors upload files twice, with the same file saved under two different names? Alternatively, will the government provide a standardized naming convention to use across NAICS and ET projects (e.g., "OfferorName.ProjectIdentifier.Sub.pdf")?	Offerors must follow the instructions in RFP Section L.4.1, proposal format table for file names. Once a file or document is uploaded in Symphony the Offeror can use the file that corresponds with the elements in their proposal.
GR4-153	(L.4.1) Proposal Format Table	L.4.1	Please confirm that for CTAs, the file names should include the CTA name in place of "OfferorName" not the names of the individual companies within the CTA.	The file names should be the name of the Offeror (see L.5.1.1). The Offering entity should match what is in SAM.gov. Symphony allows the Offeror to select the associated entities and UELs to an evaluation element to claim points, when applicable. Once a file or document is uploaded in Symphony the Offeror can use the file that corresponds with the elements in their proposal.
GR4-154	(L.4.1) Proposal Format Table	L.4.1, L.5.5.1	Table 22 indicates that responses for L.5.5.1 Financial Resources are limited to one single file, specifically the J.P-10. Some of these files can get very large when combined, however. Would the government consider modifying Table 22 to allow multiple files in response to L. 5.5.1?	The government acknowledges receipt of your question. Please refer to Response# GR1-09 from the Attachment A3 GR Set 01_08.23.24. The maximum file size for uploaded documents is 100 MB, which will allow for large sized files.
GR4-155	(L.4.1) Proposal Format Table	L.4.1(c)	For each Primary NAICS project submitted, may Offerors bundle all supporting evidence for that project into one PDF file—and include an index to identify those verification documents—as opposed to submitting a separate PDF file for each individual verification component (e.g., FPDS, award form, etc.)?	Per RFP Section L.4.1 (c), if multiple files are to be submitted for a single scoring element, the files should be uploaded and attached individually, not as one combined file. For a collection of Task Orders or BPA Calls combined as a single Primary NAICS Code Relevant Experience Project, as shown in L.4.1 Table 22, each task order's evidence should be combined in a single file and then the collection of Task Order files should be attached to scoring elements within Symphony for the Project. Files should be arranged in this order for each Task Order or BPA Call, when applicable: 1. FPDS-NG, and/or J.P-2, 2. Award Document, 3. J.P-1 or J.P-4, 4. CPAR or J.P-6 or Award Fee Determination Please see Amendment 3, items 20 and 21.
GR4-156	(L.4.1) Proposal Format Table	L.4.1(c)	For each Emerging Technology project submitted, may Offerors bundle all supporting evidence for that project into one PDF file—and include an index to identify those verification documents—as opposed to submitting a separate PDF file for each verification component (e.g., contract award, SOW, etc.)?	The government acknowledges receipt of your question. Please refer to Amendment 3, items 20 and 21.
GR4-157	(L.4.1) Proposal Format Table	L.4.1(c)	If multiple FPDS reports that are required, could we combine multiple FPDS reports into a single combined FPDS report to show all FPDS-related scoring elements for the project?	Yes, multiple FPDS reports can be combined into a single combined FPDS report to show all FPDS-related scoring elements for a project. Also, please refer to Amendment 2, item 54.
GR4-158	(L.4.1) Proposal Format Table	L.4.1(c)	L.4.1 (c) states that if multiple files are to be submitted for a single scoring element, the files should be uploaded and attached individually; however, the Proposal Format Table indicates that, for certifications, the file should be a single file. Certifications require two parts: the verification of the certification and the POC information for the entity providing the certification. Please confirm that these two documents should be combined into a single file and not uploaded in two separate pieces.	Yes, the two parts of certifications, the verification and the POC information for the entity providing the certification, should be combined into a single file and not uploaded as two separate files.
GR4-159	(L.4.1) Proposal Format Table	L.5.2.3.2, L.5.2.4.2	If a project cited for the Primary NAICS Relevant Experience or Emerging Technology Relevant Experience is from a subsidiary identified in the Meaningful Relationship Commitment Letter, please confirm that the MRCL serves as evidence related to a merger, acquisition, novation, or change of name as required by L.3.2.	Per RFP section L.5.1.5, GSA will allow an Offeror to take credit for evaluation elements involving relevant experience, past performance, system(s), certification (s), and facility clearances from a Parent Company, Affiliate, Division, and/or Subsidiary so long as there is a meaningful and operational relationship with the Offeror or CTA member(s), except for MRCLs offered by FAR 9.601(2) OTSB CTA first tier subcontractor members. Per RFP L.3.2, For any claimed evaluation element identifying a different name other than that of the Offeror or identified in the Offeror's Meaningful Relationship Commitment Letter (due to a merger, acquisition, novation, or change-of-name agreement); the Offeror has the burden to establish that the claimed evaluation element should be attributed to the Offeror. To do so, the Offeror must provide evidence of the merger, acquisition, novation, or change-of-name agreement, as well as a justification demonstrating how the evaluation element being claimed is applicable to the Offeror. Furthermore, it is important that source documents maintain the original name of the company awarded the contract, without substitutions. The Government will assess the transferability of credit by reviewing the evidence provided by the Offeror. Please refer to Amendment 3, item 18.
GR4-160	(L.4.1) Proposal Format Table	Table 22	Will the Government please confirm that Offerors will not become ineligible for award as long as the file names closely resemble the instructions in section L.4.1 (Proposal Format Table), the last column of table 22 (Proposal Format Table)?	The Symphony Application requires that the Offeror attach the evidence files to each scoring element for validation. The placement of periods in filenames would not result in an Offeror being ineligible for award.

Alliant 3 Government Responses to Request For Proposal (RFP) Feedback GR Set 04_11.08.24

Response #	RFP Paragraph Reference	Specific RFP Location	Comment/Question	Government Response
GR4-161	(L.4.1) Proposal Format Table	Table 22 RFP Ref 5.7.1	Section L.5.7.1 Public Disclosure of Scope 1 or 2 or 3 Greenhouse Gas (GHG) Emissions defines the criteria Offerors must meet in order to qualify for Sustainability Related points. Row 35 of the Proposal Format Table in Section L.4.1 indicates Offerors are to submit a PDF. Will the Government please confirm that a copy of the Offeror's Greenhouse Gas Emissions Public Disclosure is all that is required in the PDF?	Per RFP Section L.5.7.1, The Offeror must provide a self-attestation that the Scope 3 GHG emissions were calculated in accordance with the GHG Protocol Corporate Accounting and Reporting Standard. If claiming credit for this disclosure, the Offeror shall provide the location(s) (Internet URL(s)) where its Scope 1 or 2 or 3 GHG emissions are publicly disclosed. Offerors may utilize third-party sustainability reporting portals (e.g., Carbon Disclosure Project, https://www.cdp.net/en) or its own website. The Offeror must provide a self-attestation that the reported GHG emissions were calculated in accordance with the GHG Protocol Corporate Accounting and Reporting Standard (https://www.ghgprotocol.org/corporate-standard) and/or GHG Protocol Corporate Value Chain (Scope 3) Accounting and Reporting Standard (https://ghgprotocol.org/sites/default/files/standards/Corporate-Value-Chain-Accounting-Reporting-Standard_041613_2.pdf), as relevant based on the scopes reported.
GR4-162	(L.4.1) Proposal Format Table	Table 22 RFP Ref L. 5.1.1	Row 1 of the Proposal Format Table in Section L.4.1 indicates an SF-30 is required if more than four amendments are issued. Will the Government please clarify if Offerors are to submit only the last SF-30 from the last amendment issued - or - if they are to submit all signed SF-30s for all amendments? Also, Will the Government please clarify the file naming rules if more than one SF30 is required?	Per RFP Section L.5.1.1 (b) an Offeror may acknowledge up to four official amendments on the SF-33 form. However, if exceeding four amendments the Offeror must submit a signed SF-30 for each amendment above four. It is also acceptable for the Offeror to sign any and all SF-30 amendments issued via Block 14 on the SF-33.
GR4-163	(L.4.1) Proposal Format Table	Table 22 RFP Ref L. 5.1.10	The row showing L.5.1.10 Organizational Conflict of Interest inside the Proposal Format table also references L.5.6 underneath. The Offeror believes the reference to paragraph L.5.6 should be removed as L.5.6 has to do with ORA not OCI.	The government acknowledges receipt of your question. Please refer to Amendment 3, item 23.
GR4-164	(L.4.1) Proposal Format Table	Table 22 RFP Ref L. 5.1.3	Table 22 (L.5.1.3) (Other than Small Business ONLY) Individual Small Business Subcontracting Plan requires a PDF file format. The instructions in the J.P-9 state that the model is not a fill-in-the-blank template, yet Section L. paragraph L.5.1.3 states, "If an Offeror chooses to use the Attachment J.P-9, A3 Model Individual Subcontracting Plan, the Offeror must adapt the model to fit their situation. "Can the Government clarify whether the J.P-9 Model Individual Subcontracting Plan Template, once filled in with our specific goals, is acceptable for submission or shall bidders submit a written plan?"	The government acknowledges receipt of your question. Please refer to Response# GR1 -04 from the Attachment A3 GR Set 01_08.23.24.
GR4-165	(L.4.1) Proposal Format Table	Table 22 RFP Ref L. 5.1.4 Alt	Row 4 of the Proposal Format Table in Section L.4.1 indicates there are two options for small business CTAs: SBJVNameSBJV.pdf or OfferName.CTA.pdf and OfferName.SubcontractorNameLOC.pdf. Will the Government please confirm that the Prime Offeror for SBSUBs are to submit the required material using the "OfferName.CTA.pdf" file name and each subcontractor is to submit their required material using the "OfferName.CTA.pdf" file name?	The Prime Offeror for SBSUBs is to submit the required material using the "OfferName.CTA.pdf" or SBJVNameSBJV.pdf file name and each subcontractor is to submit their required material using the "OfferName.SubcontractorNameLOC.pdf" file name.
GR4-166	(L.4.1) Proposal Format Table	Table 22 RFP Ref L. 5.1.5	The Proposal Format Table seems to be in conflict with L.5.1.5, where it appears that the Government requires an entity that has a parent company with complete and full control only requires one MRCL in those circumstances. Can the Government please confirm that in the cases where the Parent Company has complete and full control over the meaningful relationship entities, that only one MRCL is required. Can the Government also please revise the Proposal Format Table to be consistent with L.5.1.5?	Per RFP Section L.5.1.5, In the event that a parent organization has complete and full control over all meaningful relationship entities, the parent entity, as the Offeror, may prepare a single Meaningful Relationship Commitment Letter that identifies all elements required above. The parent entity, as the Offeror, may use the file name OfferName.MRCL1.pdf, as listed in RFP Section L.4.1, Proposal Format Table.
GR4-167	(L.4.1) Proposal Format Table	Table 22 RFP Ref L. 5.1.6 and L.5.1.7	This section cites multiple plans such as L.5.1.6 Professional Employee Compensation Plan and L.5.1.7 Uncompensated Overtime Policy. Please confirm an Offeror who is a Joint Venture is to submit a single plan for the JV.	The government acknowledges receipt of your question. Please review to GR01-15 which was released on 8/23/24.
GR4-168	(L.4.1) Proposal Format Table	Table 22 RFP Ref L. 5.1.8	Please clarify which instructions an offeror is to follow, upload the extracted and completed Section K as a PDF, and/or completed SAM.gov reps and certs. Currently, Symphony only allows for an Offeror to upload file(s) in this tab.	The government acknowledges receipt of your question. Please refer to Amendment 3, item 17.
GR4-169	(L.4.1) Proposal Format Table	Table 22 RFP Ref L. 5.1.9	Will the Government please clarify where on the J.P-16 Self Scoring Sheet Offerors are to record their Contractor C-SCRM Responsibility Assessment? Is it in Row 9, Row 189, or both Rows 9 and 189?	The government acknowledges receipt of your question. The government acknowledges receipt of your question. Please refer to Amendment 2, item 7 and 10. Per RFP Section L.5.1.2, Attachment J.P-16, titled, "A3 Self-Scoring Worksheet" is provided to assist Offerors in determining their scoring before completing their proposal. J.P-16 is not to be submitted with the offer.
GR4-170	(L.4.1) Proposal Format Table	Table 22 RFP Ref L. 5.2.3.2	Will the Government please confirm that OfferName.NAICS1of7.SOW.pdf is an appropriate sample file name for verifying submission documents in accordance with L.5.2.3.2?	The government acknowledges receipt of your question. Please refer to Amendment 3, item 25.
GR4-171	(L.4.1) Proposal Format Table	Table 22 RFP Ref L. 5.2.3.6	Please clarify if Section L.4.1 (Proposal Format Table) table 22 (Proposal Format Table) for L.5.2.3.6 (Primary NAICS Code Relevant Experience Project in a Foreign Location (Federal Projects Only)) should include an Award Form (OfferName.NAICS1of7.Award.pdf) and an SOW or PWS (OfferName.NAICS1of7.SOW.pdf) as supporting documentation.	RFP Section L.5.2.3.6 Primary NAICS Code Relevant Experience Project in a Foreign Location (Federal Projects Only) lists required documents. The Offeror must provide an FPDS-NG report that indicates the principal place of performance location was a foreign location. If the FPDS-NG report indicates that the principal place of performance was not a foreign location, then the Offeror must provide Attachment J.P-2 signed by the Cognizant Government Official and 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. See Amendment 3 items 30, 31 and 32.
GR4-172	(L.4.1) Proposal Format Table	Table 22 RFP Ref L. 5.2.3.6	The Table format should designate file name example for a projects PWS to verify foreign location specifically if the FPDS report does not verify a foreign location, i.e. OfferName.NAICS1of7.PWS/SOW.pdf?	The government acknowledges receipt of your question. Please refer to Amendment 3, item 32. The amendment item changes the name convention from SOW to SOW-PWS. Offerors may use the following: OfferName.NAICS1of7SOW-PWS.pdf, OfferName.NAICS1of7SOW.pdf, or OfferName.NAICS1of7PWS.pdf
GR4-173	(L.4.1) Proposal Format Table	Table 22 RFP Ref L. 5.2.4.2	Attachment J.P-1 is not included as a verification document for Emerging Technology REPs. Can the Government please update the Table 22 and Section L.5.2.4.2 to include the submission of a J.P-1 for an Emerging Technology REP awarded to an existing JV?	Per Table 22 in RFP Section L.4.1 Proposal Format Table, the row for L.5.2.4.2 states the following: "5. J.P-1 Template and CTA agreement, if applicable." under the Column titled "Document". Offerors are required to submit the MRCL and relationship information in Symphony. The Symphony configuration allows the offeror to identify all entities and UELs for which they will be claiming evidence and identify each evaluation element with the MRCL or relationship information or entity for that element, when applicable. Once a file or document is uploaded in Symphony the Offeror can access and use that file that corresponds with other elements in their proposal. For related information concerning J.P-1, please see Amendment 3, items 47, 51, 52, 53, 55, 61, 63, 69, and 75
GR4-174	(L.4.1) Proposal Format Table	Table 22 RFP Ref L.5.3	For RFP Section L.5.3, the Proposal Format Table states that the Relevant Experience Project Past Performance filenames "shall remain the same as the submission for L.5.2.3.1 or L.5.2.3.2." However, the sample filenames provided by the Government are different from the sample filenames provided for L.5.2.3.1 and L.5.2.3.2 since they contain the word "CPAR" or "J.P-6". Please confirm that Offerors should use the sample file names provided for RFP Section L.5.3.	The government acknowledges receipt of your question. Please refer to Amendment 2, items 34 and 35.
GR4-175	(L.4.1) Proposal Format Table	Table 22 RFP Ref L.5.3	In Table 22 Proposal Format Table in RFP section L.4.1, row L.5.3 Past Performance for Relevant Experience Projects states "Filename shall remain the same as the submission for L.5.2.3.1 or L.5.2.3.2." This statement seems incorrect, as the Past Performance will be a separate file not submitted in relation to L.5.2.3.1 or L.5.2.3.2. Can the Government correct the sentence to state "NAICS X of 7 in filename shall remain the same as the NAICS X of 7 numbering in the file submissions for L.5.2.3.1 or L.5.2.3.2."?	The CPARS or attachment J.P-6 is required for upload as project evidence as listed in L.5.2.3.1 or L.5.2.3.2. Symphony allows uploaded files to be reused and attached to multiple scoring elements. See Symphony FAQ, Assembling a Proposal: https://industry.support.apexlogic.com/support/solutions/articles/35000213703-assembling-a-proposal .

Alliant 3 Government Responses to Request For Proposal (RFP) Feedback GR Set 04_11.08.24

Response #	RFP Paragraph Reference	Specific RFP Location	Comment/Question	Government Response
GR4-176	(L.4.1) Proposal Format Table	Table 22 RFP Ref L. 5.3.3, L.5.3	The file formats for Sections L.5.3.3 and L.5.3 are exactly the same and will result in duplicate file names. We request a clarification on this. We believe the convention for the Negative Past Performance Narrative should be something like "NAICS1of7.NPPN" instead of "NAICS1of7.CPAR."	The government acknowledges receipt of your question. Please refer to Amendment 3, item 36.
GR4-177	(L.4.1) Proposal Format Table	Table 22 RFP Ref L. 5.5.2, L.5.1.9	Please clarify that the Offeror is to submit and reference (in Symphony) the same document in response to Cybersecurity Supply Chain Risk Management (C-SCRM) sections L.5.5.2 and L.5.1.9.	The Offeror is to submit and reference (in Symphony) attachment J.P-11, A3 C-SCRM Responsibility Questionnaire, in response to Cybersecurity Supply Chain Risk Management (C-SCRM) sections L.5.5.2 and L.5.1.9.
GR4-178	(L.4.1) Proposal Format Table	Table 22 RFP Ref L. 5.5.2, L.5.1.9	Table 22 (L.5.5.2 and L.5.1.9) Cybersecurity Supply Chain Risk Management (C-SCRM) shows that J.P-11 Excel format sample name is OfferorName.C-SCRM.RA.xls. Can you confirm that *.xlsx files are acceptable?	Attachment J.P-11, C-SCRM was converted to a PDF via Amendment 2, Item 7.
GR4-179	(L.4.1) Proposal Format Table	Table 22 RFP Section L.5.2.3.6	For Primary NAICS Code Relevant Experience - Project in a Foreign Location (Federal Government Contracts Only), can an offeror submit an Attachment J.P-1 CTA document to verify foreign location using a previous/existing CTA project?	An offeror must submit an Attachment J.P-1 CTA document to verify foreign location using a previous/existing CTA project, for Primary NAICS Code Relevant Experience - Project in a Foreign Location (Federal Government Contracts Only). In addition, L.5.2.3.6 requires that the Offeror must provide an FPDS-NG report that indicates the principal place of performance location was a foreign location. If the FPDS-NG report indicates that the principal place of performance was not a foreign location, then the Offeror must provide Attachment J.P-2 signed by the Cognizant Government Official and 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.
GR4-180	(L.4.1) Proposal Format Table	Table 22 RFP Section L.5.2.4.4	In the L.5.2.4.4 row, and the Sample File Name ... column, what is the significance of the number "1" following "SBE" and preceding ".1 of 5" in the sample file names? Is it intended to identify the relevant Emerging Technology (1-11)?	The government acknowledges receipt of your question. Please refer to Amendment 2, item 42. The numbering convention has been updated. In regards to the 1 preceding the ".1 of 5" in the sample filename (OfferorName.SBE1.1of 5.J.P-5.pdf), the bolded 1 reflects the tracking identifier for each engagement (for example 1st engagement submission would be .SBE1, and the 2nd engagement submission would be .SBE2, etc.). It is a way to reference the engagement submissions in sequence.
GR4-181	(L.4.1) Proposal Format Table	Table 22 RFP Section L.5.6; Symphony	The row for L.5.6 indicates that "If an Offeror is an established individual company, NO FILES NEED TO BE SUBMITTED to receive the Organizational Risk Assessment points." Is there a mechanism in Symphony for an Offeror to indicate they are not required to submit any files for Organizational Risk Assessment?	Symphony will grant points to an individual company Offeror that claims ORA as a Performance Factor on their Primary REP. The system will not force the individual company Offeror to upload additional documents. An Offeror's scorecard and review screens in Symphony will display a non-compliance warning if the Offeror has a CTA member but doesn't provide evidence for ORA points.
GR4-182	(L.5) Proposal Content	General Comment	For L.5, is any writing required as a proposal response? Or is it sufficient to upload all attachments in the Symphony portal?	The government appreciates your feedback. After a careful review and analysis of your question or comment, we believe the RFP is well-defined in this area and supportive of a competitive proposal.
GR4-183	(L.5) Proposal Content	L.5	Section L.5, Areas a through f identify contract award document types. Since companies may not want to share their contract award documentation with their subcontractors, will the Government please consider allowing Offerors to instead use FPDS reports as evidence for the Prime contract when submitting a subcontract as a relevant experience project?	Yes, an FPDS report is the primary document that is used to provide evidence for Verification of Primary NAICS Code Relevant Experience and attachment J.P-4 Subcontractor Experience Project Template. If the FPDS-NG Report is not available or the FPDS-NG Report does not substantiate all claimed scoring elements please see Section L.5.2.3.1.
GR4-184	(L.5) Proposal Content	L.5	Will the Government please confirm that offerors who performed as a first-tier subcontractor are required to submit at least one contract award cover page based on the options provided in section L.5, areas a through f?	Per RFP Section L.5.1 "When an Offeror submits a prior experience proposal under which they performed as a First-Tier subcontractor, the Offeror will be required to submit both the evidence for the Prime Contract (evaluation element under Section L.5, Areas a through f), as well as the A3 Subcontractor Experience Project Template (Attachment J.P-4)."
GR4-185	(L.5) Proposal Content	L.5	Section L.5 states "When an Offeror submits a prior experience proposal under which they performed as a First Tier subcontractor, the Offeror will be required to submit both the evidence for the Prime Contract... as well as the A3 Subcontractor Experience Project Template." Because subcontractors do not have privity of contract on the Prime contract and therefore do not have the Prime contract documentation or ability to talk to the Prime contract CO/COR, we request the removal of the Prime contract evidence when experience is performed as a First Tier subcontractor.	The government appreciates your feedback. After a careful review and analysis of your question or comment, we believe the RFP is well-defined in this area and supportive of a competitive proposal.
GR4-186	(L.5) Proposal Content	L.5, L.5.2.1	The RFP states that "except for allowances provided in Sections L. 5.1.4.1 and L.5.1.5, all projects and Past Performance submitted in response to this solicitation shall have been performed as a Prime Contractor or First-Tier Subcontractor." Please confirm that "Subcontractor" means "any supplier, distributor, vendor, or firm that furnishes supplies or services to or for a prime contractor" in accordance with FAR 44.101, whether or not the agreement between the parties is labeled as a "subcontract."	Per FAR 44.101, Definitions, Subcontract means any contract as defined in subpart 2.1 entered into by a subcontractor to furnish supplies or services for performance of a prime contract or a subcontract. It includes but is not limited to purchase orders, and changes and modifications to purchase orders. This must be a written, formal agreement that is a mutually binding legal relationship obligating the seller to furnish the supplies or services (including construction) and the buyer to pay for them. Per RFP Section L.5.2.1 towards the bottom of the section: For relevant experience, work performed as a "Subcontractor" means the Contractor does not have privity-of-contract with the end-user but has privity-of-contract with the Prime Contractor or another Subcontractor. While a project performed as a subcontractor will likely be part of a larger project, only the work identified in the specific subcontract may be utilized for scoring as a Relevant Experience Project.
GR4-187	(L.5) Proposal Content	L.5.2.3, L.5.2.4	If a subcontractor company is part of multiple submissions under different primes, can the subcontractor utilize a given project reference on more than one of those submissions for use as Primary Relevant NAICS and/or ET experience?	A prime Offeror can claim the relevant Primary NAICS code and emerging technology experience on projects performed by a subcontractor. A subcontractor can use the relevant Primary NAICS code and emerging technology experience they performed under a contract regardless if it is used in another proposal by a different prime Offeror. The subcontractor can only claim credit for the work they performed under the relevant Primary NAICS code and emerging technology project.
GR4-188	(L.5) Proposal Content	L.5.2.4.4	Please confirm that a completed and signed Attachment J.P-5 is the only verification documentation an Offeror is to submit to claim the Small Business Emerging Technology Solutions Engagement point(s).	The government acknowledges receipt of your question. Please refer to Amendment 2, items 66 & 67.
GR4-189	(L.5.1) General	L.5.1.1	Is it the Government's intent that Alliant 3 will not have a Small Business set-aside award category? As a successful, former Alliant SB Prime contractor, we recommend the Government set-aside specific award categories for small businesses to compete on this contract.	Alliant 3 is an unrestricted vehicle. It does not provide a set-aside or a reserve opportunity for small business.
GR4-190	(L.5.1) General	L.5.1.1	Symphony only allows for one start date and end date per project. What Period of Performance Start Date and End Date should we use for Collection of Task Orders in Symphony?	The government acknowledges receipt of your question. Please refer to Amendment 2, item 53.
GR4-191	(L.5.1) General	L.5.1.1	If more than four SF 30 forms are required, should each one be uploaded separately, or should they be combined into one SF30 file?	If more than four SF 30 forms are required, the offeror has the option to upload them separately into Symphony or combine into one PDF file.
GR4-192	(L.5.1) General	L.5.1.2(a) & (c)	In (a) it states that the J.P-16 is not submitted with the offer, however in (c) it states "The scoring in the Symphony application will take precedence should there be any scoring difference between the J.P-16, A3 Self Scoring Worksheet and the symphony application scoring". How can there be comparison if J.P-16 is not submitted?	Per RFP Section L.5.1.2(a), attachment J.P-16, A3 Self-Scoring Worksheet is provided to assist Offerors estimate their scoring before completing their proposal. J.P-16 will not be submitted to the government as part of the RFP response, is not compared in Symphony, and is not provided for the use of anyone other than the Offeror.
GR4-193	(L.5.1.1) Standard Form (SF) 33 and SF-30 for Amendments	L.5.1.1	L.5.1.1 states, "Offeror means an official legal offering entity with a single registered UEI number in SAM.gov that corresponds solely to the Offeror." Legal offering entities with multiple corporate office locations will possess multiple UEI numbers in SAM. Will the Government please confirm that offerors may submit award elements with different associated UEI numbers as long as they all belong to one legal offering entity?	Yes, offerors may submit award elements with different associated UEI numbers as long as they all belong to one legal offering entity. Symphony will allow an Offeror to identify all entities and UEIs associated with a MRCL to support their claimed score for each evaluation element, when applicable.
GR4-194	(L.5.1.1) Standard Form (SF) 33 and SF-30 for Amendments	L.5.1.1	Can we be a part of multiple Joint Venture CTAs?	Per RFP Section L.5.1.1, "Offeror" means an official legal offering entity with a single registered UEI Number in SAM.gov (https://www.SAM.gov), that corresponds solely to the Offeror. An Offeror must ensure that only one proposal is submitted in response to this solicitation. Offerors shall not submit multiple offers under their own entity, an affiliated entity, or via an offer in which they are participating through a Contractor Teaming Arrangement (CTA).

Alliant 3 Government Responses to Request For Proposal (RFP) Feedback GR Set 04_11.08.24

Response #	RFP Paragraph Reference	Specific RFP Location	Comment/Question	Government Response
GR4-195	(L.5.1.1) Standard Form (SF) 33 and SF-30 for Amendments	L.5.1.1	The RFP indicates that proposals can be submitted from entities with "a single registered UEI number in SAM.gov" As a result of a recent name change and headquarters relocation, some of our supporting documents are associated with previous name and/or a secondary UEI number. What documentation would suffice to demonstrate these existing relationships?	Offerors are required to submit mergers, acquisitions, novations, name-change agreements, and MRCI information in Symphony. Symphony allows the Offeror to select the associated entities and UEIs to an evaluation element to claim points, when applicable. Once a file or document is uploaded in Symphony the Offeror can use the file that corresponds with the elements in their proposal.
GR4-196	(L.5.1.1) Standard Form (SF) 33 and SF-30 for Amendments	L.5.1.1	Section L.5.1.1 states only one proposal may be submitted under its own entity, an affiliated entity, or a CTA. Please confirm this excludes a Mentor Protege Agreement (MPA) Joint Venture (JV) Submission.	A Mentor Protege Joint Venture Offeror is considered a single Offeror. Section L.5.1.1 states, "an Offeror must ensure that only one proposal is submitted in response to this solicitation. Offerors shall not submit multiple offers under their own entity, an affiliated entity, or via an offer in which they are participating through a Contractor Teaming Arrangement (CTA)." A CTA includes an MPJV.
GR4-197	(L.5.1.1) Standard Form (SF) 33 and SF-30 for Amendments	L.5.1.1(c) under "Small Business (SB) Offerors"	Can an (L.5.1.1.c) Other Than Small Business (OTSB) offeror and its proposed First-Tier Subcontractor Team use various subcontractors to meet the Emerging Technology (L.5.2.4) contract needs to earn points? Example: "ABC CTA" (offeror) has company "XYZ" submit a Contract reference to satisfy ET1, Artificial Intelligence. "XYZ" contract meets all the criteria for ET Para 1.5.2.4.1. Will that count towards ABC CTA's points? The solicitation paragraph above is only referring to the CTA itself not subcontractor team members, correct?	Per RFP Section L.5.2 Relevant Experience is divided into two separate categories. Primary NAICS Code Projects and Emerging Technology Projects. Per RFP Section L.5.1.4, Other than small business (OTSB) primes with first-tier subcontractors must use the OTSB Offeror's UEI number and will not be allowed to use the relevant experience, past performance, systems, certifications, and clearances of the First-Tier subcontractors for their proposal submission.
GR4-198	(L.5.1.1) Standard Form (SF) 33 and SF-30 for Amendments	L.5.1.1(c) under "Small Business (SB) Offerors"	Can a (L.5.1.1.c) Small Business (SB) offeror and its proposed First-Tier Subcontractor Team use multiple subcontractors to meet the Emerging Technology (L.5.2.4) contract needs to earn points? Example SB Prime "A" has company "B" and company "C" join the bid to submit an Emerging Technology project. Company "B" also provides the project to another offeror for another bid, is that allowed? Will both Offerors be able to use the project? If not, would both offerors be disqualified?	RFP Section L.5.1.1 an Offeror must ensure that only one proposal is submitted in response to this solicitation. Offerors shall not submit multiple offers under their own entity, an affiliated entity, or via an offer in which they are participating through a Contractor Teaming Arrangement (CTA). The one proposal offered must represent the sole response from the Offeror and all of its affiliated entities (either as a singular Offeror or CTA member). Submission of more than one proposal from any Offeror or affiliate will require the Highest-Level Parent Company, or if a CTA the managing shareholder, to select one proposal for submission and withdraw all other proposals. A Highest-Level Parent Company is defined as the ultimate controlling company within a corporate structure.
GR4-199	(L.5.1.3) Individual Small Business Subcontracting Plan (Required for Other than Small Business Offerors)	J.P-9, L.5.1.3	Is there a plug value that may be used to calculate total subcontracted dollars, or can Offerors alternately use the heading "Sample Dollars"?	GSA expects the Offeror's small business subcontracting plan to be compliant with FAR Clause 52.219-9. The Offeror's Subcontracting Plan should only contain realistic goals that are attainable to the Offeror's individual circumstances. This includes the Total Contract Value and Total Planned Subcontracted Dollars. Below is historical information from Alliant 2's completed task orders for a six year period: 1. An average of 67.33 completed task orders per contract year. 2. The average value of completed task orders was \$143.7M For more information on Alliant 2 historical sales data and trends please see: https://d2d.gsa.gov/report/gsa-fas-gwac-sales-dashboard
GR4-200	(L.5.1.3) Individual Small Business Subcontracting Plan (Required for Other than Small Business Offerors)	L.5.1.3	Please clarify if for the small business goal subcontractors are required to be certified by SBA, or if the state / city / self-certification by SBA size standard is sufficient.	The Small Business Administration (SBA) is the authoritative entity for determining size standards for federal contracts, including those under GSA Government-Wide Acquisition Contracts (GWACs). While a firm may qualify as a small business under state or local programs, it is the SBA's size and certification standards that govern eligibility for federal contracts. Therefore, to participate as a small business under a GSA GWAC, firms must meet the size standards as defined and certified by the SBA. Compliance with SBA standards is mandatory, and these standards take precedence over any other local or state size classifications. for more information visit https://www.sba.gov/partners/contracting-officials/small-business-procurement/small-business-size-standards or contact your local SBA contacts.
GR4-201	(L.5.1.3) Individual Small Business Subcontracting Plan (Required for Other than Small Business Offerors)	L.5.1.3	To complete the Small Business Subcontracting Plan, an Offeror must estimate the value of the work it would win and perform under Alliant 3 without any knowledge of the task orders to be competed and their values. Will GSA confirm that offerors will be expected to meet the percentage goals stated in its plan but not the dollar value goals?	GSA expects the Offeror's small business subcontracting plan to be compliant with FAR Clause 52.219-9. The Offeror's Subcontracting Plan should only contain realistic goals that are attainable to the Offeror's individual circumstances. This includes the Total Contract Value and Total Planned Subcontracted Dollars. Below is historical information from Alliant 2's completed task orders for a six year period: 1. An average of 67.33 completed task orders per contract year. 2. The average value of completed task orders was \$143.7M For more information on Alliant 2 historical sales data and trends please see: https://d2d.gsa.gov/report/gsa-fas-gwac-sales-dashboard
GR4-202	(L.5.1.3) Individual Small Business Subcontracting Plan (Required for Other than Small Business Offerors)	L.5.1.3	May an Offeror submit a small business subcontracting plan that has been approved by GSA elsewhere (e.g., MAS or 2GIT) in lieu of negotiating a new plan with GSA for purposes of Alliant 3?	No. The Offeror shall submit a single Individual Subcontracting Plan that applies to the Alliant 3 GWAC.
GR4-203	(L.5.1.3) Individual Small Business Subcontracting Plan (Required for Other than Small Business Offerors)	L.5.1.3	Instead of an Individual Subcontracting Plan, may Offerors submit their current Commercial Subcontracting Plan in accordance with FAR Clause 52.219-9?	No, a Commercial Subcontracting Plan is not acceptable. Per RFP Section L.5.1.3, The Offeror shall submit a single Individual Subcontracting Plan that applies to the Alliant 3 GWAC program as a whole. Commercial and Master Subcontracting Plans will not be accepted.
GR4-204	(L.5.1.4) Existing Contractor Teaming Arrangement, if Applicable	L.5.1.4	In an OTSB CTA, can a Prime contractor use relevant experience, past performance, systems, certifications, and clearances from any member of the arrangement?	An Other Than Small Business (OTSB) Contractor Teaming Arrangement (CTA) may use the relevant experience, past performance, systems, certifications, and clearances from any member of the arrangement with the exception of OTSB CTA with first-tier subcontractors. Per RFP Section L.5.1.4, an OTSB with First-Tier Subcontractors must use the OTSB Offeror's UEI number and will not be allowed to use the relevant experience, past performance, systems, certifications, and clearances of the First-Tier subcontractors for their proposal submission.
GR4-205	(L.5.1.4) Existing Contractor Teaming Arrangement, if Applicable	L.5.1.4	Will the government clarify what the latest date a CTA must have been established to be considered "existing" in the context of this paragraph?	The criteria for an existing CTA are listed in L.5.1.4, second paragraph. Please note there is not a specific date, rather, criteria which must be met to show evidence that the CTA is existing.
GR4-206	(L.5.1.4) Existing Contractor Teaming Arrangement, if Applicable	L.5.1.4	Does a CTA entity, as it relates to this paragraph, only refer to those arrangements that are existing Joint Ventures?	No, RFP Section L.5.1.4 does not solely refer to Contract Team Arrangements that are existing Joint Ventures.
GR4-207	(L.5.1.4) Existing Contractor Teaming Arrangement, if Applicable	L.5.1.4	If "ABCD CTA" is comprised of "AB" and "CD" and has a single UEI, it is our understanding that of the seven contracts submitted as relevant experience four projects could come from company "AB" and three from company "CD", is this accurate? Further, "ABCD CTA" uses company "XYZ" for emerging technology points, but "XYZ" is not a member of the "ABCD CTA" is this allowed?	The Government appreciates your question. Upon review, we found that the information provided does not contain sufficient detail to enable us to deliver a thorough and accurate response.
GR4-208	(L.5.1.4) Existing Contractor Teaming Arrangement, if Applicable	L.5.1.4	The definition of an existing CTA includes "a potential prime contractor agrees with one or more other companies to have them as its subcontractor." For an Other Than Small Business Prime Offeror that has only recently teamed with subcontractors for Emerging Technology experience, does this also define a CTA and require all items under L.5.1.4 (a-h)?	Per RFP Section L.5.1.4 Other Than Small Business (OTSB) Offeror with First-Tier subcontractors must use the OTSB Offeror's UEI number and will not be allowed to use the relevant experience, past performance, systems, certifications, and clearances of the First-Tier subcontractors for their proposal submission. Conditions L.5.1.4(b) through (h) do not apply to OTSB CTA subcontractors.
GR4-209	(L.5.1.4) Existing Contractor Teaming Arrangement, if Applicable	L.5.1.4	Is it possible to bid as a Prime-Sub arrangement for this opportunity instead of a joint venture arrangement?	Yes, please refer to RFP Section L.5.1.1 for more information.
GR4-210	(L.5.1.4) Existing Contractor Teaming Arrangement, if Applicable	L.5.1.4(e)	L.5.1.4 (e) states: "Offerors submitting as a CTA must provide evidence of a system, certification, or clearance being in the name of the CTA or in the name of an individual member of the CTA." Recommend this be revised as follows: "Offerors submitting as a CTA must provide evidence of a system, certification, or clearance being in the name of the CTA".	The government appreciates your feedback. After a careful review and analysis of your question or comment, we believe the RFP is well-defined in this area and supportive of a competitive proposal.
GR4-211	(L.5.1.4-Alt.) Small Business Contractor Teaming Arrangements, If Applicable	L.5.1.4-Alt	Does Alliant 3 offer small business or disadvantaged company (i.e., WOB, 8A etc) set-aside opportunities?	Alliant 3 is an unrestricted vehicle. It does not provide a set-aside for small business.

Alliant 3 Government Responses to Request For Proposal (RFP) Feedback GR Set 04_11.08.24

Response #	RFP Paragraph Reference	Specific RFP Location	Comment/Question	Government Response
GR4-212	(L.5.1.4-Alt.) Small Business Contractor Teaming Arrangements, If Applicable	L.5.1.4.3-Alt	This section refers to SB Mentor-Protégé Contracting Teaming Arrangements. Please confirm this section applies to SB Mentor-Protégé Joint Ventures as a form of CTA.	Yes, RFP section L.5.1.4.3-Alt. applies to SB Mentor-Protégé Joint Ventures as a form of Contracting Teaming Arrangements (CTA).
GR4-213	(L.5.1.4.1) Claiming Relevant Experience from an Existing or Previous CTA	J.P-1	L.5.1.4 specifies certain types of CTAs that are allowable as OTSB OFFERORS. L.5.1.4.1 separately discusses use of a contract from a previous CTA (not the offeror) as a REP. For claiming relevant experience where the offeror performed as a member of a previous CTA, please confirm that the restrictions on type of CTA discussed in L.5.1.4 (i.e. allowable offerors) do not apply to L.5.1.4.1 (i.e. instructions for use of previous CTA order as a REP), specifically that a previous task order awarded to a GSA FSS CTA is allowable as a previous CTA REP. Previous GSA FSS CTA task orders are very common and industry needs clarity on which forms/instructions to use for this type of REP.	A previous task order awarded to a GSA FSS CTA is allowable as a Relevant Experience from an Existing or Previous CTA (L.5.1.4.1). The Offeror shall use the A3 Contractor Teaming Arrangement (CTA) Template (Attachment J.P-1) for each Relevant Experience Project that was performed under an existing or previous CTA. Please also see Amendment 3, items 47, 51, 52, 53, 55, 61, 63, 69, and 75
GR4-214	(L.5.1.4.1) Claiming Relevant Experience from an Existing or Previous CTA	L.5.1.4.1	The GAO has said that an agency may, for purposes of evaluating past performance, consider a project performed as a participant in a joint venture (JV) if the offeror had a sufficient role in the joint venture to make the performance relevant (see Amentum Servs., Inc., B-421183, et al., Jan. 17, 2023, 2023 CPD 24). Since past performance is an "indicator of an offeror's ability to perform the contract successfully" per FAR 15.305(a)(2), and many small and mid-size companies have developed significant and relevant experience and capabilities demonstrating the ability to perform contracts successfully as JV participants, we recommend the Government, in congruence with the GAO's ruling, allow the Mentor of an SBA-approved Mentor-Protégé Joint Venture be able to claim 100% of the credit for that past performance if they had a sufficient role in performance as long as the Protégé is not submitting a proposal for Alliant 3.	An offeror may claim the demonstrated experience gained from their performance on a project as a member of a Joint Venture (including Mentor-Protégé Joint Ventures). The Offeror shall use the A3 Contractor Teaming Arrangement (CTA) Template (Attachment J.P-1) for each Relevant Experience Project that was performed under an existing or previous CTA, per RFP Section L.5.1.4.1 Claiming Relevant Experience from an Existing or Previous CTA.
GR4-215	(L.5.1.4.3 -Alt) Small Business Mentor-Protégé CTAs, If Applicable	L.5.1.4.3-Alt	Please confirm that a Small Business Mentor-Protégé (SBMP) Offeror may also use First Tier Small Business Subcontractors to meet the Primary NAICS Code Relevant Experience Requirement in L.5.2.2 and the Emerging Technology Relevant Experience in L.5.2.4.	A Small Business Mentor-Protégé (SBMP) may choose to offer as an SBMP with a First-Tier Small Business Subcontractor. This arrangement allows the SBMP to leverage the work performed by its First-Tier Small Business Subcontractor to satisfy the Primary NAICS Code Relevant Experience Requirement outlined in Section L.5.2.2, as well as the Emerging Technology Relevant Experience in Section L.5.2.4. However, a SBMP with First-Tier Small Business Subcontractors are subject to FAR Clause 52.207-6, 13 CFR § 125.9 and/or 13 CFR § 125.10, 13 CFR 125.3 (b), and all aspects of such arrangements, including CTAs and MRCLs, must comply with the applicable regulations at 13 CFR Part 121 per RFP Sections L.5.1.4-Alt and L.5.1.5. Further, Organizational Risk Assessment (ORA) points will only be granted if the SBMP with First-Tier Subcontractor members have performed exclusively together on the relevant projects, as specified in the RFP Section L.5.6 Organizational Risk Assessment.
GR4-216	(L.5.1.4.3 -Alt) Small Business Mentor-Protégé CTAs, If Applicable	L.5.1.4.3-Alt	If the Mentor and Protégé is in a Joint Venture (as a MPA JV) is the Joint Venture Operating Agreement also required to be submitted along with the Mentor Protege Agreement?	A Mentor-Protégé Joint Venture (MPJV) offeror is required to submit documentation that captures the requirements outlined in FAR Clause 52.207-6 and 13 CFR § 125.9 and/or 13 CFR § 125.10. If the MPJV is submitting as a Small Business Joint Venture (SBJV), it must also provide documentation that demonstrates compliance with the definition and requirements of a Joint Venture under 13 CFR § 125.8. This may include the joint venture operating details to ensure adherence to small business regulations.
GR4-217	(L.5.1.5) Meaningful Relationship Commitment Letters, If Applicable	L.5.1.5	Please clarify if an Offeror may submit one file to contain all applicable documentation to support MRCL requirements for all wholly owned subsidiaries that might be referenced as the contractor in FPDS and contract award documents provided for Relevant Experience projects—along with an index to clearly and specifically identify each applicable proposal element with a meaningful relationship.	Offerors are required to submit mergers, acquisitions, novations, name-change agreements, and MRCL information in Symphony. Symphony allows the Offeror to select the associated entities and UELs to an evaluation element to claim points, when applicable. Once a file or document is uploaded in Symphony the Offeror can use the file that corresponds with the elements in their proposal.
GR4-218	(L.5.1.5) Meaningful Relationship Commitment Letters, If Applicable	L.5.1.5	Please confirm that a managing member of a FAR 9.601(1) CTA (Joint Venture) can use the relevant experience of a wholly-owned subsidiary as long as a MRCL is submitted with its proposal.	Yes, a managing member of a FAR 9.601(1) CTA (Joint Venture) can use the relevant experience of a wholly-owned subsidiary as long as the MRCL is submitted with its proposal.
GR4-219	(L.5.1.5) Meaningful Relationship Commitment Letters, If Applicable	L.5.1.5	Section L.5.1.5 states that an offeror "is not allowed to use a Holding Company for a Meaningful Relationship." It also states that "Holding Companies with 51% majority share ownership of, and operational control will be considered a Parent Company", and then implies that Offerors can "claim a Meaningful Relationship with a Holding Company" if they "provide an explanation detailing the Holding Company's majority ownership and current operational control of both the Offering Entity and Meaningful Relationship Entity's business functions, and control over the composition of the Offering and Meaningful Relationship Entities' boards of directors." The aforementioned sentences appear to contradict whether an MRCL can be applied to a "Holding Company." Will the Government please confirm that offerors can submit a "Holding Company" MRCL, as defined in section L.5.1.5, if they provide the aforementioned explanation details?	An Offeror, including an individual CTA member, is not allowed to use a Holding Company for a Meaningful Relationship. For purposes of this solicitation, a Holding Company is a business entity that owns a financial and non-operational interest in an Offeror's (or individual CTA member's) shares, but does not own the majority of an Offeror's (or individual CTA member's) shares, engage in operational control of the Offeror (or individual CTA member), and control the composition of the Offeror's (or individual CTA member's) board of directors. A Parent Company is a business entity that engages in operational control of the Offeror (or individual CTA member), owns at least 51% of the Offeror's (or individual CTA member's) total shares, and controls the composition of the Offeror's (or individual CTA member's) board of directors. Holding Companies with 51% majority share ownership of, and operational control over, the business functions and composition of the boards of directors of both the Offeror and the Meaningful Relationship entity, will be considered a Parent Company for Meaningful Relationships. Parent Company's are allowable entities in a meaningful relationship, per RFP Section L.5.1.5.
GR4-220	(L.5.1.5) Meaningful Relationship Commitment Letters, If Applicable	L.5.1.5	Section L.5.1.5 of the RFP states the MRCL needs to be signed by a Corporate Officer/Official. Please clarify if individuals with the authority to obligate the entities (contractual POCs) may sign the MRCL.	Yes, individuals with the authority to obligate the entities (contractual POCs and empowered corporate officers) may sign the Meaningful Relationship Commitment Letters (MRCL).
GR4-221	(L.5.1.5) Meaningful Relationship Commitment Letters, If Applicable	L.5.1.5	The government is asking for executed agreements (contract, subcontract, inter-corporation, governmental, or other) to be required from the Offeror or Meaningful Relationship entity in order to make available those identified assets, services, facilities, subcontracts, permits, licenses, etc. Would the government consider removing this requirement, since the offeror is required to provide their Business systems approvals and work with the entity DCMA POC to validate this requirement?	All MRCLs, including those within any corporate structure, require the information listed in L.5.1.5(a) through (f). Common corporate ownership alone is insufficient to demonstrate a MRCL.
GR4-222	(L.5.1.5) Meaningful Relationship Commitment Letters, If Applicable	L.5.1.5	Does the Offeror need to submit a Meaningful Relationship Commitment Letter (MRCL) between itself and an entity it recently acquired and has fully merged with?	Offerors are required to submit mergers, acquisitions, novations, name-change agreements, and MRCL information in Symphony. Symphony allows the Offeror to select the associated entities and UELs to an evaluation element to claim points, when applicable. Once a file or document is uploaded in Symphony the Offeror can use the file that corresponds with the elements in their proposal.
GR4-223	(L.5.1.5) Meaningful Relationship Commitment Letters, If Applicable	L.5.1.5	This section states "A statement of commitment by the Offering and MRCL entities as to the performance and utilization of the identified entity's resources on Alliant 3 GWAC Task Orders." We believe that the word "Offering" should be "Offeror". We ask that the Government provide clarification so that Offerors can respond correctly to the requirement.	The government acknowledges receipt of your question. Please refer to Amendment 3, item 41 and 42.
GR4-224	(L.5.1.5) Meaningful Relationship Commitment Letters, If Applicable	L.5.1.5	Would the government please confirm that pursuant to 13 CFR 121.103 (b) (2) (ii), small business offerors that are owned and controlled by Indian Tribes, ANCs, NHOs, CDCs, or wholly owned entities of Indian Tribes, ANCs, NHOs, or CDCs claiming relevant experience of their affiliates by way of MRCL are not considered to be affiliated with other concerns owned by these entities because of their common ownership or common management?	The solicitation refers to 13 CFR Part 121 as the source authority being used to determine small business size, per RFP Section L.5.1.5.

Alliant 3 Government Responses to Request For Proposal (RFP) Feedback GR Set 04_11.08.24

Response #	RFP Paragraph Reference	Specific RFP Location	Comment/Question	Government Response
GR4-225	(L.5.1.5) Meaningful Relationship Commitment Letters, If Applicable	L.5.1.5, L.3.1	RFP Section L.5.1.5, Meaningful Relationship Commitment Letters (MRCLs), states "GSA will allow an Offeror to take credit for evaluation elements involving relevant experience, Past Performance, system(s), certification(s), and facility clearances from a Parent Company, Affiliate, Division, and/or Subsidiary so long as there is a meaningful and operational relationship with the Offeror or CTA member(s), except for MRCLs offered by FAR 9.601(2) OTSB CTA first tier subcontractor members. If an Offeror intends to claim credit for the system(s) and certification(s) and/or facility clearance of a Parent Company, Affiliate, Division, and/or Subsidiary, the MRCL must describe the details of how the Offeror will access and apply their meaningful relationship capabilities to perform on Task Orders issued under the Master Contract." However, the instructions in L.3.1, Official Legal Offering Entity state: "All the evaluation elements for which an Offeror is claiming credit in accordance with Section L.5, must be in the Offeror's name as submitted in Block 15A on the Standard Form (SF) 33, Solicitation, Offer and Award, with a corresponding Commercial and Government Entity (CAGE) Code in SAM.gov that matches the Offeror name on the SF-33, Block 15A. (See Section L.5.1.1). (See Sections 3.2, L.5.1.4, and L.5.1.5 for the only exceptions to this requirement)." Can the Government please confirm that the exceptions are those noted in Section L.5.1.5 within the RFP, and Offerors can use the MRCL instructions when using the designated clearances, certifications, and project experience?	Yes, confirming a MRCL (L.5.1.5) is an exception as stated in L.3.1. An Offeror can use a MRCL for designated clearances, certifications, and project experience. However, MRCLs offered by FAR 9.601(2) OTSB CTA first tier subcontractor members are not applicable.
GR4-226	(L.5.1.5) Meaningful Relationship Commitment Letters, If Applicable	L.5.1.5, L.5.7	Does GSA also include Responsibility or Sustainability Related Disclosures in the category of "approved evaluation elements" the offeror can use within a MRCL?	Yes, MRCLs can be applied to Sustainability-Related Disclosures in section L.5.7.
GR4-227	(L.5.1.5) Meaningful Relationship Commitment Letters, If Applicable	L.5.1.5(f)	Can GSA confirm that paragraph F (An explanation detailing how the Offeror will access each Meaningful Relationship entity's capabilities) is not applicable to wholly owned subsidiary or other organizations within a corporate structure?	All MRCLs, including those within any corporate structure, require the information listed in L.5.1.5(a) through (f). Common corporate ownership alone is insufficient to demonstrate a MRCL.
GR4-228	(L.5.1.5) Meaningful Relationship Commitment Letters, If Applicable	L.5.1.5(f)(1-5)	RFP Section L.5.1.5 is unclear as to what information is required from an Offeror with meaningful relationships within the corporate structure. The RFP requires Offerors to provide MRCLs that include specific information as described in (f)(1)-(5). We recommend amending RFP Section L.5.1.5 to state that the instructions listed in (e) and (f) on page 272 are not applicable to Offerors with a meaningful relationship within the corporate structure.	"All MRCLs, including those within any corporate structure, require the information listed in L.5.1.5(a) through (f). Common corporate ownership alone is insufficient to demonstrate a MRCL."
GR4-229	(L.5.1.5) Meaningful Relationship Commitment Letters, If Applicable	L.5.1.5(f)(3)	If an Offeror's proposal includes resources from a wholly-owned subsidiary that operates under common policy and corporate guidelines, what type of documentation can we provide in lieu of an executed agreement?	All MRCLs, including those within any corporate structure, require the information listed in L.5.1.5(a) through (f). Common corporate ownership alone is insufficient to demonstrate a MRCL.
GR4-230	(L.5.1.5) Meaningful Relationship Commitment Letters, If Applicable	L.5.1.5(f)(5)	Please clarify how an Offeror, either a Parent Company, or an entity that is within a corporate structure owned by a Parent Company, 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.
GR4-231	(L.5.1.9) Cybersecurity Supply Chain Risk Management (C-SCRM) Responsibility Assessment	L.5.1.9, L.5.5.2	C-SCRM Responsibility Assessment instructions seem to be included in RFP Section L.5.1.9 AND in RFP Section L.5.5.2. Please confirm that the C-SCRM Responsibility Assessment should only be included in L.5.5.2 (under Responsibility).	Attachment J.P-11, C-SCRM Responsibility Questionnaire is intentionally included in RFP Sections L.5.1.9 and L.5.5.2. RFP Section L.5.1.9 provides eligibility requirements instructions, which include the submission of J.P-11, A3 Contractor C-SCRM Responsibility Questionnaire. RFP Section L.5.5.2 provides instructions and conditions for the determination of responsibility as it relates to a completed J.P-11, A3 Contractor C-SCRM Responsibility Questionnaire submitted by an offeror.
GR4-232	(L.5.1.10) Organizational Conflict of Interest (OCI) Plan	L.5.1.10	Please confirm whether the Organizational Conflict of Interest (OCI) Plan 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 OCI Plan.	The Organizational Conflict of Interest (OCI) Plan 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, each CTA member is to submit an OCI Plan.
GR4-233	(L.5.1.10) Organizational Conflict of Interest (OCI) Plan	L.5.1.10	Does the Government anticipate having an OCI-form template, or is a contractor OCI form addressing the requirements in Section L sufficient?	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.
GR4-234	(L.5.2) Relevant Experience	J.P-3, L.5.2	Attachment J.P-2 A3 Primary NAICS Code Relevant Experience Project Template includes fields for Offeror Name and Offeror UEI. We assume the Offeror Name and UEI should correspond to the entity that performed the project and not the name of the offeror who is submitting the Alliant 3 proposal response if the submitting entity was not the awarded entity on the project. Is our assumption correct? If no, please clarify. Further recommend that the Government add a field for Contractor Name on the J.P-2 form to align to J.P-7 fields to crosswalk to FPDS field names and to accommodate situations where the Contractor Name on the project is not the same as the Offeror Name.	Attachment J.P-2, Offeror Name and Offeror UEI applies to the Offeror. Symphony allows the Offeror to select the associated entities and UEIs from mergers, acquisitions, novations, name-change agreements, and MRCLs to evaluation elements to claim points, when applicable. Once a file or document is uploaded in Symphony the Offeror can use the file that corresponds with the elements in their proposal.
GR4-235	(L.5.2) Relevant Experience	J.P Templates	Once an offeror has received signed JP Forms from its customers, will the Government accept earlier signed JP Forms leading up to proposal submission in the event an RFP amendment alters the JP Form (or form data elements) or will additional time to secure new/revised signatures be granted?	Offerors should submit the latest version of JP forms with their proposals. However, if offerors used JP Forms J.P-2 through J.P-6, which were published in SAM.gov on 4/10/24 during the draft RFP release, the Government will accept those forms.
GR4-236	(L.5.2) Relevant Experience	J.P-1, J.P-4, L.5.2.3.1	For a previous CTA project used as a REP, may we include the dollar value performed by the offeror in the J.P-1 narrative and validate it with the signed J.P-1 form? If not, what evidence is required to show total value performed by the offeror for a previous CTA REP?	Yes, the dollar value performed by the offeror may be included in the J.P-1 narrative and validated with a signed J.P-1 form.
GR4-237	(L.5.2) Relevant Experience	J.P-1, L.5.2.3.3	Section L.5.2.3.3 does not include instructions regarding the submission of the J.P-1 CTA document to verify Primary NAICS Code Relevant Experience - Project Size for projects performed by a member of a previous/existing CTA.	The government appreciates your feedback. After a careful review and analysis of your question or comment, we believe the RFP is well-defined in this area and supportive of a competitive proposal.
GR4-238	(L.5.2) Relevant Experience	J.P-2, L.5.2.3.1	L.5.2.3.1 states "The Attachment J.P-2 must include both cognizant CO's and COR's direct telephone numbers and email addresses." However, if the Cognizant Project Official for a program is not always the COR. Will the government provide an updated J.P-2 form to include another section to capture the COR's name, title, phone, and email?	The government acknowledges receipt of your question. Please refer to Amendment 3, item 49.
GR4-239	(L.5.2) Relevant Experience	J.P-3, J.P-7, L.5.2.4.2	Can the Government please confirm that Emerging Technology REPs do not require FPDS-NG Reports to be submitted?	The government confirms that Emerging Technology REPs do not require FPDS-NG Reports to be submitted.
GR4-240	(L.5.2) Relevant Experience	J.P-3, L.5.2.4.2	Request that the Government remove the requirement for obtaining Contracting Officer, Contracting Officer's Representative, or Corporate Officer/Official signatures on the Attachment J.P-3 form unless the submitted artifacts (e.g., SOW/PWS/SOW, FPDS, award forms) cannot substantiate the claimed points.	The government acknowledges receipt of your question. Per RFP Section L.5.2.4.2, Verification of Emerging Technology Relevant Experience Submission, Attachment J.P-3 requires a signature for verification. Please refer to Amendment 3, item 71.
GR4-241	(L.5.2) Relevant Experience	J.P-3, L.5.2.4.2	If the value and/or Period of Performance (PoP) on the J.P-3 has been updated since the original award, and hence doesn't match the original award document, is the signed J.P-3 adequate proof of the current value/PoP or is the contractor required to submit the most recent mod that demonstrates the current value/PoP?	A signed J.P-3 is adequate proof of the current contract value/PoP.
GR4-242	(L.5.2) Relevant Experience	J.P-5, L.5.2.4.4	Can the Government confirm that an Other Than Small Business Offerors engaging with Small Businesses need to submit the Small Business' SOW in addition to their award form and a completed/signed J.P-5?	Yes, OTSBs engaging with Small Businesses need to submit the Small Business' SOW, award form, and Signed J.P-5 as evidence as listed in L.5.2.4.4. See Amendment 2, item 66.

Alliant 3 Government Responses to Request For Proposal (RFP) Feedback GR Set 04_11.08.24

Response #	RFP Paragraph Reference	Specific RFP Location	Comment/Question	Government Response
GR4-243	(L.5.2) Relevant Experience	J.P-6, L.5.2.4	The RFP provides an option to provide an "Interim or final CPARS report, or a completed Award Fee Determination document, or signed Attachment J.P-6" with the proposal for an ongoing project with less than one year of performance. However, the J.P-6 form only contains drop-downs for NAICS Code and NAICS Code Relevant Project fields, and does not provide similar options for Emerging Technology Projects. Will the government please update the J.P-6 form to provide these drop-down options?	The government acknowledges receipt of your question. Please refer to Amendment 3, items 33, 34, and 74.
GR4-244	(L.5.2) Relevant Experience	L.3	What process or mechanism exists for bidders to create and submit key and relevant Symphony entries associated with classified programs (including SAP), when required data fields (e.g., program name, name of cognizant authorizing officials, etc.) are themselves classified? Without this ability, bidders are precluded from creating Symphony entries for these projects.	If claiming a NAICS for a federal contract that does not have an FPDS-NG Report, a signed J.P-2 and relevant verification documents as stated in L.5.2.3.1 are required. RFP Section L.3, The Offeror shall not submit classified information without redaction, sanitization, and government official authorization.
GR4-245	(L.5.2) Relevant Experience	L.3, L.5.2	For classified contracts and SOWs, would the government consider allowing a classified proposal submittal to meet the submittal requirements?	Per RFP Section L.3, please see the paragraph entitled "REDACTED PROPOSAL DOCUMENTS" for more information regarding submitting redacted information.
GR4-246	(L.5.2) Relevant Experience	L.5.1.4, L.5.2	Is there any restriction for a Prime contractor to use relevant experience projects from its subcontractor in both OTSB and SB CTAs?	An OTSB and SB CTA can use a relevant experience project from a subcontractor when the Offering entity was the prime contractor on the project. Per RFP Section L.5.1.4, OTSB with First-Tier Subcontractors must use the OTSB Offeror's UEI number and will not be allowed to use the relevant experience, past performance, systems, certifications, and clearances of the First-Tier subcontractors for their proposal submission.
GR4-247	(L.5.2) Relevant Experience	L.5.2	For Alliant 3 scoring, over 50% of the total maximum points derive from relevant NAICS or Emerging Technology experience projects. Will commercial projects be allowed in the final solicitation?	Yes, offerors are permitted to submit commercial projects for credit in their proposals as long as they meet the criteria set forth in RFP Section L.5.2 and subsequent paragraphs of the RFP.
GR4-248	(L.5.2) Relevant Experience	L.5.2	If an Offeror has recently acquired and fully merged with another corporate entity—i.e., the resulting single company is now operating under a single Unique Entity Identifier (UIE)—can the Offeror claim Relevant Experience and Past Performance points for work that the acquired company performed before the Offeror acquired them?	Offerors are required to submit mergers, acquisitions, novations, name-change agreements, and MRCL information in Symphony (See Sections L.3.2 and L.5.1.5). Symphony allows the Offeror to select the associated entities and UEIs to an evaluation element to claim points, when applicable. Once a file or document is uploaded in Symphony the Offeror can use the file that corresponds with the elements in their proposal.
GR4-249	(L.5.2) Relevant Experience	L.5.2	Can we use a new contract, awarded after the Alliant 3 GWAC solicitation release date, for NAICS or Emerging Technology purposes if we will submit the contract award documentation along with the signed J.P-6 form?	An Offeror can submit a new contract awarded after the Alliant 3 GWAC solicitation release date if the project meets the relevant experience duration requirement of L.5.2.2(d) prior to the proposal due date.
GR4-250	(L.5.2) Relevant Experience	L.5.2	To meet relevant experience requirements in section L.5.2, it is possible to utilize commercial sector experience? Or is it mandatory to have government experience?	Yes, it is possible to utilize commercial sector experience. Per RFP section L.5.2 (a) "The Offeror must document and attach verification documents in accordance with Verification of Primary NAICS Code Relevant Experience Submission (Federal Government Contracts) as delineated in Section L.5.2.3.1, or Verification of Primary NAICS Code Relevant Experience Submission (Non-Federal Contracts including Non-Federal and Commercial Subcontracts) as delineated in Section L.5.2.3.2."
GR4-251	(L.5.2) Relevant Experience	L.5.2, G.24	If an Offeror has recently acquired and fully merged with another corporate entity, how should the Offeror address the FPDS-NG record, which still shows the work as having been performed by the acquired entity under its previous name and UEI?	Offerors are required to submit mergers, acquisitions, novations, name-change agreements, and MRCL information in Symphony. Symphony allows the Offeror to select the associated entities and UEIs to an evaluation element to claim points, when applicable. Once a file or document is uploaded in Symphony the Offeror can use the file that corresponds with the elements in their proposal.
GR4-252	(L.5.2) Relevant Experience	L.5.2, L.5.2.3.4	In some cases Federal agencies do not use FPDS and therefore offerors will not be able to verify the Funding Agency ID in an FPDS report. In those instances, can offerors provide the contract award to verify the funding agency?	In cases where offerors will not be able to verify the Funding Agency ID in an FPDS Report, a signed J.P-2 and relevant verification documents as stated in L.5.2.3.1 are required.
GR4-253	(L.5.2) Relevant Experience	L.5.2.1	Will the government please confirm that only one J.P-2 is required when submitting multiple Task Orders as one project? Also, will the government please clarify if the Statement of Work, Award Documentation, and other verification artifacts can be from the IDIQ or BPA level when using a collection of Task Orders where the requirements are well defined? Providing Statements of Work, Award Documentation, and other verification artifacts for every Task Order that has been bundled to count as a single project could cause unnecessary burden on government evaluators.	Yes, only one J.P-2 is required when submitting multiple Task Orders as one project as long as each task order is listed within the narrative section of J.P-2. Documentation will need to be submitted for each Task Order to verify dates and order values (e.g.FPDS documents).
GR4-254	(L.5.2) Relevant Experience	L.5.2.1	Is the intent of project definition "d" to allow offerors to combine Task Orders for the same requirement into a single project? May we combine the task order and related bridged task orders into one project?	The government acknowledges receipt of your question. Please refer to Amendment 2, item 53. A bridge task order can be used if it was issued under the same IDIQ as the combined task orders.
GR4-255	(L.5.2) Relevant Experience	L.5.2.1	Can we use IDIQs as relevant experience where task orders have not been released yet?	No, an IDIQ without task orders may not be used as relevant experience because work is not typically performed directly under the IDIQ contract itself, but rather through individual task orders. Task orders contain the details of what is required for each job, including scope, schedule, and price. See RFP Section L.5.2.1 for a relevant experience project definition.
GR4-256	(L.5.2) Relevant Experience	L.5.2.1	If a contract is structured in a way that the customer further divides a task order (TO) into smaller tasks/projects (e.g., with a Technical Direction Letter), would it be permissible to treat each task/project or a collection of these smaller tasks/projects as a separate Relevant Experience Project for the purpose of the Alliant 3 RFP?	The government acknowledges receipt of your question. Please refer to Amendment 2, items 53, 57. An Offeror cannot further divide an individual task order into smaller tasks or projects (see L.5.2.1 for project definition) as a separate Primary NAICS code Relevant Experience Project (L.5.2.2).
GR4-257	(L.5.2) Relevant Experience	L.5.2.1	Will the Government please confirm if "Project" is synonymous with "Contract"?	Please refer to RFP Section L.5.2.1 which provides the definition of a Relevant Experience "project".
GR4-258	(L.5.2) Relevant Experience	L.5.2.1(d)	Is an offeror allowed to submit more than one collection of unique task orders from an IDIQ or BPA contract? How is the offeror to provide Past Performance for a collection of task orders?	The government acknowledges receipt of your question. Please refer to Amendment 3, item 35.
GR4-259	(L.5.2) Relevant Experience	L.5.2.1(d)	Is combining task orders under an IDIQ contract limited to only those task orders performed for the same client, for the same work, under successive task orders OR can all task orders under an IDIQ contract for different customers be combined?	The government acknowledges receipt of your question. Please refer to Amendment 3, items 54, 56, 57 and 58.
GR4-260	(L.5.2) Relevant Experience	L.5.2.1(d)	What is the best way to combine a collection of task orders (with different POPs, values, etc.) for submission into the Symphony dashboards?	Per L.4.1, Table 22, multiple supporting documents can be attached. Symphony allows for the attachment of multiple documents for each scoring element. Please refer to Amendment 2, item 58 and Amendment 3, items 20, 21, 24, 26, 27, 28, 29, 31.
GR4-261	(L.5.2) Relevant Experience	L.5.2.1(d)	Will the government consider a collection of call orders under a BPA or task orders under a master contract that were completed outside the recency window as eligible if their combined performance extended into the recency window?	L.5.2.4(c) establishes the age recency parameters for the Relevant Experience project. All projects must be aged 5 years or less from when the RFP was issued. Thus, given the RFP issuance date of June 28, 2024, all Relevant Experience projects must be ongoing or completed after June 27, 2019. L.5.2.4 (d) establishes whether the Relevant Experience project provides sufficient amounts of performance in order to be assessed. Relevant Experience projects must demonstrate a sufficiency of actual performance, and are not eligible for assessment until they are either complete, or have one year's worth of performance. The age recency requirement of L.5.2.4(c) does not apply to the L.5.2.4.(d) performance sufficiency period, thus a 5 years old or less Relevant Experience project (which meets the age requirement of L.5.2.4.(c)), that is completed or reaches one year of performance prior to proposal submission has acceptable performance amounts (that meets the requirements of L.5.2.4(d)). Please refer to Amendment 3, items 45 and 68.

Alliant 3 Government Responses to Request For Proposal (RFP) Feedback GR Set 04_11.08.24

Response #	RFP Paragraph Reference	Specific RFP Location	Comment/Question	Government Response
GR4-262	(L.5.2) Relevant Experience	L.5.2.1(d)	If we combine a unique set of Task Orders or BPA Calls for a single Primary NAICS Code Relevant Experience, can we also use the individual Task Orders or BPA Calls to use individually for Emerging Technology submissions? Do individual Task Orders or BPA Calls combined have to have 1 year of performance each or do all combined have to total one year?	If a unique set of Task Orders or BPA Calls are combined for a Primary NAICS Code Relevant Experience Project, Task orders or BPA Calls can be submitted separately and be used as individual Emerging Technology Relevant Experience Projects. Each individual Task Order or BPA Call must be complete or have a year or more of performance per RFP Section L.5.2.4(d).
GR4-263	(L.5.2) Relevant Experience	L.5.2.2	Please provide guidance on how to handle relevant experience on a Federal Contract, that may or may not have a NAICS code assigned, but where the NAICS code is classified.	Per L.5.2.3.1, If the FPDS-NG Report is not available or the FPDS-NG Report does not substantiate all claimed scoring elements (e.g., an Offeror claims a different NAICS code than the NAICS code assigned in FPDS-NG), per paragraph (b), "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." Per RFP Section L.3, "The Offeror shall not submit classified information without redaction, sanitization, and government official authorization."
GR4-264	(L.5.2) Relevant Experience	L.5.2.2	How will the Government evaluate "value" on a Federal contract that is not allocated Federal funding but that is a Government program that funds the vendor through fees collected by the vendor from consumers or state, local, and commercial agencies? Will the Government accept the total fees collected as a representation of the value of the contract? Also, will the Government accept anticipated fees to be collected in contract option years?	Per RFP Section L.5.2.3.1, If the FPDS-NG Report is not available or the FPDS-NG Report does not substantiate all claimed scoring elements the following verification document must be included: (b) the Offeror will provide a signed J.P-2 attachment by a Contracting Officer (CO) with cognizance over the submitted Project.
GR4-265	(L.5.2) Relevant Experience	L.5.2.2	Will the Government confirm that an Offeror may submit a project that achieves one year of performance after the release of the RFP (6/28/2024) prior to the date of the submission (10/28/24)?	The government acknowledges receipt of your question. Please refer to Amendment 3, items 45 and 68.
GR4-266	(L.5.2) Relevant Experience	L.5.2.2	Could each of the different submitted projects claim the same NAICS Code to reach the maximum of seven distinct Primary NAICS Code Relevant Experience Projects? For example, submitting seven projects with the same NAICS 541512.	The primary NAICS code for this acquisition is 541512, however the 5 NAICS codes listed in Section L.5.2.3 can be applied to the Primary NAICS code Relevant Experience projects. Offerors can submit up to 7 projects in any combination of the 5 NAICS codes. There are no limits or extra points given for the same or different combinations of these NAICS codes.
GR4-267	(L.5.2) Relevant Experience	L.5.2.2	Will the government confirm that the offeror must use J.P-2 to explain how the project met the claimed NAICS code, if FPDS sites a NAICS code not listed in Section L.5.2.3 for a relevant experience project?	Yes, an offeror must use J.P-2 to explain how the project met the claimed NAICS code in addition to providing the other required documents as defined in the RFP per Section L.5.2.3.1.
GR4-268	(L.5.2) Relevant Experience	L.5.2.2	If NAICS Project work was performed as a member of a JV, will we be allowed to claim credit if we have the Managing Partner of the JV sign a J.P-4 stating we performed the entire scope of work for the project?	Yes, please see RFP Section L.5.1.4.1. The Offeror shall use the A3 Contractor Teaming Arrangement (CTA) Template (Attachment J.P-1) for each Relevant Experience Project that was performed under an existing or previous CTA. The CTA agreement shall be submitted as an addendum to Attachment J.P-1.
GR4-269	(L.5.2) Relevant Experience	L.5.2.2, L.5.2.1(d)	Is a J.P-2 Form needed for a collection of task orders to verify the sum of the total value of the collection task orders?	If the sum of the total value of the collection of task orders is not verifiable on FPDS reports, a signed J.P-2 and relevant verification documents as stated in L. 5.2.3.1 are required.
GR4-270	(L.5.2) Relevant Experience	L.5.2.2, L.5.2.3	Verification of Primary NAICS Code Relevant series has only six categories while the self-scoring sheet has seven scoring criteria. Could you please elaborate on the 7th category?	The primary NAICS code for this acquisition is 541512, however the 5 NAICS codes listed in Section L.5.2.3 can be applied to the Primary NAICS code Relevant Experience projects. Offerors can submit up to 7 projects in any combination of the 5 NAICS codes. There are no limits or extra points given for different combinations of these NAICS codes.
GR4-271	(L.5.2) Relevant Experience	L.5.2.2, L.5.2.4	On L.5.2.2 Primary NAICS Code Relevant Experience Project and L. 5.2.4 Emerging Technology Relevant Experience projects, they say that the project must be complete or have at least one year of performance and that the project must be ongoing or have been completed within five (5) years from the date the solicitation is released. The RFP was released June 28, 2024. What if I have a project that has one year's worth of performance or is complete after June 28th, 2024 but before the proposals are due. I can't use it the way this is written.	The government acknowledges receipt of your question. Please refer to Amendment 3, item 45 and 68.
GR4-272	(L.5.2) Relevant Experience	L.5.2.2, L.5.3	Would the government consider allowing a classified proposal submittal to meet the NAICS Code and Past Performance requirements?	Yes, classified proposals may be used to meet NAICS Code and Past Performance requirements. Per RFP Section L.3, please see the paragraph entitled "REDACTED PROPOSAL DOCUMENTS" for more information regarding submitting redacted information.
GR4-273	(L.5.2) Relevant Experience	L.5.2.3	Are the only applicable NAICS codes under this solicitation 541512 and 541519?	Per RFP L.5.2.3, the primary NAICS code for this acquisition is 541512. Please refer to Section L.5.2.2, Table 26 for a list of the NAICS codes that can be applied to the Primary NAICS code Relevant Experience projects.
GR4-274	(L.5.2) Relevant Experience	L.5.2.3	Would GSA please confirm that an offeror using a Federal prime contract issued under a NAICS code other than those specified in Section L.5.2.3 is not required to submit a copy of the SOO/SOW/PWS with index and tagging, and that the Federal customer's signature on the J.P-2 form is sufficient to verify the NAICS scope claim?	Per RFP Section L.5.2.3.1(b), No copy of the SOW or PWS is required for Federal Contracts.
GR4-275	(L.5.2) Relevant Experience	L.5.2.3	Since any single NAICS code aligns with many IT services, does a contract SOW/PWS with a primary NAICS code as listed in Table 26 also need to align with the specific NAICS description presented in Table 26 (e.g., a NAICS description in Table 26 describes computer system design, but a contract with that same primary NAICS is related to/focused on cybersecurity)?	If the NAICS code in FPDS-NG or on attachment J.P-2 matches one of the NAICS codes listed in RFP Section L.5.2.3, Table 26, and all required evidence in RFP section L.5.2.3.1 is provided to substantiate the claim the government will accept the Primary NAICS Code Relevant Experience project.
GR4-276	(L.5.2) Relevant Experience	L.5.2.3, L.5.2.4.2	When a project is used to satisfy both Primary NAICS Code Relevant Experience, and Emerging Technology Relevant Experience, should the file name follow the Sample File Name Instructions under Section L.5.2.3., or the instructions under L.5.2.4.2?	Symphony requires the evidence be attached to each evaluation element. Projects used for both Primary NAICS Code Relevant Experience, and Emerging Technology Relevant Experience, should be named as prescribed for the corresponding evaluation element.
GR4-277	(L.5.2) Relevant Experience	L.5.2.3.1	If claiming credit for a relevant project performed as a subcontractor, who must complete and sign Project Verification Form J.P-2 (if applicable, such as explaining how the project met the claimed NAICS code), i.e., the prime's corporate officer or the Prime's Cognizant Project Official (e.g., CO, COR, etc.)?	For Federal Projects performed by the Offeror as subcontractor, the Form J.P-2 is signed by the Government Contracting Officer (or cognizant project official), and the Form J.P-4 is signed by the Prime Contractor's Corporate Officer/Official of the commercial entity with cognizance over the submitted Project. See L.5.2.3.1 Verification of Primary NAICS Code Relevant Experience Submission (Federal Government Contracts). For Non-Federal Projects performed by the Offeror as a subcontractor, the Form J.P-2 is signed by the Corporate Officer/Official of the commercial entity with cognizance over the submitted Project, and the Form J.P-4 is signed by the Prime Contractor's Corporate Officer/Official of the commercial entity with cognizance over the submitted Project. See L.5.2.3.2 Verification of Primary NAICS Code Relevant Experience Submission (Non-Federal Contracts).
GR4-278	(L.5.2) Relevant Experience	L.5.2.3.1	In RFP Section L.5.2.3.1 – Verification of Primary NAICS Code Relevant Experience Submission (Federal Government Contracts) – an SOW, PWS, or SOO does not seem to be required, even when the FPDS-NG Report does not substantiate the NAICS Code. However, Part III of Attachment J.P-2 requires the submission of tagged documentation (such as the SOW, PWS, or SOO). Is the SOW, PWS, or SOO required to be submitted if the FPDS-NG Report does not substantiate all claimed scoring elements for Federal Contracts? If required, recommend adding the SOW/PWS/SOO as part of the list of required verification documents.	Per RFP Section L.5.2.3.1, if the FPDS-NG Report is not available or the FPDS-NG Report does not substantiate all claimed scoring elements (b) a signed J.P-2 must be uploaded to Symphony. No copy of the SOW or PWS is required for Federal Contracts.
GR4-279	(L.5.2) Relevant Experience	L.5.2.3.1	Please confirm that SOWs are allowed to be provided as verification documentation for Federal REPs.	The government appreciates your feedback. After a careful review and analysis of your question or comment, we believe the RFP is well-defined in this area and supportive of a competitive proposal.

Alliant 3 Government Responses to Request For Proposal (RFP) Feedback GR Set 04_11.08.24

Response #	RFP Paragraph Reference	Specific RFP Location	Comment/Question	Government Response
GR4-280	(L.5.2) Relevant Experience	L.5.2.3.1	Since a multi-tenant, single-award, task order contract can support work performed across various NAICS codes at the Technical Direction Letter (TDL) level, will the Government accept a signed J.P-2 that describes work performed under the relevant TDLs for Alliant 3 relevant NAICS codes?	No, a Technical Direction Letter (TDL) is a document that provides guidance to a contractor on how to perform a task in a contract. a TDL is not a contract in itself. Please see RFP Section L.5.2.1 for the definition of a "project".
GR4-281	(L.5.2) Relevant Experience	L.5.2.3.1	We performed work as a subcontractor for a federal contract. For claiming NAICS experience, is the signed Attachment J.P-4 from the prime contractor sufficient, or do we also need to provide the J.P-2 A3 form from the Prime? Additionally, should we include the Prime Award Documentation, as Prime will not provide its award document? Please clarify.	Yes. For work performed as a subcontractor on a federal project, a signed J.P-4 attachment is required along with the documentation listed in L.5.2.3.1 Verification of Primary NAICS Code Relevant Experience Submission (Federal Government Contracts).
GR4-282	(L.5.2) Relevant Experience	L.5.2.3.1	For a project performed as a sub-contractor, is Attachment J.P-2 to be provided along with Attachment J.P-4? For a project performed as a sub-contractor is the Government CO's information to be provided?	Yes. For work performed as a subcontractor on a federal project, a signed prime contractor J.P-4 attachment is required along with the documentation listed in L.5.2.3.1 Verification of Primary NAICS Code Relevant Experience Submission (Federal Government Contracts). When a J.P-2 attachment is required (see RFP Section L.5.2.1), a Government CO will sign the document. If the Government CO is not available then a Cognizant Government Official must sign attachment J.P-2.
GR4-283	(L.5.2) Relevant Experience	L.5.2.3.1, L.5.2.3.2	For Primary NAICS Code Relevant Experience, please clarify whether the SOO that indicates the NAICS code being claimed or a copy of the contract SOW/PWS is required for Non-Federal contracts only or both federal and non-federal contracts.	Per RFP Section L.5.2.3.1, Verification of Primary NAICS Code Relevant Experience Submission (Federal Government Contracts), no copy of the SOW or PWS is required for Federal Contracts. Per RFP Section L.5.2.3.2 (c), Verification of Primary NAICS Code Relevant Experience Submission (Non-Federal Contracts), For Non-Federal Contracts Only- Copy of Contract Statement of Work is required.
GR4-284	(L.5.2) Relevant Experience	L.5.2.3.1, L.5.2.3.3, L.5.2.3.4, L.5.2.3.6	Please confirm if the FPDS report covers the scoring elements for L.5.2.3.1, L.5.2.3.3, L.5.2.3.4, and L.5.2.3.6 then the contractor does not need to supply a J.P-2 form or any additional supporting documentation?	The government appreciates your feedback. After a careful review and analysis of your question or comment, we believe the RFP is well-defined in this area and supportive of a competitive proposal.
GR4-285	(L.5.2) Relevant Experience	L.5.2.3.1(b)	When a REP is a previous CTA project, if FPDS substantiates NAICS/client/PoP, and J.P-1 substantiates the total value of the project performed by the offeror, please confirm that a J.P-2 is not ALSO required.	Per RFP Section L.5.2.3.1, if FPDS substantiates all required information, a J.P-2 is not required.
GR4-286	(L.5.2) Relevant Experience	L.5.2.3.1(b)	Paragraph (b) states "If the cognizant Contracting Officer's signature is unattainable, the Government will accept the signature of the cognizant project official directly associated with the Project." Later in the paragraph it refers to the COR. Please confirm that the signature does not need to be from the COR, but can be from a cognizant project official.	The government acknowledges receipt of your question. Please refer to Amendment 3, item 49 and 71.
GR4-287	(L.5.2) Relevant Experience	L.5.2.3.1(b)	In L.5.2.3.1(b) the RFP requires the signature of the Cognizant Contracting Officer, or the signature of the cognizant project official if the Cognizant Contracting Officer's signature is unattainable on the J. P-2. Please confirm that if an offeror obtains the Cognizant Contracting Officer's signature, they should leave the second signature box on the J.P-2 form Part II blank.	Only one signature is required on J.P-2, but the contact information is required for both boxes. Please refer to Amendment 3, item 49.
GR4-288	(L.5.2) Relevant Experience	L.5.2.3.1(b)	This section states, "The Attachment J.P-2 must include both cognizant CO's and COR's direct telephone numbers and email addresses." Please confirm the offeror is permitted to add that information related to the COR on the form itself as there is not a dedicated space for this information.	The government acknowledges receipt of your question. Please see Amendment 3 item numbers 49 and 71.
GR4-289	(L.5.2) Relevant Experience	L.5.2.3.1(c)	When the RFP refers to the "original contract award document", is it referring to just the form used as the first page (e.g., SF 33) and any continuation pages, or to the entire contract document?	An original award document refers to the contract document issued to the successful offeror at time of the initial award. RFP Section L.5.2.3.1 (c) provides a list of award documents that may be submitted as verification documents when a FPDS-NG Report is not available or the FPDS-NG Report does not substantiate all claimed scoring elements. Offerors would need to determine what is needed to substantiate all claimed scoring elements.
GR4-290	(L.5.2) Relevant Experience	L.5.2.3.1(c)	Occasionally one comes across a Government form used to award contracts or task orders where the Contracting Officer chose not to enter data in one of the fields listed in this section. What additional documentation (e.g., FPDS form, signed J.P-2 form) can offerors use to verify this information?	If the FPDS-NG Report is not available or the FPDS-NG Report does not substantiate all claimed scoring elements(e.g., an Offeror claims a different NAICS code than the NAICS code assigned in FPDS-NG), evidence will be verified in accordance with L.5.2.3.1(a) through (c).
GR4-291	(L.5.2) Relevant Experience	L.5.2.3.1(d)	Is item (d) (CPARS or J.P-6) required for all submittals or only those with less than one year of performance?	The government acknowledges receipt of your question. Please refer to Amendment 3, item 50.
GR4-292	(L.5.2) Relevant Experience	L.5.2.3.1(d), L.5.2.4.2 (e)	Will the Government confirm that an Offeror may submit an ongoing Project with less than one year of performance completed if they also submit an interim CPARS or signed J.P-6?	No, L.5.2.2(d) states, "With respect to performance, each Primary NAICS Code Relevant Experience Project must be complete or have at least one year of performance prior to the date of proposal submission. If a final CPARS is not available at least one year of performance was not completed in the base period, then either an interim or final CPARS, or a completed Award Fee Determination, or a completed A3 Past Performance Rating Template (Attachment J.P-6) will be accepted. See Amendment 3 items 45 and 46.
GR4-293	(L.5.2) Relevant Experience	L.5.2.3.1(e)	Please confirm that for a Federal Government Subcontract submitted, both Attachment J.P-4 signed by the prime contractor and the FPDS Report for the prime's contract must be submitted.	Yes, an FPDS report is the primary document that is used to provide evidence for Verification of Primary NAICS Code Relevant Experience and attachment J.P-4 Subcontractor Experience Project Template. If the FPDS-NG Report is not available or the FPDS-NG Report does not substantiate all claimed scoring elements please see Section L.5.2.3.1.
GR4-294	(L.5.2) Relevant Experience	L.5.2.3.1(e)	Will the Government please confirm that submission of a subcontract agreement with the prime contractor for a Government project is an acceptable contract award document when submitting a subcontract as a NAICS Code Relevant Experience Project?	Attachment J.P-4 must be provided and signed by the prime contractor as verification of the project work, scope, location, and value performed by the subcontractor.
GR4-295	(L.5.2) Relevant Experience	L.5.2.3.2	Is a SOW / PWS needed to support NAICS Relevant Projects that are claiming a different NAICS Code than assigned in FPDS-NG?	If claiming a NAICS for a federal contract that is not indicated on an FPDS-NG Report, a signed J.P-2 and relevant verification documents as stated in L.5.2.3.1 are required. Per Section L.5.2.3.2 (c), if the SOO does not clearly indicate the NAICS code being claimed, then the contractor-generated SOW/PWS must be submitted along with the SOO.
GR4-296	(L.5.2) Relevant Experience	L.5.2.3.2	Request Government guidance for bidders on how to show that work relevant to Alliant 3 was performed if such work is not expressly stated in the SOW/PWS. What are the Government's expectations, or is the verification (signature) from the verifying Government POC in Attachment J.P-2 sufficient?	The Offeror should use the narrative section in J.P-2, A3 Primary NAICS Code Relevant Experience Project Template. The narrative section should explain why the project fits under the claimed NAICS. The J.P-2 must be validated and signed by a Cognizant Government Project Official.
GR4-297	(L.5.2) Relevant Experience	L.5.2.3.2	For non-federal contracts where price is only documented in the Statement of Work (SOW) documents, can vendors provide only the signed contract documentation or purchase order information vs. the other recommended/required documents?	The government appreciates your feedback. After a careful review and analysis of your question or comment, we believe the RFP is well-defined in this area and supportive of a competitive proposal.
GR4-298	(L.5.2) Relevant Experience	L.5.2.3.2, L.5.2.4.2, L.5.2.4.4	Regarding submitting a "contractor generated SOW/PWS" if the SOO does not clearly indicate the NAICS code being claimed: does this mean a contractor-written summary of the related work, or SOW/PWS excerpts copied and pasted into a separate file, or relevant pages from the SOW/PWS, or a complete SOW/PWS? Does a contractor generated SOW/PWS need to be signed, and if so, by whom?	RFP Sections L.5.2.3.2, L.5.2.4.2, and L.5.2.4.4 lists the required documentation. There is no requirement for a contractor generated SOW/PWS to be signed, however the associated J.P attachment(s), when applicable, do require signatures in order for the Government to validate the claimed element.

Alliant 3 Government Responses to Request For Proposal (RFP) Feedback GR Set 04_11.08.24

Response #	RFP Paragraph Reference	Specific RFP Location	Comment/Question	Government Response
GR4-299	(L.5.2) Relevant Experience	L.5.2.3.3	Section L.5.2.3.3 requires that Project Size be verified via FPDS-NG Report or contract award document. Classified federal projects not entered into FPDS cannot be verified with a FPDS-NG Report, nor can a copy of the contract award document be provided. Will the government accept the J.P-2 Attachment, signed by the customer with the value reflected to meet the verification requirement?	If claiming a NAICS for a federal contract that is not indicated on an FPDS-NG Report, a signed J.P-2 and relevant verification documents as stated in L.5.2.3.1 are required.
GR4-300	(L.5.2) Relevant Experience	L.5.2.3.3	Section L.5.2.3.3 states that "Project value for completed Projects is determined by the total obligated dollars. Project value for ongoing Projects is determined based on the total estimated value (inclusive of all option periods)." For the purposes of tagging FPDS reports in support of this requirement, can the government confirm that the FPDS "Total Action Obligation" value is the correct value to be evaluated for completed projects, and the "Base and All Options Value (Total Contract Value)" is the correct value to be evaluated against for ongoing projects?	Completed projects will utilize the "Base and Exercised Options Value", and Ongoing Projects will utilize the Base and All Options Value (Total Contract Value) fields respectively. Please note, Step 5 of page 1 of the J.P-7 attachment, it states, "Specific data fields in your report may vary from the samples depending on the contract action. The table on Page 2 of this attachment provides a crosswalk of the data fields within FPDS-NG that can provide verification of the claimed scoring elements. Please see Amendment 3, Item 1.
GR4-301	(L.5.2) Relevant Experience	L.5.2.3.4	Section L.5.2.3.4 requires a unique Funding Agency ID from the FPDS-NG Report. Classified federal projects not entered into FPDS cannot be verified with a FPDS-NG Report. Please describe how classified Federal contracts could meet the verification requirement. Will the government accept the J.P-2 Attachment, signed by the customer with the value reflected to meet the verification requirement?	If claiming a NAICS for a federal contract that is not indicated on an FPDS-NG Report, a signed J.P-2 and relevant verification documents as stated in L.5.2.3.1 are required.
GR4-302	(L.5.2) Relevant Experience	L.5.2.3.4	Section L.5.2.3.4 (Demonstrating Experience with Multiple Federal Government Customers (Federal Government Contracts Only)) states that "subcontractors will only receive credit" for Demonstrating Experience with Multiple Federal Government Customers "if the submitted J.P-4 Subcontractor Experience forms submitted indicate multiple Federal Customers." Will the Government please confirm that each completed J.P-4 Subcontractor Experience Form is not required "to indicate multiple Federal Customers" as there is only one "Customer Name" and Funding Agency ID field on each form? If multiples customers are required on a single form, please provide instructions on how offerors are to accomplish this.	The government acknowledges receipt of your question. Please refer to Amendment 3, item 57.
GR4-303	(L.5.2) Relevant Experience	L.5.2.3.4	Would the Government consider changing the verification for this element from different "Funding Agency IDs" on FPDS to "Funding Office IDs on the FPDS"?	The government appreciates your feedback. After a careful review and analysis of your question or comment, we believe the RFP is well-defined in this area and supportive of a competitive proposal.
GR4-304	(L.5.2) Relevant Experience	L.5.2.3.4	Section L.5.2.3.4 does not include instructions regarding the submission of the J.P-1 CTA document to Demonstrate Experience with Multiple Federal Government Customers for Federal Government projects performed by a member of a previous/existing CTA.	The government appreciates your feedback. After a careful review and analysis of your question or comment, we believe the RFP is well-defined in this area and supportive of a competitive proposal.
GR4-305	(L.5.2) Relevant Experience	L.5.2.3.4	Since a multi-tenant, single-award, task order contract can support several funding agencies at the Technical Direction Letter (TDL) level, will the Government accept a signed JP-2 that describes work performed under the relevant TDLs for a specific funding agency?	No, a Technical Direction Letter (TDL) is a document that provides guidance to a contractor on how to perform a task in a contract, a TDL is not a contract in itself. Please see RFP Section L.5.2.1 for the definition of a "project".
GR4-306	(L.5.2) Relevant Experience	L.5.2.3.5	Will the government allow points for hybrid contract types that are identified as Firm Fixed Price in FPDS but also contain CR type contract CLINs for labor not reflected in FPDS? If so, what evidence needs to be provided if a CR contract type is not reflected as such in the FPDS-NG report and only shown in contract documents (e.g., DD1150)?	As stated in L.5.2.3.5 Projects with Cost-Reimbursement (Federal Government Contracts Only), the Offeror must provide an FPDS-NG report that indicates a Cost-Reimbursement Contract type. Attachment J.P-2 will not be accepted as evidence, unless the contract is Classified and contains no FPDS record.
GR4-307	(L.5.2) Relevant Experience	L.5.2.3.5	Section L.5.2.3.5 does not include instructions regarding the submission of the J.P-1 CTA document to verify Projects with Cost-Reimbursement for Federal Government projects performed by a member of a previous/existing CTA.	The government appreciates your feedback. After a careful review and analysis of your question or comment, we believe the RFP is well-defined in this area and supportive of a competitive proposal.
GR4-308	(L.5.2) Relevant Experience	L.5.2.3.6	Section L.5.2.3.6 requires a FPDS-NG Report to verify performance location was a foreign location. Classified federal projects not entered into FPDS cannot be verified with a FPDS-NG Report. The contract and SOW are classified as well, and cannot be provided. Please describe how classified Federal contracts could meet the verification requirement. Will the government accept the J.P-2 Attachment, signed by the customer with the value reflected to meet the verification requirement?	If claiming a NAICS for a federal contract that is not indicated on an FPDS-NG Report, a signed J.P-2 and relevant verification documents as stated in L.5.2.3.1 are required. J.P-2 has a box to check for Foreign location. However, attachment J.P-2 does not ask for the specific foreign location to avoid divulging sensitive information.
GR4-309	(L.5.2) Relevant Experience	L.5.2.3.6	In Section L.5.2.3.6 (Foreign Location (Federal Government Contracts Only)), will the Government please confirm that offerors who submit documentation for a project reference as a Federal Government Subcontract should provide a signed-by-the-Government J.P-2 and a signed-by-the-Prime-contractor J.P-4?	Per RFP Section L.5.2.3.6, if the FPDS-NG report indicates that the principal place of performance was not a foreign location, then the Offeror must provide attachment J.P-2 is signed by the Cognizant Government Official and 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. In addition, Attachment J.P-4 must be provided and signed by the prime contractor as verification of the project work, scope, location, and value performed by the subcontractor. Please refer to Amendment 2, item 61.
GR4-310	(L.5.2) Relevant Experience	L.5.2.3.6	Will the Government please confirm that the instructions in L.5.2.3.6, along with the mention of a "required signature," are referring to a completed J.P-2, even if one isn't required by L.5.2.3.1 (Verification of Primary NAICS Code Relevant Experience Submission (Federal Government Contracts)) when the FPDS-NG report verifies all other claimed scoring elements?	Per RFP Section, L.5.2.3.6, Foreign location, "The Offeror must provide an FPDS-NG report that indicates the principal place of performance location was a foreign location. If the FPDS-NG report indicates that the principal place of performance was not a foreign location, then the Offeror must provide Attachment J.P-2 signed by the Cognizant Government Official and 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."
GR4-311	(L.5.2) Relevant Experience	L.5.2.3.6	Would the government consider allowing additional programs, or provide an alternate avenue, to more accurately illustrate our experience working in foreign countries?"	The government acknowledges receipt of your question. Please refer to Amendment 2, item 61.
GR4-312	(L.5.2) Relevant Experience	L.5.2.3.6	Foreign Location - It appears the government no longer using the term OCONUS - instead the term "foreign location" is used in the RFP. Does the government consider these to be one in the same?	Per Section L.5.2.3.6 Foreign Location is defined, for purposes of this RFP, as any country or nation outside of the United States of America (USA). The USA includes Contiguous United States (CONUS) locations, the 48 contiguous States and the District of Columbia, plus the overseas states (Alaska and Hawaii), and all Territories and Possessions of the USA, (e.g., Puerto Rico, U.S. Virgin Islands, Guam, American Samoa, and The Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands). The Government does not consider OCONUS and "foreign location" as one and the same. Per Section B.13, OCONUS stands for Outside of the contiguous United States. All foreign locations are OCONUS, but not all OCONUS locations are foreign.
GR4-313	(L.5.2) Relevant Experience	L.5.2.3.6	The RFP and J.P-16 state that a Relevant Experience Project may claim credit for non-TDY work performed in a Foreign Location even if it was not the primary place of performance. However, form J.P-2 currently reads "Project work in a foreign location must be the primary place of performance". Will the government please amend Form J.P-2 to read "Project involved work in a foreign location?"	Both L.5.2.3.6 and J.P-2 state that the primary location of performance must be a foreign location to receive this credit. J.P-16 is amended to align with this requirement. Please refer to Amendment 3, item 3.
GR4-314	(L.5.2) Relevant Experience	L.5.2.3.6	Would the Government consider changing the requirement for "principal place of performance location was a foreign location" to "principal place of performance location was a OCONUS location?"	The Government does not consider OCONUS and "foreign location" as one in the same. Per Section B.13, OCONUS stands for Outside of the Contiguous United States. All foreign locations are OCONUS, but not all OCONUS locations are foreign. See RFP Section L.5.2.3.6 for more information.

Alliant 3 Government Responses to Request For Proposal (RFP) Feedback GR Set 04_11.08.24

Response #	RFP Paragraph Reference	Specific RFP Location	Comment/Question	Government Response
GR4-315	(L.5.2) Relevant Experience	L.5.2.3.6	Companies with capability to deploy to non-foreign (OCONUS) Overseas Areas also demonstrate the methodology needed to manage complex deployments to foreign locations. Would the government please consider revising this requirement to include all OCONUS locations, inclusive of non-contiguous US states, all territories, and possessions?	The Government does not consider OCONUS and "foreign location" as one in the same. Section L.5.2.3.6, defines a Foreign Location as any country or nation outside of the United States of America (USA). OCONUS is defined as the 48 contiguous States and the District of Columbia, plus the overseas states (Alaska and Hawaii), and all Territories and Possessions of the USA, (e.g., Puerto Rico, U.S. Virgin Islands, Guam, American Samoa, and The Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands). There are additional complexities that arise when working in foreign locations, which is why offerors may receive points for demonstrating experience working in foreign locations.
GR4-316	(L.5.2) Relevant Experience	L.5.2.3.6	Section L.5.2.3.6 does not include instructions regarding the submission of the J.P-1 CTA document to verify Foreign Location for Federal Government projects performed by a member of a previous/existing CTA.	The government appreciates your feedback. After a careful review and analysis of your question or comment, we believe the RFP is well-defined in this area and supportive of a competitive proposal.
GR4-317	(L.5.2) Relevant Experience	L.5.2.4	For the Emerging Technology references, to reduce the burden on the Government, will the Government allow for an SOW/PWS, signed award document, and FPDS-NG Report as sufficient evidence to substantiate claims in lieu of the signed J.P-3 Attachments?	A signed J.P-3 is required for Emerging Technology experience.
GR4-318	(L.5.2) Relevant Experience	L.5.2.4	No Project may be used more than once within the Emerging Technology Relevant Experience. It is acceptable for the same Project to be submitted for both Primary NAICS Code Relevant Experience and Emerging Technology Relevant Experience As we can use same project for Primary NAICS Code Relevant Experience and Emerging Technology Relevant Experience but will this project qualify as a Past performance and will we be rated for this?	L.5.2.4 (a) states, "No Project may be used more than once within the Emerging Technology Relevant Experience. It is acceptable for the same Project to be submitted for both Primary NAICS Code Relevant Experience and Emerging Technology Relevant Experience." L.5.3 states, "Past performance will be evaluated using only Projects submitted under L.5.2.2, Primary NAICS Code Relevant Experience."
GR4-319	(L.5.2) Relevant Experience	L.5.2.4	Please clarify what the minimum dollar value to submit project under Emerging Technology?	RFP Section L.5.2.4(d), "Individual Project Value must be equal to or greater than \$1,000,000...The Emerging Technology performed within the project submitted may comprise only a portion of the overall Scope in the Project rather than be required to comprise the entire Scope; consequently, the dollar value of the Emerging Technology requirement/deliverable may be a less than the required minimum of the \$1-Million-dollar project." See RFP Section L.5.2.4.2, Verification of Emerging Technology Relevant Experience Submission.
GR4-320	(L.5.2) Relevant Experience	L.5.2.4	In L.5.2.4, the Final RFP made an unexpected change to the performance timing requirement for Emerging Technology relevant experience projects—requiring a year of performance measured from the "date the solicitation is released" rather than the "date proposals are due". Given that GSA provided that guidance for several months and even instructed that offerors could use Draft RFP J.P-3 forms to start the client signature process, would the government consider changing the timing language to "the date proposals are due"? With a 4 month RFP response period, this change is particularly significant.	L.5.2.4(c) establishes the age recency parameters for the Relevant Experience project. All projects must be aged 5 years or less from when the RFP was issued. Thus, given the RFP issuance date of June 28, 2024, all Relevant Experience projects must be ongoing or completed after June 27, 2019. L.5.2.4 (d) establishes whether the Relevant Experience project provides sufficient amounts of performance in order to be assessed. Relevant Experience projects must demonstrate a sufficiency of actual performance, and are not eligible for assessment until they are either complete, or have one year's worth of performance. The age recency requirement of L.5.2.4(c) does not apply to the L.5.2.4 (d) performance sufficiency period, thus a 5 years old or less Relevant Experience project (which meets the age requirement of L.5.2.4 (c)), that is completed or reaches one year of performance prior to proposal submission has acceptable performance amounts (that meets the requirements of L.5.2.4(d)). Please refer to Amendment 3, Items 45 and 68.
GR4-321	(L.5.2) Relevant Experience	L.5.2.4	L.5.2.4 states that "No Project may be used more than once within the Emerging Technology Relevant Experience" - how is project being defined? If we have a unique team performing one emerging technology and another unique team performing a different emerging technology but they charge to the same contract, are we able to count them as two projects or just one?	Please see RFP Section L.5.2.1 for the definition of a "project". Per RFP Section L.5.2.4 bullet point (a), no Project may be used more than once within the Emerging Technology Relevant Experience. It is acceptable for the same Project to be submitted for both Primary NAICS Code Relevant Experience and Emerging Technology Relevant Experience.
GR4-322	(L.5.2) Relevant Experience	L.5.2.4	For a project performed as a sub-contractor is attachment J.P-3 to be signed by the Government CO and provided along with Attachment J. P-4?	Yes, for a federal project performed as a subcontractor an attachment J.P-4 and a Government CO signed attachment J.P-3 is required. If the Government CO is not available then a Cognizant Government Official must sign the J.P-3 attachment.
GR4-323	(L.5.2) Relevant Experience	L.5.2.4, L.5.2.4.4	For OTSBs, please confirm that the Small Business Emerging Technology Solutions Engagement references can also be submitted as five of the potential 33 Emerging Technology references in RFP section L.5.2.4. And if so, please confirm that all documents (e.g., J.P-3, etc.) for Emerging Technology will need to be submitted.	No, the Emerging Technology Relevant Experience in Section L.5.2.4.2 is separate and distinct from the SB Emerging Technology Solutions Engagement. The Emerging Technology Relevant Experience in Section L.5.2.4.2 is the Offeror's experience. The SB Emerging Technology Solutions Engagement in Section L.5.2.4.4 is the OTSB Offeror meeting with a SB that has experience with Emerging Technology and learning about their experience for potential future subcontracting opportunities for the SB. Please refer to Amendment 2, Items 66 which provide further clarity on what types of documentation are required.
GR4-324	(L.5.2) Relevant Experience	L.5.2.4.1	Section L.5.2.4.1 (Emerging Technology Listing) describes each of the Emerging Technologies (ET). Most of the eleven ETs describe what offerors should consider as "acceptable citations"; however, there are no acceptable citations or expectations presented for ET5) Edge Computing, ET6) Extended Reality, or ET11) Zero Trust Networks. Will the Government please provide guidance on acceptable citations for Edge Computing, Extended Reality (XR), and Zero Trust Networks to allow offerors to fully comply with their expectations?	Offerors should include citations for Edge Computing, Extended Reality (XR), and Zero Trust Networks in the narrative section of J.P-3 as an Emerging Technology listed in Section L.5.2.4.1. The Offeror should describe how the selected Emerging Technology (ET) was integral to performance of the project (see RFP Section L.5.2.4.2).
GR4-325	(L.5.2) Relevant Experience	L.5.2.4.1	In Section L.5.2.4.1 where it states: "Acceptable citations must clearly include Emerging Technology cited with the scope statement highlighted to indicate the activity that qualifies including – but not limited to – the list of examples below." Please confirm that not all examples from the list of activities must be included in the project citation for a project to be relevant? Does the offeror have discretion as to what activities they cite as relevant so long as they meet the intent of the emerging technology area?	The government confirms that not all examples from the list of activities must be included in the project citation for a project to be relevant. The Offeror has discretion as to what activities they cite as relevant so long as they meet the intent of the emerging technology area.
GR4-326	(L.5.2) Relevant Experience	L.5.2.4.2	Will the Government please confirm the list of required documents needed to verify subcontractor Emerging Technology projects? It is clear that to verify this project work, we must provide an Attachment J. P-4 signed by the prime contractor that delineates the value and scope of the subcontracted work. Are the Award Form (L.5.2.3.2 (b)) and the Contract Statement of Work / Performance Work Statement with an accompanying index to the relevant passages (L.5.2.3.2 (c)) the only additional documents needed?	L.5.2.4.2 (d) states that Offerors may use work as a subcontractor for both Federal and Commercial projects. However, they may only use the value and scope of the work subcontracted. In addition to the project verification requirements under Section L.5.2.4, which shall be provided for the prime award, they must also provide Attachment J.P-4 signed by the prime contractor as verification of the project work, scope and value performed by the subcontractor. All required documents in L.5.2.4.2 must be provided for the Prime Contract in addition to the J.P-4 form for the subcontract.
GR4-327	(L.5.2) Relevant Experience	L.5.2.4.2	Will the Government please confirm that submission of a subcontract agreement with the prime contractor on a Government project is an acceptable contract award document when submitting a subcontract as an Emerging Technology Relevant Experience Project?	No, the submission of a subcontract agreement with the prime is not an acceptable contract award document when submitting a subcontract as an ET relevant experience project. Attachment J.P-4 must be provided and signed by the prime contractor as verification of the project work, scope, location, and value performed by the subcontractor in addition to all information required by L.5.2.4.2 for the Prime Contract.
GR4-328	(L.5.2) Relevant Experience	L.5.2.4.2	For Emerging Technologies, will the government accept the OTA agreement as evidence of an awarded federal contract which is signed by the Consortium as the representative government officer?	The government acknowledges receipt of your question. Please refer to Amendment 2, Item 62.
GR4-329	(L.5.2) Relevant Experience	L.5.2.4.2	Section L.5.2.4.2 does not include instructions regarding the submission of the J.P-1 CTA document to verify Emerging Technology Relevant Experience for projects performed by a member of a previous/existing CTA.	The government appreciates your feedback. After a careful review and analysis of your question or comment, we believe the RFP is well-defined in this area and supportive of a competitive proposal.

Alliant 3 Government Responses to Request For Proposal (RFP) Feedback GR Set 04_11.08.24

Response #	RFP Paragraph Reference	Specific RFP Location	Comment/Question	Government Response
GR4-330	(L.5.2) Relevant Experience	L.5.2.4.2	For the emerging technology projects, the RFP currently states that the SOW needs to be highlighted to demonstrate relevance. We would like the government to recommend that all contractual documentation be accepted as evidence, such as project deliverables, modifications, schedule B containing description of services and labor categories, etc. Due to the nature of these technologies, many times the use of them in programs becomes relevant after a program has already started, and thereafter the description of the original scope of work might not contain the required information.	The government acknowledges receipt of your question. Please refer to Response# GR1-17 from the Attachment A3 GR Set 01_08.23.24.
GR4-331	(L.5.2) Relevant Experience	L.5.2.4.2	Occasionally agencies restrict or prohibit the sharing of awards and statements of work outside the issuing agency, even if those documents are unclassified. This is particularly true in the Emerging Technologies pertaining to system and infrastructure security (e.g., cybersecurity, zero trust, edge computing, and quantum computing). Would the government allow for signed J.P-3 forms to be submitted to substantiate statements of fact that cannot be found in releasable contract documents (e.g., due to classification or other sensitivities)? This approach was used effectively under both OASIS+ and ASTRO as an alternative for offerors to obtain client certification for specific scoring elements.	In addition to the signed Attachment J.P-3, the offerors are required to submit items listed in RFP section L.5.2.4.2 (a) through (e). Offerors must work with Contracting Officers or Contracting Officer Representative to meet this requirement.
GR4-332	(L.5.2) Relevant Experience	L.5.2.4.2, L.5.1.4	Are Letters of Commitment also required for Other Than Small Business Offerors with new subcontractors who submit Emerging Technology Relevant experience?	Small Business with Subcontractor offerors may use the relevant experience in section L.5.1.4.2-Alt Small Business with Subcontractors, If Applicable. However, Other Than Small Business Offerors with first-tier subcontractors must use the OTSB Offeror's UEI number and will not be allowed to use the relevant experience, past performance, systems, certifications, and clearances of the First-Tier subcontractors for their proposal submission per RFP Section L.5.1.4.
GR4-333	(L.5.2) Relevant Experience	L.5.2.4.2, L.5.2.4.4, Symphony	Are Emerging Technology Projects and Small Business Emerging Technology Solutions to be placed in the Symphony Projects/Past Performance folder?	Symphony provides the specific file locations associated with all proposal submission elements. It is the Offerors' responsibility to upload files in the correct file locations within symphony.
GR4-334	(L.5.2) Relevant Experience	L.5.2.4.2(a)	Please rephrase the requirement for Attachment J.P-3 to "If the Cognizant Contracting Officer's signature is unattainable, the Government will accept the signature of the Contracting Officer's Representative (COR) or other Government Employee with cognizance over the project."	No adjustments to J.P-2 or J.P-3 will be made at this time. Please see Amendment 0003 for related edits made to the RFP to provide further clarity and alignment between the signatory requirements of the J.P attachments and the instruction in the RFP. Please see Amendment 3 item numbers 49 and 71.
GR4-335	(L.5.2) Relevant Experience	L.5.2.4.2(a)	In L.5.2.4.2(a) the RFP requires the signature of the Cognizant Contracting Officer, or the signature of the Contracting Officer's Representative (COR) if the Cognizant Contracting Officer's signature is unattainable on the J.P-3. Please confirm that if an offeror obtains the Cognizant Contracting Officer's signature, they should leave the second signature box on the J.P-3 form Part II blank.	Only one signature is required on J.P-3, but the contact information is required for both boxes. Please refer to Amendment 3, item 71.
GR4-336	(L.5.2) Relevant Experience	L.5.2.4.2(c)	Regarding submitting a "contractor generated SOW/PWS" if the SOO doesn't clearly describe the Emerging Technology(s) being claimed: does this mean a contractor-written summary of the related work SOW/PWS excerpts copied and pasted into a separate file, or relevant pages from the SOW/PWS? Does a contractor generated SOW/PWS need to be signed, and if so, by whom?	RFP Sections L.5.2.3.2, L.5.2.4.2, and L.5.2.4.4 lists the required documentation. There is no requirement for a contractor generated SOW/PWS to be signed, however the associated J.P attachment(s), when applicable, do require signatures in order for the Government to validate the claimed element.
GR4-337	(L.5.2) Relevant Experience	L.5.2.4.2(e)	Paragraph (e) cites submitting a signed J.P-6 form. However, Emerging Technologies do not require Past Performance. Please clarify if Past Performance is required in the situation called out in paragraph (e).	The government acknowledges receipt of your question. Please refer to Amendment 3, item 74.
GR4-338	(L.5.2) Relevant Experience	L.5.2.4.3	Will the Government please confirm that the maximum points of 1,500 will be awarded for having eight (8) or more different ET categories (not seven)?	The government confirms 1,500 points will be awarded for demonstrating eight (8) or more different ET categories. Please refer to Amendment 2, item 65.
GR4-339	(L.5.2) Relevant Experience	L.5.2.4.3	In Section L.5.2.4.3, will the Government please confirm that Section L.5.2.4.1 should refer to Emerging Technology projects submitted under L.5.2.4 (Emerging Technology Relevant Experience) or L.5.2.4.2 (Verification of Emerging Technology Relevant Experience Submission)?	The government acknowledges receipt of your question. Please refer to Amendment 3, item 76.
GR4-340	(L.5.2) Relevant Experience	L.5.2.4.3	Section L.5.2.4.3 states that "a maximum of eleven (11) Emerging Technology Projects may be submitted under L.5.2.4.1 for Emerging Technology points." Section L.5.2.4.1 is just a listing of Emerging Technologies. Should this text instead reference Section L.5.2.4.3, as this section defines scoring for demonstrating a breadth of emerging technology experience?	RFP Section L.5.2.4.1 contains the list of Emerging Technology projects and L.5.2.4.2 is the submission process for Emerging Technology relevant experience. L.5.2.4.3 refers to credit for the breadth and depth of Emerging Technology experience across the 11 Emerging Technology categories as listed in L.5.2.4.1 and claimed by the Offeror as defined in L.5.2.4.2. Please refer to Amendment 3, item 76.
GR4-341	(L.5.2) Relevant Experience	L.5.2.4.4	Small Business Emerging Technology demonstrations - Does the government intend for these small businesses to be listed in SAM.gov under one of the NAICS listed in L.5.2.3 or can any small business provide a demonstration as long as it aligns to the emerging technology areas listed in L.5.2.4.1?	L.5.2.4.4, Small Business Emerging Technology Solutions Engagement requires a NAICS Code to verify that the Business qualifies as a Small Business under the project NAICS code in SAM.gov as an Emerging Technology Relevant Experience as listed in L.5.2.4.1.
GR4-342	(L.5.2) Relevant Experience	L.5.2.4.4	What kind of documentation is the Government expecting from Offerors for a Small Business Emerging Technology Solutions Engagement?	Please refer to the updated RFP (V.4) Section L.5.2.4.4, released on 9/19/24 in SAM.Gov. In addition, see Amendment 2, items 66 and 67, which provide further clarification on what type of documentation is required.
GR4-343	(L.5.2) Relevant Experience	L.5.2.4.4	Paragraph 1 in RFP Section L.5.2.4.4 states: "A Small Business Emerging Technology Solutions Engagement is a documented, one-on-one meeting between an Other than Small Business (OTSB) Offeror and a Small Business which has delivered an Emerging Technology Solution for any single Emerging Technology listed in L.5.2.4.1, where the SB may present its Emerging Technology solution and capabilities to the OTSB Offeror." What kind of information regarding the one-on-one meeting with an OTSB and SB is the Government requiring Offerors to provide?	Section L.5.2.4.4 details what evidence is required for the OTSB engagement with the SB with ET experience.
GR4-344	(L.5.2) Relevant Experience	L.5.2.4.4	In Paragraph 1 of Section L.5.2.4.4, is the Government looking for information from a one-on-one meeting between an OTSB and SB or the work that the small business has provided?	Please refer to the updated RFP (V.4) Section L.5.2.4.4, released on 9/19/24 in SAM.Gov. In addition, see Amendment 2, items 66 and 67, which provide further clarification on what type of documentation is required.
GR4-345	(L.5.2) Relevant Experience	L.5.2.4.4	Will we be scored for a proof of concept developed for the Veterans Health Administration (VHA) as part of our relevant experience under Small Business Emerging Technology Solutions Engagement which was unpaid?	No, Per RFP Section L.5.2(b) the Emerging Technology category of relevant experience is tied solely to the Projects submitted under Section L.5.2.4.4, Emerging Technology Relevant Experience. The Offeror must document and attach verification documents in accordance with L.5.2.4.2. Furthermore, L.5.2.4.4 (a)(2) informs offerors that the Small Business Emerging Technology Solutions project value must be equal or greater to \$100,000.
GR4-346	(L.5.2) Relevant Experience	L.5.2.4.4	Can an Other Than Small Business form a CTA with Small Business and vice-versa?	Yes, an Other Than Small Business (OTSB) can form a Contractor Team Arrangement (CTA) with a Small Business, and vice-versa, but there are important considerations and rules depending on the Offeror's business size and the type of CTA.
GR4-347	(L.5.2) Relevant Experience	L.5.2.4.4	Will the government confirm that the \$100,000 and five year project threshold is related to the small business' emerging technology solution presented to the other than small business, and not the cost of the engagement?	The government confirms that the \$100,000 and five year project threshold is related to the small business' emerging technology solution presented to the Other Than Small Business, and not the cost of the engagement.
GR4-348	(L.5.2) Relevant Experience	L.5.2.4.4	Please confirm that of the requirement of up to 33 ET REPs INCLUDES the maximum of 5 small business ET engagement REPs.	The requirement of up to 33 ET REPs does not include the maximum of five (5) Small Business Emerging Technology Solution engagement REPs. The maximum of 33 ET Relevant Experience Projects are work performed by the Offeror. The maximum of 5 SB ET Engagements are demonstrations to the OTSB Offeror of a SB ET capability.

Alliant 3 Government Responses to Request For Proposal (RFP) Feedback GR Set 04_11.08.24

Response #	RFP Paragraph Reference	Specific RFP Location	Comment/Question	Government Response
GR4-349	(L.5.2) Relevant Experience	L.5.2.4.4	Please confirm the five (5) Small Business Emerging Technology Solution engagements must be one of the emerging technology projects already claimed in L.5.2.4.	The requirement of up to 33 ET REP's does not include the maximum of five (5) Small Business Emerging Technology Solution Engagement REP's. The maximum of 33 ET Relevant Experience Projects are work performed by the Offeror. The maximum of 5 SB ET Engagements are demonstrations to the OTSB Offeror of a SB ET capability.
GR4-350	(L.5.2) Relevant Experience	L.5.2.4.4	Please confirm that the Government will accept a Small Business Emerging Technology Solutions Engagement under NAICS 541715- "Research and Development in the Physical, Engineering and Life Sciences" given that most of the emerging technology solutions would fall under research and development related work.	The Government will accept a Small Business Emerging Technology Solutions Engagement under NAICS 541715, as long as the Small Business is listed as a small business under that NAICS code and the required project documentation as listed in L.5.2.4.4 support the claim that the ET was integral to the project.
GR4-351	(L.5.2) Relevant Experience	L.5.2.4.4	The RFP allows an OTSB Offeror to "submit a MAXIMUM of five (5) Small Business Emerging Technology Solutions Engagements." For existing JVs, if a Small Business is a JV partner and is using a project from the Small Business as an Emerging Technology Relevant Experience project (L.5.2.4), is the JV allowed to claim credit for that as a small business engagement under this section?	Yes, the RFP allows an OTSB Offeror to claim points for current projects resulting from previous small business engagement for Small Business Emerging Technology Solutions Engagements, provided the project meets the criteria outlined in RFP Section L.5.2.4.4.
GR4-352	(L.5.2) Relevant Experience	L.5.2.4.4, Symphony	An OTSB Offeror may submit a MAXIMUM of five (5) Small Business Emerging Technology Solutions Engagements. In Symphony, when claiming credit for this area, the system only allows offerors to select an Emerging Technology category. Should this be updated to reflect a drop down of the offeror's existing projects instead, along with the corresponding verification documents?	No, the five (5) Small Business Engagement submissions are not the same as the maximum of 33 Emerging Technology Relevant Experience Projects. The Emerging Technology Relevant Experience submissions reflect work performed by the Offeror. The SB Engagement submissions are demonstrations of SB ET capabilities to OTSB Offerors.
GR4-353	(L.5.2) Relevant Experience	L.5.2.4.4(c)	L.5.2.4.4 Paragraph (c) states only one of the listed contract award documents will be accepted as supporting evidence for the explicitly identified fields. For engagements where the Small Business was the subcontractor and is unable to obtain a single document that shows all required evidence/fields, will the Government accept multiple documents to verify all required fields?	The Offeror may provide multiple documents from the list in RFP Section L.5.2.4.4 (c) to verify the information requested. Symphony allows for the attachment of multiple documents for each scoring element. Please refer to Amendment 3, item 77.
GR4-354	(L.5.2) Relevant Experience	L.5.2.4.4(c)	Can the government confirm that the SOO or SOW/PWS and associated index are not required for federal projects?	The government acknowledges receipt of your question. Please refer to Amendment 2, item 66.
GR4-355	(L.5.2) Relevant Experience	L.5.2.4(a)	If using an IDIQ contract as Primary NAICS Code Relevant Experience, can multiple discrete task orders under that IDIQ contract be used as Emerging Technology Relevant Experience projects?	No, multiple discrete task orders cannot be combined under a single IDIQ contract for a single Emerging Technology Relevant Experience project. Please see Amendment 3, item 66.
GR4-356	(L.5.2) Relevant Experience	L.5.2.4(a)	Will the Government accept submission of individual, distinct TOs/SOWs supported as a subcontractor under a single prime contractor's IDIQ as distinct projects for purposes of demonstrating Emerging Technology experience?	Yes, the Government will accept submission of individual, distinct TOs/SOWs supported as a subcontractor under a single prime contractor's IDIQ as distinct projects for purposes of demonstrating Emerging Technology experience (see L.5.2.4.2(d)). Attachment J.P-4 must be provided and signed by the prime contractor as verification of the project work, scope, location, and value performed by the subcontractor in addition to all information required by L.5.2.4.2 for the Prime Contract, as applicable.
GR4-357	(L.5.2) Relevant Experience	L.5.2.4(c)	Paragraph (c) states "If the relevant experience project was not fully completed but at least one year of performance was not completed..." Please confirm that the "but" should be an "or".	The government acknowledges receipt of your question. Please refer to Amendment 3, items 43 and 67.
GR4-358	(L.5.2) Relevant Experience	L.5.2.4(c)	This section states that "with respect to performance, each Emerging Technology Relevant Experience Project must be complete or have at least one year of performance." We recommend that projects with a year of performance by the proposal submission date be eligible for submission as an Emerging Technology REP.	The government acknowledges receipt of your question. Please refer to Amendment 3, item 68.
GR4-359	(L.5.2) Relevant Experience	L.5.2.4(d)	Some of our Commercial/Non-Government projects do not have a defined total contract value at the Master Service Agreement level. Will the Government accept the value listed on the J.P-3 document, which will be signed by our customer, as validation of the total project value?	Yes, the Government will accept the value listed on the J.P-3 document, signed by the cognizant government official for Federal Contracts or the cognizant corporate official for Non-Federal Contracts, as validation of the total project value.
GR4-360	(L.5.2) Relevant Experience	L.5.2.4(d)	For classified programs/programs without an FPDS report, will the Government be willing to accept CPARS to demonstrate the Period of Performance and Total Contract Value?	If claiming a NAICS for a federal contract that is not indicated on an FPDS-NG Report, a signed J.P-2 and relevant verification documents as stated in L.5.2.3.1 are required. For Emerging Technology, a signed J.P-3 and relevant verification documents as stated in L.5.2.4.2 are required.
GR4-361	(L.5.2) Relevant Experience	L.5.3, L.5.2.4.2(e)	Can the Government please confirm that submitting Past Performance documentation is acceptable per Section L.5.2.4.2(e) for completed projects with less than one year of performance?	Emerging Technologies Relevant Experience does not require a CPARS report or Attachment J.P-6. Please also refer to Amendment 3, item 74.
GR4-362	(L.5.3) Past Performance for Relevant Experience Projects	L.5.3	Please confirm that for work performed as a subcontractor, the offeror's prime for the work must complete Attachment J.P-6 since no CPAR exists for the subcontractor.	Per RFP section L.5.3, Offerors are required to provide either a CPARS report or a signed J.P-6 attachment for the Prime Contract to receive the Past Performance for Relevant Experience Project points during evaluation.
GR4-363	(L.5.3) Past Performance for Relevant Experience Projects	L.5.3	If past performance will only be assessed for Primary NAICS Code Relevant Projects, would the Government consider removing the requirement for Contractor Performance Assessment Reporting System (CPARS) / J.P-6 for the Emerging Technology Relevant Projects (L.5.2.4.2, [e])?	The government acknowledges receipt of your question. Please refer to Amendment 3, item 74.
GR4-364	(L.5.3) Past Performance for Relevant Experience Projects	L.5.3	If submitting a Primary NAICS Relevant Experience Project awarded to its existing Joint Venture (JV) entity, can an Offeror submit the JV's CPARS for Past Performance credit or is a J.P-6 required?	Per Section L.5.3, only in the event CPARS information is not available will an Offeror submit Attachment J.P-6.
GR4-365	(L.5.3) Past Performance for Relevant Experience Projects	L.5.3	If we are using any Past Performance from a company that was awarded prior to our acquisition of that company, can we claim that as small business?	The Government appreciates your question. Upon review, we found that the information provided does not contain sufficient detail to enable us to deliver a thorough and accurate response.
GR4-366	(L.5.3) Past Performance for Relevant Experience Projects	L.5.3, L.5.3.1, L.5.3.2, L.5.2.2(d)	"Section L.5.2.2.d requires that either CPARS, a completed Award Fee Determination, or a completed A3 Past Performance Rating Template are required if at least one year of performance was not completed. However, section L.5.3 states that each Relevant Past Performance Citations must include a copy of the CPARS or A3 Past Performance Rating Template. Please confirm if the Relevant Past Performance Citation has more than 1 year of performance in the base year that L.5.3 requirements do not apply for these citations.	The requirements in Sections L.5.2 (Relevant Experience) and L.5.3 (Past Performance) are distinct and separate evaluation factors. L.5.2.2 provides a list of conditions in which each Relevant Experience Project must meet for proposal credit. L.5.3 provides the criteria to earn points for Past Performance. The Government will not credit points for Past Performance based solely on submissions made in L.5.2. In order to receive points for L.5.3, offerors must provide Past Performance evidence in accordance with that section. Amendment 3, item 46 provides an adjustment of language to provide clarity.
GR4-367	(L.5.3) Past Performance for Relevant Experience Projects	L.5.3.1	If the CPAR was issued at the IDIQ level and not at the TO level can an IDIQ CPAR which states that all task order evaluations are incorporated into the CPAR be submitted to verify the task order past performance?	Yes, an IDIQ CPAR which states that all task order evaluations are incorporated into the CPAR can be submitted to verify the task order past performance. Also, see Amendment 2, item 57.
GR4-368	(L.5.3) Past Performance for Relevant Experience Projects	L.5.3.1	The Government requires offerors to submit the most recent CPARS report for a given REP. Will the Government confirm that they will accept and evaluate any current CPARS pulled after the solicitation date of 6/28/24?	Per Section L.5.3.1, the final CPARS Past Performance information from a Relevant Experience Project will be used to assess Past Performance. If a final CPARS rating is not available, the most current Past Performance information from CPARS will be used.
GR4-369	(L.5.3) Past Performance for Relevant Experience Projects	L.5.3.1, L.5.3.2	When the Offeror is submitting multiple CPARS or J.P-6 forms for a collection of task orders to claim NAICS Relevant Experience Past Performance, how do we identify, or link, all of the files?	The government acknowledges receipt of your question. Please refer to Amendment 2, item 58.
GR4-370	(L.5.3) Past Performance for Relevant Experience Projects	L.5.3.2	For projects performed as a subcontractor, if an offeror is unable to have their prime complete the Past Performance Rating Template, Attachment J.P-6, is it acceptable to have J.P-6 completed by the CO, COR, or COTR who has cognizance over the prime contract?	Yes, this is acceptable. In accordance with RFP Section L.5.3.2, The Offeror must provide the Attachment J.P-6 directly to each of the references from whom the Offeror seeks a performance rating template. The Past Performance Rating Template must be completed and signed by either a Contracting Officer or a Corporate Officer with cognizance over the project for the ordering activity. Also see instructions in L.5.3.2 for instances when the Offeror is unable to obtain a record of Past Performance (either CPARS or a completed Attachment J.P-6) for any Primary NAICS Code Relevant Experience Project.

Alliant 3 Government Responses to Request For Proposal (RFP) Feedback GR Set 04_11.08.24

Response #	RFP Paragraph Reference	Specific RFP Location	Comment/Question	Government Response
GR4-371	(L.5.3) Past Performance for Relevant Experience Projects	L.5.3.2	Past Performance rating forms are typically submitted directly to the Government Agency because they include sensitive information on contractor performance. Will the government allow J.P-6 Past Performance Rating Templates to be submitted directly to GSA such that we cannot upload them to Symphony?	As stated in RFP Section L.3.4, Offerors must provide all documentation and proposal contents exclusively via Symphony. Proposals submitted through other methods will not be considered.
GR4-372	(L.5.3) Past Performance for Relevant Experience Projects	L.5.3.2	The requirement states, "The Offeror must provide the Attachment J. P-6 directly to each of the references from whom the Offeror seeks a performance rating template. 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." Will the government add Program/Project Manager to the list of acceptable persons with cognizance over the project?	The government acknowledges receipt of your question. Please refer to Amendment 3, item 79.
GR4-373	(L.5.4) Systems, Certifications, and Clearances	L.5.4	When bidding as part of a Contractor Teaming Arrangement (CTA) in both OTSB (Other Than Small Business) and SB (Small Business) categories, can any member of the teaming partner present their Systems, Certifications, and Clearances? Suppose if bidding as a joint venture, can any member of the venture highlight these qualifications, or in a Prime-Sub CTA, can the subcontractor showcase their Systems, Certifications, and Clearances?	Per RFP Section L.5.1.1, An Offeror must ensure that only one proposal is submitted in response to this solicitation. Offerors shall not submit multiple offers under their own entity, an affiliated entity, or via an offer in which they are participating through a Contractor Teaming Arrangement (CTA). The one proposal offered must represent the sole response from the Offeror and all of its affiliated entities (either as a singular Offeror or CTA member). Per RFP Section L.5.1.4, an Offeror (OTSB, SB) submitting a proposal as an existing CTA may use the systems, certifications, and clearances of the CTA members with the exception of an OTSB with First-Tier Subcontractors.
GR4-374	(L.5.4) Systems, Certifications, and Clearances	L.5.4.1	RFP Section L.5.4.1, Accounting System and Audit Information, Part 2, requires an official letter to reference FAR 16.301-3(a)(3), our letter references DFARS 252.242-7006. Will the government accept the DFARS equivalent to FAR 16.301-3(a)(3)?	An official letter referencing DFARS 252.242-7006 is acceptable when it is received from the federal auditing agency on their agency letterhead from DCAA, DCMA, or CFA indicating unequivocally that the Offeror's accounting system has been audited and determined adequate for determining costs applicable to the contract or order.
GR4-375	(L.5.4) Systems, Certifications, and Clearances	L.5.4.1- L.5.4.5	Our supporting documentation does not have the UEI but does have the CAGE Code. Does the CAGE code suffice?	RFP Section L.5.4.1, Part 1 requires the CAGE code and UEI. Part 2, the supporting documentation, does not need to contain a UEI.
GR4-376	(L.5.4) Systems, Certifications, and Clearances	L.5.4.1, L.5.4.2, L.5.4.3, L.5.4.4, L.5.4.5	It is our understanding, that we do not have authority to release CUI-labeled audit reports. Would it be acceptable to provide the DCAA/DCMA audit report number (which includes the performing audit office) and the issue date so that the audit report can be validated inside USG channels?	No, providing the DCAA/DCMA audit report number alone is unacceptable. Offerors are required to provide DCAA/DCMA audit reports if claiming points for different systems. GSA requires the reports as evidence of the audit in order to validate the claim. The standard for access to CUI is a "lawful government purpose." This is defined as "any activity, mission, function, operation, or endeavor that the U.S. Government authorizes or recognizes as within the scope of its legal authorities or the legal authorities of a nonexecutive branch entity." (32 CFR 2002.4(bb))
GR4-377	(L.5.4) Systems, Certifications, and Clearances	L.5.4.1, L.5.4.2, L.5.4.3, L.5.4.4, L.5.4.5	Please confirm you will score DCAA/DCMA audited systems as greater value in scoring than ones audited by NASA or similar.	The government acknowledges receipt of your question. Please refer to Amendment 2, items 91-96.
GR4-378	(L.5.4) Systems, Certifications, and Clearances	L.5.4.10	The government should evaluate Facility Clearance Levels for all members of a JV, because any JV member that does not hold a clearance may not staff employees on any Task Order with clearance requirements. This could result in situations where a JV member holds critical capabilities, such as CMMI or ISO certification, for the JV but cannot support a classified Task Order. The government should adjust the scoring to award an additional 1,000 points to individual offerors who hold a Top Secret FCL, or if the JV itself holds a Top Secret FCL.	The government appreciates your feedback. After a careful review and analysis of your question or comment, we believe the RFP is well-defined in this area and supportive of a competitive proposal.
GR4-379	(L.5.4) Systems, Certifications, and Clearances	L.5.4.3	Would GSA consider allowing points for provisional rates?	Yes, the government will consider allowing points for provisional rates. The government considers Approved Provisional Billing Rates a type of Approved Billing Rate.
GR4-380	(L.5.4) Systems, Certifications, and Clearances	L.5.4.3	For many businesses who have limited cost-reimbursable contracts, the government has determined annual audits of billing rates are not required since these companies are deemed to be "low risk" to the government and were not selected for audit. For Offerors who are in this situation, will the government allow for the submission of their most recent approved billing rates as well as the most recent letter stating that an audit was not conducted due to the "low risk" nature of the company to receive points for L.5.4.3?	Yes, for Offerors who are in this situation, the government will allow for the submission of their most recent DCAA low risk determination memorandum stating that an incurred cost audit was not conducted due to the "low risk" nature of the company to satisfy L.5.4.3 (b) Part II. Please refer to Amendment 3, items 4, 37, 38, 80, 81, 82, and 88.
GR4-381	(L.5.4) Systems, Certifications, and Clearances	L.5.4.3	Would GSA accept a signed NICRA letter as sufficient proof of approved billing rates?	Yes, a signed Negotiated Indirect Cost Rate Agreement (NICRA) letter is acceptable to satisfy L.5.4.3 (b) Part II.
GR4-382	(L.5.4) Systems, Certifications, and Clearances	L.5.4.3	Per Section L.5.4.3: "If claiming credit for this scoring element, the Offeror must provide verification from the Defense Contract Audit Agency (DCAA), or Defense Contract Management Agency (DCMA), or any Cognizant Federal Agency (CFA) of Forward Pricing Rate Agreements (FPRA), Forward Pricing Rate Recommendations, and/or Approved Billing..." Will the Government also accept an Offeror's Forward Pricing Rate Proposals (FPRP) as verification of their proposed indirect rates?	No, the government will not accept a Forward Pricing Rate Proposal as current verification of Forward Pricing Rate Agreements (FPRA), Forward Pricing Rate Recommendations, and/or Approved Billing Rates. Please refer to Amendment 2, item 77 which is related to this question.
GR4-383	(L.5.4) Systems, Certifications, and Clearances	L.5.4.4	Would the government allow a 3rd party evaluator to demonstrate that an EVMS is compliant with EIA Standard-748?	No, the government will not allow a third-party evaluator to demonstrate that an EVMS is compliant with EIA Standard-748.
GR4-384	(L.5.4) Systems, Certifications, and Clearances	L.5.4.4	Can Offeror claim credit for EVMS of an Affiliate if we have a dual signed MRCL?	Yes, EVMS is a business system and is covered under a MRCL. RFP Section L. 5.1.5 "GSA will allow an Offeror to take credit for evaluation elements involving relevant experience, Past Performance, system(s), certification(s), and facility clearances from a Parent Company, Affiliate, Division, and/or Subsidiary so long as there is a meaningful and operational relationship with the Offeror or CTA member(s), except for MRCLs offered by FAR 9.601(2) OTSB CTA first tier subcontractor members. If an Offeror intends to claim credit for the system(s) and certification(s) and/or facility clearance of a Parent Company, Affiliate, Division, and/or Subsidiary, the MRCL must describe the details of how the Offeror will access and apply their meaningful relationship capabilities to perform on Task Orders issued under the Master Contract."
GR4-385	(L.5.4) Systems, Certifications, and Clearances	L.5.4.6	L.5.4.6 Capability Maturity Model Integration (CMMI) Certification notes that certification must be active as of the initial solicitation close date. Respectfully request that the Government consider CMMI Level III or higher 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 and is expected to have the necessary certificate in hand by award.	The government acknowledges receipt of your question. Please refer to Amendment 2, item 82.
GR4-386	(L.5.4) Systems, Certifications, and Clearances	L.5.4.7	L.5.4.7 ISO 9001:2015 Certification notes that certification must be active as of the date the solicitation is released. Respectfully request that the Government consider ISO 9001:2015 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 83.
GR4-387	(L.5.4) Systems, Certifications, and Clearances	L.5.4.8	Could an offeror use ISO 223011 as an acceptable substitute in lieu of ISO/IEC 20000-1:2018 and receive related points?	No, an offeror will not earn points for certification substitutions.
GR4-388	(L.5.4) Systems, Certifications, and Clearances	L.5.4.8	Can Offeror claim credit for ISO 20000 of an Affiliate if we have a dual signed MRCL?	Yes, an Offeror can claim credit for ISO 20000 of an Affiliate if they have a dual signed MRCL.

Alliant 3 Government Responses to Request For Proposal (RFP) Feedback GR Set 04_11.08.24

Response #	RFP Paragraph Reference	Specific RFP Location	Comment/Question	Government Response
GR4-389	(L.5.5.1) Financial Resources	L.5.5.1	Under the instructions for the Certification (a), it indicates that, "The Name of Business must correspond to the official legal offering entity on the SF33." Please confirm the SF33 referred to is the same one required in L. 5.1.1.	The entity as listed on the SF33 should match the Entity on the GSA Form 527 if offering as a single company. For Joint Ventures or Partnerships, Offerors must complete and provide separate GSA Form 527 representing their individual companies. For SBCTA Offerors, each SBJV, SBSUBK, SBMP team member and/or subcontractor must complete a separate GSA Form 527 representing their individual companies.
GR4-390	(L.5.5.1) Financial Resources	L.5.5.1	May financial resources files be password protected or submitted outside the Symphony Portal to protect individual company information when bidding as a CTA?	Per RFP Section L.3, The Offeror shall not submit password protected documents. Be advised that the Offeror bears the risk that password protected documents will not receive credit and may result in the Government ending the proposal evaluation and removing the Offeror from consideration for award. Per RFP Section L.3.4, Offerors must provide all documentation and proposal contents exclusively via Symphony. Proposals submitted through other methods will not be considered.
GR4-391	(L.5.5.1) Financial Resources	L.5.5.1	For Offerors submitting as a Joint Venture, will the Government provide a method for member firms to upload supporting documents individually given the sensitive and confidential nature of the financial information?	The government appreciates your feedback. After a careful review and analysis of your question or comment, we believe the RFP is well-defined in this area and supportive of a competitive proposal.
GR4-392	(L.5.5.1) Financial Resources	L.5.5.1, Table 22 RFP Section L.5.5.1	Section L.5.5.1 (Financial Resources) requires the offeror to "complete and submit a GSA Form 527. This contradicts section L.4.1, Table 22 (Proposal Format Table) and section L.5.5.1, which indicates offerors should use Attachment J.P-10. Will the Government please confirm that offerors should complete and submit attachment J.P-10 to Symphony to satisfy section L.4.1, L.5.5, and L.5.5.1 requirements?	Offerors shall complete and submit a GSA Form 527 Contractor's Qualification and Financial Information included in this solicitation as Attachment J.P-10.
GR4-393	(L.5.5.2) Cybersecurity Supply Chain Risk Management (C-SCRM)	L.5.5.2	The Alliant 3 Solicitation Package includes four (4) documents related to C-SCRM. They are: 1. J.P-11+A3+Contractor+C-SCRM+Responsibility+Questionnaire 2. J.P-12+A3+C-SCRM+References+V.2 3. J.P-13+A3+C-SCRM+Plan+Template+V.2 4. J.P-14+A3+C-SCRM+Control+Selections In L.5.5.2, the Government only requires Offerors to submit the J.P-11+A3+Contractor+C-SCRM+Responsibility+Questionnaire. CLARIFICATION: Will the Government please confirm that the J.P-12, J.P-13, and J.P-14 are for informational purposes only and are not required to be completed and submitted by the Offeror as part of their proposal response package?	Yes, J.P-12, J.P-13, and J.P-14 are provided for informational purposes and are not required to be completed and submitted by the offeror as part of their proposal.
GR4-394	(L.5.6) Organizational Risk Assessment	L.5.6	Section L.5.6 (Organizational Risk Assessment) states that "Single Offerors will earn Organizational Risk Assessment points (1,000 for each project, up to a maximum of 7,000 points) for projects previously performed per Section L.5.2.2, Primary NAICS Code Relevant Experience." Will the Government please confirm that OTSBs who submit the maximum seven (7) projects in accordance with section L.5.2.2, as an established individual company, can also claim the 7,000 points in accordance with section L.5.6, without submitting any additional supporting documentation?	Yes, the government confirms that OTSBs who submit the maximum seven (7) projects in accordance with section L.5.2.2, as an established individual company, can claim the 7,000 points in accordance with section L.5.6, without submitting any additional supporting documentation.
GR4-395	(L.5.6) Organizational Risk Assessment	L.5.6	Please clarify whether a project will receive ORA points if the work was carried out by the actual Contractor Team Arrangement (CTA) and involved a subcontractor?	Yes, a project will receive ORA points if the work was carried out by the actual Contractor Team Arrangement (CTA) and subcontractors of the CTA.
GR4-396	(L.5.6) Organizational Risk Assessment	L.5.6	Please confirm that the requirement to have previously performed together on Primary NAICS Code Relevant Experience projects is limited to Primary NAICS Code Relevant Experience projects only and that Emerging Technology experience and Small Business Emerging Technology Solution Engagements are not included in this requirement and do not impact the Organizational Risk Assessment points.	Per RFP Section L.5.6, "Organizational Risk Assessment points may be earned by an Offeror for each relevant experience project (1,000 for each project, up to a maximum of 7,000 points) in which all members of a CTA have previously performed, exclusively together, for Primary NAICS Code Relevant Experience projects.
GR4-397	(L.5.6) Organizational Risk Assessment	L.5.6	Will the government confirm that an individual company Offeror can only claim points for this section if they completed the work on the NAICS Code REP without any CTA members?	Yes, an individual company Offeror can claim Organizational Risk Assessment points when they have completed the work on the NAICS Code Relevant Experience Project as an individual company, without any CTA members.
GR4-398	(L.5.6) Organizational Risk Assessment	L.5.6	Will the government confirm that a Mentor-Protégé SBCTA Offeror can only claim points for this section (L.5.6, Organizational Risk Assessment) if either the Mentor or Protégé completed the work on the NAICS Code REP without any CTA members that are not a part of the SBCTA Offeror?	Per RFP Section L.5.6(d), a Mentor-Protégé SBCTA is considered to have previously performed if the Contract/Order was previously performed by the Mentor and the Protégé, working exclusively together. Please refer to Amendment 3, item 84.
GR4-399	(L.5.6) Organizational Risk Assessment	L.5.6, Table 22 RFP Section L.5.6	The RFP specifies that if an Offeror is an established individual company, no files need to be submitted to receive the Organizational Risk Assessment points. However, Symphony seems to require an offeror to specify a supporting file if an Offeror selects the Organizational Risk Assessment checkbox in the Performance Factors section. Must individual companies specify a document to claim the Organizational Risk Assessment points if the Offeror is an individual company? If so, will GSA please update the RFP? If not, will Symphony be updated to make the specified filename optional?	Symphony will grant points to an individual company Offeror that claims ORA as a Performance Factor on their Primary REP. The system will not force the individual company Offeror to upload additional documents. An Offeror's scorecard and review screens in Symphony will display a non-compliance warning if the Offeror has a CTA member but doesn't provide evidence for ORA points.
GR4-400	(L.5.6) Organizational Risk Assessment	L.5.6(a)	What verification method is required for an individual Offeror? Note: Symphony requires an artifact document with a location tag.	No artifact documents or location tagging is required to apply ORA points for Single Offerors. Per RFP Section L.5.6, Single Offerors will earn Organizational Risk Assessment points (1,000 for each project, up to a maximum of 7,000 points) for projects previously performed per Section L.5.2.2, Primary NAICS Code Relevant Experience.
GR4-401	(L.5.6) Organizational Risk Assessment	L.5.6(a)	If NAICS Project work was previously performed as a member of a JV, will we be allowed to claim credit under Organizational Risk assessment?	The government acknowledges receipt of your question. Please refer to Amendment 3, item 40.
GR4-402	(L.5.7.1) Public Disclosure of Scope 1 or 2 or 3 Greenhouse Gas (GHG) Emissions	L.5.7.1	For Sustainability Related Disclosures, will the Government please accept an interim statement for the purposes of point accumulation for the Alliant 3 proposal or consider making this requirement upon award to provide additional time to complete the required data collection and trend analysis?	The government appreciates your feedback. After a careful review and analysis of your question or comment, we believe the RFP is well-defined in this area and supportive of a competitive proposal.
GR4-403	(L.5.7.1) Public Disclosure of Scope 1 or 2 or 3 Greenhouse Gas (GHG) Emissions	L.5.7.1	Section L.5.7.1 requires offerors to 1) "provide a self-attestation that the Scope 3 GHG emissions were calculated in accordance with the GHG Protocol Corporate Accounting and Reporting Standard", 2) "provide the location(s) (Internet URL(s)) where its Scope 1 or 2 or 3 GHG emissions are publicly disclosed", and 3) "provide a self-attestation that the reported GHG emissions were calculated in accordance with the GHG Protocol Corporate Accounting and Reporting Standard . . . and/or GHG Protocol Corporate Value Chain (Scope 3) Accounting and Reporting Standard . . . as relevant based on the scopes reported." Will the Government please confirm that all three items should be in a single pdf document?	Yes, the government confirms all three items listed in Section L.5.7.1 should be in a single pdf document.
GR4-404	(L.5.7.1) Public Disclosure of Scope 1 or 2 or 3 Greenhouse Gas (GHG) Emissions	L.5.7.1	Will the government reconsider differentiating between the Scopes to account for the increased benefits of Scope 3 by re-allocating 1,750 points for Scope 3, allocating 500 points for Scope 3, or requiring all Scopes (1, 2, and 3) to claim points?	The government acknowledges receipt of your question. Please refer to Amendment 2, item 87.
GR4-405	(L.5.7.1) Public Disclosure of Scope 1 or 2 or 3 Greenhouse Gas (GHG) Emissions	L.5.7.1	There are instruction indicating what is required to submit for a Scope 3 attestation, but the requirements for Scope 1 and Scope 2 submissions are less clear. Will the Government please clarify what is acceptable as a submission for a Scope 1 or Scope 2 attestation.	Per RFP Section L.5.7.1, "If claiming credit for this disclosure, the Offeror shall provide the location(s) (Internet URL(s)) where its Scope 1 or 2 or 3 GHG emissions are publicly disclosed. Offerors may utilize third-party sustainability reporting portals (e.g., Carbon Disclosure Project, https://www.cdp.net/en) or its own website. The Offeror must provide a self-attestation that the reported GHG emissions were calculated in accordance with the GHG Protocol Corporate Accounting and Reporting Standard (https://www.ghgprotocol.org/corporate-standard) and/or GHG Protocol Corporate Value Chain (Scope 3) Accounting and Reporting Standard (https://ghgprotocol.org/sites/default/files/standards/Corporate-Value-Chain-Accounting-Reporting-Standard_041613_2.pdf), as relevant based on the scopes reported."

Alliant 3 Government Responses to Request For Proposal (RFP) Feedback GR Set 04_11.08.24

Response #	RFP Paragraph Reference	Specific RFP Location	Comment/Question	Government Response
GR4-406	(L.5.8) Price	L.5.8.2	For Offerors submitting as a Joint Venture, may the Offeror submit the indirect rates for any JV member to apply to all of the Offerors Fully Burdened Labor Hour Rates provided that evidence is provided for such rates? If not, what indirect rates should a JV Offeror use to complete the Pricing requirement?	Per RFP Section L.5.8.2 an Offeror shall provide Fully-Burdened Labor-Hour Rates for all 31 IT Senior Level Labor Categories. The submission of indirect rates is not a requirement of the solicitation.
GR4-407	(L.5.8.2) Fully-Burdened Rate Evaluation	L.5.8.2, M.8.2	The RFP instructions (L.5.8.2), evaluation criteria (M.8.2), and Attachment J.P-18 A3 Labor Rate Attestation lacks specificity as to the standard for acceptability of the supporting rate evidence. For example, are offerors required to demonstrate invoiced / awarded rates for identical labor category titles? Can supporting rate evidence be provided for "similar" or "equivalent" but not identical labor category titles?	Yes, supporting rate evidence can be provided for "similar" or "equivalent" if not identical labor category titles. Proposed labor-hour rates that exceed the Government referenced Alliant 2 published labor-hour rates must be supported with evidence showing that the proposed higher rates have been accepted on a T&M/L-H Federally awarded Government Contract.
GR4-408	(M.2) Basis for Awards	M.2	Will the government explain how "non-price factors, when combined, [are] significantly more important than price," if a tradeoff is not being conducted in the evaluation approach?	The government appreciates your feedback. After a careful review and analysis of your question or comment, we believe the RFP is well-defined in this area and supportive of a competitive proposal.
GR4-409	(M.2) Basis for Awards	M.2	Please clarify how many awards will be made across the different business classifications (e.g., Large Business, Small Business, Hubzone, 8(a), etc.)?	Alliant 3 is an unrestricted contract vehicle providing for full and open competition. There will be no awards set aside for small business.
GR4-410	(M.4.2) Acceptability Review	M.4.2	Section M.4.2 (Acceptability Review) refers to "information requested in section L.5.1", which will "be evaluated on a pass/fail basis". The list includes "VETS-4212 Federal Contract Reporting"; however, this is no longer listed in section L (or L.5.1). Will the Government please confirm that "VETS-4212 Federal Contract Reporting" will be removed from the evaluation? If this is not the case, please provide instructions that correspond with the evaluation criteria to allow offerors to comply with all Government expectations.	Per RFP Section M.4.2 (i), VETS-4212 is included in the Acceptability review and will be evaluated on a Pass/Fail basis. Submission of any VETS-4212 documents into the Offeror's proposal is not required. The Government will verify that the Offeror has completed this form as required on the DOL website. The RFP provides information and instructions in Sections I, K, and L (IBR) via clauses 52.222-37 and 52.222-38.
GR4-411	(M.4.2) Acceptability Review	M.4.2	The evaluation criteria for Public Disclosure of Scope 1 or 2 or 3 Greenhouse Gas (GHG) Emissions are not listed in Section M except for the points allocated. Can the Government confirm whether this element should be included in list in Section M.4.2 Acceptability Review of items to be evaluated on a pass/fail basis?	Public Disclosure of Scope 1 or 2 or 3 Greenhouse Gas (GHG) Emissions is not part of the Acceptability review; it is a scored evaluation area.
GR4-412	(M.4.2) Acceptability Review	M.4.2(d), Table 22 RFP Section L.5.1.4	Per Table 22 in L.4.1 with regards to Section L.5.1.4, Offerors must only submit the required JV, OsuBk, or CTA documentation IF proposing as one of those entities. Therefore, please add "(if applicable)" to the end of the bullet for M.4.2(d).	The government acknowledges receipt of your question. Please refer to Amendment 3, item 86.
GR4-413	(M.5.2) Past Performance	L.5.2.3.3	Regarding the statement that "Task Orders issued from a single IDIQ contract or schedule may be aggregated, with a total estimated value inclusive of all option periods", please confirm that for a Primary NAICS Code project, offerors may use an IDIQ contract and for the purpose of project size, consider the total value of the IDIQ contract as shown in FPDS, inclusive of all task order values.	The project value is the total value of the combined task orders in the submission and not the value of the overarching IDIQ Contract. As stated in L.5.2.3.3, Project value for completed Projects is determined by the total obligated dollars. Project value for ongoing Projects is determined based on the total estimated value (inclusive of all option periods). Project value for Non-Federal Contracts is determined based on the contract value listed on the Non-Government Award Form. Task Orders issued from a single IDIQ contract or schedule may be aggregated, with a total estimated value inclusive of all option periods.
GR4-414	(M.5.2) Past Performance	M.5.2, L.5.2.4.4	Is a minimum performance period required for Small Business Emerging Technology experience submitted projects?	No, a minimum performance period is not required for Small Business Emerging Technology experience submitted projects. However, per RFP Section L.5.2.4.4, (a)(1), Each SB Emerging Technology Engagement must contain an Emerging Technology solution project that is ongoing or completed within five (5) years from the date the solicitation is released.
GR4-415	(M.5.2) Past Performance	M.5.2.1	RFP M.5.2.1 states "A positive rating means receiving a Satisfactory or greater rating for four or more of the six rating elements on a Project." If a CPAR only has three rating elements scored and were all positive ratings, will the Government accept this as a positive CPAR?	Per RFP Section M.5.2.1, In the event the CPARS report does not contain a rating for all six rating areas, more than 50% of the rated areas must have received a satisfactory (or above) rating to be considered a positive rating. Please refer to Amendment 3, item 87.