

Question Id	Question	Answer
6803	Offerors are instructed to provide Exhibit 5 back to the Government as an Excel file; however, Exhibit 5 has a place for Offerors to provide a signature (cell B18) asserting the information in Exhibit 5 is accurate. Can the Government confirm that Offerors can provide an image of the Signer's signature in cell B18 to comply with the requirement for returning Exhibit 5 as an Excel file and having it signed?	This has been corrected in Amendment 11.
6804	Can the Government confirm that provision of the most recent CPAR information as part of recent customer evaluations of previous performance would fall under Item 9 and be excluded from page limitation?	The referenced "recent customer evaluations of previous performance" has been removed in Amendment 11.
6805	The response to Question #4135 confirms that "...recent customer evaluations of past performance" in A.3.6(B) #9, page 107, also include CPARS?. Does the government require copies of the CPARS for the specific projects identified in the Past Performance Volume and if so can those be provided as separate PDF files within Volume II?	The referenced "recent customer evaluations of previous performance" has been removed in Amendment 11.
6806	Section A.3.7.2(a) states "For joint ventures, the Offerors shall provide past performance for the work done and qualifications held either individually by a partner to the joint venture, the work done by the joint venture itself, or any combination of both." Later in the same section when referring to SB Category B it states "For offerors submitting as Mentor-Protégé Joint Ventures, contracts may be submitted from the Protégé or the offering Mentor-Protégé Joint Venture itself." The response to Question #3766 "Does a protege JV member have to provide a past performance?" - Answer: "No". If the Offeror is an SB MPJV are we required to submit only past performance from the protégé or work done by the joint venture itself or can we submit past performance from the mentor?	For Mentor-Protégé Joint Ventures, A Mentor may provide Past Performance References and REPs in accordance with the RFP. Amendment 11 provides this clarification.
6813	There appears to be a contradiction in the requirements for both REPs and Past Performance withing an SBA approved Mentor-Protégé JV. For example, the response to Q#3089 states "The mentor cannot submit REPs or Past Performance references." Q#6046 asks "Is the protégé of a mentor-protégé joint venture required to submit any REP or PP references?" "with a response of "No". Will the government clarify within the RFP that a REP and Past Performance can come from either the mentor or protégé?	For Mentor-Protégé Joint Ventures, A Mentor may provide Past Performance References and REPs in accordance with the RFP. Amendment 11 provides this clarification.
6817	We had a contract that was awarded on 9/30/2021 and we were planning on using that Past Performance for our original submission back when SEWP VI was due in March 2024, that would have been within the 3 year widow for Past Performance, since there have been many delays to submission, can we still use the past performance since the delays have caused the timeline to go over the 3 year window for Past Performance	Amendment 11 revised the recency date to 3 years from the original RFP release date.
6819	Section A.3.7.2(a) states "For joint ventures, the Offerors shall provide past performance for the work done and qualifications held either individually by a partner to the joint venture, the work done by the joint venture itself, or any combination of both." Later in the same section when referring to SB Category B it states "For offerors submitting as Mentor-Protégé Joint Ventures, contracts may be submitted from the Protégé or the offering Mentor-Protégé Joint Venture itself." The response to Question #3766 "Does a protege JV member have to provide a past performance?" - Answer: "No". If the Offeror is an SB MPJV is it permissible to submit all Past Performance from the mentor?	For Mentor-Protégé Joint Ventures, A Mentor may provide Past Performance References and REPs in accordance with the RFP. Amendment 11 provides this clarification.
6821	Q&A Batch 6: The answer to Q3089 states that "The mentor cannot submit REPs or Past Performance references." However, Section A.3.7.1 (c ) paragraph "For Category B and C:" says that "For Mentor-Protégé Joint Ventures, one of the REPs from different mandatory experience technical areas shall be submitted from the Protégé or the Mentor-Protégé Joint Venture itself." To clarify, doesn't this mean that the mentor is able to submit at least 1 REP?	For Mentor-Protégé Joint Ventures, A Mentor may provide Past Performance References and REPs in accordance with the RFP. Amendment 11 provides this clarification.
6824	SF1449: Are offerors required to complete Block 10 to specify our NAICS code for which we are bidding for a master contract and our business size? If so, please include detailed instructions.	The Offeror shall include in Block 17a of the SF1449 the NAICS Code the Offeror is proposing using for competition at the master contract level. Amendment 11 reflects this clarification.

6826	<p>Section A.1.34 NORTH AMERICAN INDUSTRY CLASSIFICATION SYSTEM (NAICS) &amp; NAICS CODES WITHIN SCOPE.</p> <p>Q&amp;A #4495 asks "Would Government please confirm that the AbilityOne subcontracting is not required under Category A NAICS 541519(e)?".</p> <p>NASA Response was: "AbilityOne subcontracting is not required under Category A NAICS 541519(e)."</p> <p>Q&amp;A #2199 asks: "For the NAICS codes marked with two asterisks (**) is unclear if the footnote of one asterisk (*) also applies to those. Does 541519e and 513210 require the use of Ability One as subcontractor?".</p> <p>NASA Response was: "No, 541519e and 513210 does not require the use of Ability One NPA as subcontractors.".</p> <p>Q&amp;A #6199 asks: "On page 61, Section A.1.34 NORTH AMERICAN INDUSTRY CLASSIFICATION SYSTEM (NAICS) &amp; NAICS CODES WITHIN SCOPE lists NAICS code 541519 as one that has a mandatory requirement to subcontract with AbilityOne. Can the government confirm whether small businesses submitting a Category A response using NAICS code 541519e have to use AbilityOne as a subcontractor?"</p> <p>NASA Response was: "Small Businesses submitting a Category A response using NAICS Code 541519e have a mandatory requirement to utilize AbilityOne non-profit organizations as subcontractors.</p> <p>Question #1846 asks: "Are we required to have a formal agreement with AbilityOne if we are proposing under NAICS 541519e footnote 18 Information Technology Value Added Resellers?"</p> <p>NASA Response was: "Yes, offerors proposing under NAICS 541519e footnote 18 (Information Technology Value Added Resellers) are required to have a formal agreement with an AbilityOne nonprofit if the task order involves a designated NAICS code or Product Service Code requiring AbilityOne subcontracting. A.1.35 AbilityOne SUBCONTRACTING"</p>	Yes, NAICS 541519e footnote 18 is a required AbilityOne NAICS code.
6827	<p>As a follow up to question # 3089, in which the Government stated “The mentor cannot submit REPs and Past Performance references” SBA regulations dictate that when evaluating a mentor - protégé joint venture’s experience, capabilities, and past performance an agency “may not require the protégé firm to individually meet the same evaluation or responsibility criteria as that required of other offerors generally.” The joint venture as a whole must “demonstrate the past performance, experience, business systems and certifications necessary to perform the contract.” Will the Government please revise the RFP to allow REPs and Past Performance references from both mentors and protégés?</p>	For Mentor-Protégé Joint Ventures, A Mentor may provide Past Performance References and REPs in accordance with the RFP. Amendment 11 provides this clarification.
6828	<p>Many AbilityOne NPAs do not want to sign an agreement until a Contract Holder has received an award. This avoids unnecessary paperwork for the NPA. How many days from contract award will the contract holder have to establish a formal agreement with an NPA or NPAs as it will not be possible to have an agreement ready upon award? "Upon award, the SEWP Contract Holder shall have an established formal agreement with AbilityOne Non-Profit Agency (NPA)/Non-Profit Agencies NPAs as proof of commitment to meeting the mandatory requirement to utilize non-profit organizations, which will be incorporated into the contract as Attachment H."</p>	Contract Holders should establish a formal agreement with AbilityOne Non-Profit Agency (NPA)/Non-Profit Agencies NPAs within 60 days of Contract Award.
6829	<p>The RFP requires OTSB firms submit a Small Business Subcontracting Plan. AbilityOne NPAs are not necessarily small businesses. However, on page 66 of the RFP, the AbilityOne Subcontracting requirement states "The subcontracting plan from Other Than Small Businesses (OTSBs) shall include the goals of the AbilityOne NPAs and their associated NAICS codes. Contract holders shall allocate a target goal of at least 2% of the overall value of all task orders placed under AbilityOne NAICS codes." Should the RFP be amended to require a Subcontracting Plan vs. a Small Business Subcontracting Plan? If not, can the government please identify an alternative location for OTSB to answer this goal?</p>	The referenced sentence was removed in Amendment 11.
6833	<p>Where do we acknowledge amendments, on SF1449 or someplace else? If SF1449, what box?</p> <p>"Failure to provide a signed SF 1449 and acknowledgement of all subsequent solicitation amendments will result in the Offeror being eliminated from competition."</p>	The solicitation was updated in Amendment 11 to indicate "acknowledgement of all subsequent solicitation amendments" can be done via the SF 30 or via an affirmative statement within the General Instructions Cover Page.
6836	<p>Attachment D states that a DEIA plan is required within 30 days of contract award. It is unclear how NASA intends to utilize the DEIA plan in conjunction with ATTACHMENT_B-PROGRAM_PERFORMANCE to determine that a contractor should be off-ramped on page 10 of Attachment B due to non-compliance with contract deliverables."Contract holders will also be considered for Off-Ramp if one of the following occur: The Contract Holder fails to comply with deliverables as defined in the SEWP contracts". Is a Contractor compliant simply because they submitted a DEIA plan or are there qualitative measures that NASA intends to enforce about the content and approach of the plan, which may lead to an off-ramp decision?</p>	The due date was changed in Amendment 11 to within 6 months of Contract award. The requirement is to submit a DEIA plan that addresses the requested information. Failure to provide a compliant report that addresses the requested information will result in program performance actions as described in A.1.39 CONTRACT PROGRAM PERFORMANCE.
6842	<p>References: RFP A.3.7.3 Mission Suitability Volume, (a) Technical Approach (Subfactor A) and Attachment A SOW A.2. SCOPE</p> <p>Question: Starting with Amendment 8, NASA has emphasized that Volume 3, Subfactor A shall focus on a bidder’s overall capabilities with respect to A.2 Scope of Attachment A SOW rather than the Technical Areas. However, particularly with Category C, the SOW says, “Category C, will be focused on ITC/AV mission-based services that provide a full range of technology services inclusive of custom computer programming services, telecommunication services including network operations, etc.” In effect, all of the technical areas are brought right back in. Please change “inclusive of” to “such as” to clarify that these are merely examples and not to be prioritized in the response.</p>	Amendment 11 clarifies the wording in Attachment A.

6843	The Q&A responses state that Block 10, on the SF 1449 should be updated with the prime NAICS being used for all Categories being pursued and submitted but this was not updated in the RFP released with the Amendment. However, in Block 10 of the SF 1449s is it acceptable to mark the socioeconomic category be used vice the current Small Business block which is currently marked?	The Offeror shall include in Block 17a of the SF1449 the NAICS Code the Offeror is proposing using for competition at the master contract level. Amendment 11 reflects this clarification.
6846	REP 3 Year Age Recency as of SEWP RFP Release vs SEWP Bid Submission. The recent change of this in Amendment 10 from “projects that are completed or ongoing within three (3) years of the solicitation release date” now to “projects that are completed or ongoing within three (3) years of the proposal due date” is having a major impact on bids. Project Experience up to five (5) years old for recency is often typical on IDIQs and so we therefore suggest NASA consider reverting this back to “solicitation release date”. Bidders have done extensive work based on the previous RFP language age of REPs based on “solicitation release date” and this change has major impacts on recency of bidder REPs.	Amendment 11 revised the recency date to 3 years from the original RFP release date.
6847	Past Performance Recency Age as of SEWP RFP Release vs SEWP Bid Submission. The recent change of this in Amendment 10 from “performance occurring within the last three years of the solicitation release date” now to “performance occurring within the last three years of the proposal due date” is having a major impact on bids. Past Performance experience up to five (5) years old for recency is often typical on IDIQs and so we therefore suggest NASA consider reverting this back to “solicitation release date”. Bidders have done extensive work based on the previous RFP language age of Past Performance experience based on “solicitation release date” and this change has major impacts on recency of bidder Past Performance submissions.	Amendment 11 revised the recency date to 3 years from the original RFP release date.
6848	SF1449 NAICS Problem. Per various Q&A items, NASA says to have portal submission NAICS match the bidder submitted SF1449 NAICS but the field for NORTH AMERICAN INDUSTRY CLASSIFICATION STANDARD (NAICS) there has “See Section A.1.34” text already which is a reference to the list of NAICS by Category. Should bidders edit out that text and enter their primary NAICS?	The Offeror shall include in Block 17a of the SF1449 the NAICS Code the Offeror is proposing using for competition at the master contract level. Amendment 11 reflects this change.
6849	Exhibit 1 Problem. Amendment 8 REP form doesn’t display correctly for fields like PROJECT TITLE, if the text in that row is longer than 1 line then you can’t read the other lines.	The Project Title should be limited to 50 characters to fit one line. The Exhibit has been updated in Amendment 11 to include that instruction.
6850	SourceAmerica Letter of Commitment NAICS. Per the NASA answers to various Q&A such as Q5269 “The AbilityOne Commitment Letter must include” .....“List of NAICS codes for which the Offeror plans to subcontract with AbilityOne organizations”. However, the letter format from SourceAmerica / AbilityOne has reference to “NAICS Codes identified in Section A.1.35 of the Solicitation.” Do we truly need a new letter with the NAICS listed?	The only letter required for the proposal is the Commitment Letter issued by either SourceAmerica or NIB Central Nonprofit Agency (CNAs) and signed by the Prime Contractor and the CNA. The Prime Contractor does not need to include an additional letter with the NAICS listed.
6854	Can the Government please clarify the requirement to acknowledge all Amendments to this solicitation? Will a statement to that effect within the body of Volume I suffice, or are we required to sign all SF 30s for each and every Amendment? And if we are required to sign all SF 30s, can the Government please re-release them in an editable format? Currently only Amendments 7 and 9 have been released in an editable format, with the other 8 being scanned images that are impossible to fill out and sign.	The solicitation was updated in Amendment 11 to indicate "acknowledgement of all subsequent solicitation amendments" can be done via the SF 30 or via an affirmative statement within the General Instructions Cover Page.
6855	REPs for Multiple Bid Teams or Not. The answer to these two questions appear to contradict each other. Can a firm use a REP on their bid for example in Category C as a small business prime bidder and use that same REP for another bidder’s bid in Category C where they are on that team as a subcontractor? Q5003 = Will the Government please clarify if an offeror can re-use the same REP more than once in the same Category? For example once as an 8(a) and a SDVOSB as a Subcontractor? Please advise. NASA answer was No. Q5011 = Can we use the projects for REPs and PPs if we submit the proposals for multiple teaming arrangements? e.g. As an 8a Prime and Small business JV partner or Subcontractor to SDVOSB? NASA answer was Yes, you can use the same projects for REPs and PPs if you submit proposals for multiple teaming arrangements.	An Offeror can propose as the prime contractor one time per category and can propose one additional time as a member of a joint venture (JV) or Contractor Team Arrangement (CTA) in that same category. For example, it is permissible for XYZ, Corp to propose as a prime contractor in Category A, and form a JV with 123, LLC to propose in category A. This example applies to all categories as well as CTAs.  The above limitations do not preclude a prime contractor from acting as a first-tier subcontractor on one or more proposals within a category if they are not providing REP or Past Performance references for another Offeror's proposal. These limitations apply only to the number of prime Offeror proposals a company can participate in (as a CTA/JV or standalone prime), not on the number of times they can act as a first-tier subcontractor.
6858	FAR Type 1 CTAs. Please confirm that bidders can submit a bid under FAR 9.6 as a Type 1 Contractor Team Arrangement (CTA) ‘partnership’ where both firms would be considered a prime contractor via the CTA. Type (1) is where “Two or more companies form a partnership or joint venture to act as a potential prime contractor”. Type (2) is traditional prime/sub where “A potential prime contractor agrees with one or more other companies to have them act as its subcontractors under a specified Government contract or acquisition program”.	Confirmed.
6860	Regarding question 1690 - "on page 103, 2nd paragraph, if subcontractor experience is used for an REP, does the SB offeror need to submit a Teaming Agreement? or is an MRCL what is required? Amendment 10 updated the cited instructions regarding small business subcontractor experience for REPs and Past Performance." We have reviewed Amendment 10, especially A.3.7.1(a)(4), A.3.7.1(c), and A.3.7.2(a), and it isn't clear if a SB using a first-tier SB subcontractor to show REP and PP would submit an MRCL or CTA.	Offeror would submit a CTA.

6863	<p>A.1.35 AbilityOne Subcontracting (page 66) states "The subcontracting plan from Other Than Small Businesses (OTSBs) shall include the goals of the AbilityOne NPAs and their associated NAICS codes."</p> <p>Instructions to Offerors (page 90) states "A commercial subcontracting plan is preferred. An individual subcontracting plan may be submitted if a commercial subcontracting plan is not available."</p> <p>QUESTION: Given that it is unlikely Offerors will have a current Commercial Subcontracting Plan with AbilityOne goals incorporated, please clarify what an Offeror should submit to meet this requirement:</p> <p>a) the current Commercial Subcontracting Plan (as-is, without AbilityOne goals),  b) an individual subcontracting plan that includes the AbilityOne goals, or  c) both the current Commercial Subcontracting Plan AND an individual subcontracting plan that includes the AbilityOne goals"</p>	The solicitation was updated in Amendment 11 to remove the subcontracting plan reference.
6864	<p>A.3.7.2(a) Past Performance Volume, Information from the Offeror (page 106) states "Contracts that are completed or ongoing within three years of the proposal due date will be considered recent."</p> <p>A.4.3 Phase Two-Past Performance (page 117) states "Recency is defined as performance occurring within the last three years of the proposal due date."</p> <p>QUESTION: The original proposal due date was July 11, 2024. As of Amendment 10, the current proposal due date is February 17, 2025. Offerors selected past performance references and requested Past Performance Questionnaires (PPQs) from customers in compliance with the original requirement (through Amendment 9) of "within three years of the solicitation release date (05/23/2024)". Changing the period of recency for past performance in Amendment 10 (dated 12/16/2024), seven months after solicitation release and five months after the original due date, creates an unreasonable burden on Offerors and Government Contracting Officers who have already completed and submitted PPQs. Request the past performance recency definition be revised to "within three years of the solicitation release date (05/23/2024)".</p>	Amendment 11 revised the recency date to 3 years from the original RFP release date.
6867	<p>Page 110 of the solicitation states "All Offerors shall present a summary of relevant past performance information in matrix form as set forth below in Table 1, Sample Past Performance Matrix and accompany each category of the relevant experience. The information shall match the past performance information with the relevant experience identified in paragraph (a)(12) of this section." There is no (a)(12) in the past performance section. Can you please clarify the past performance matrix requirements?</p>	The current RFP is updated in Amendment 11.
6869	<p>Page 109 of the solicitation states "For the references submitted with the Offeror's proposal, Offeror shall provide recent customer evaluations of previous performance including Award Fee Evaluation results, Fee Determination Official letters, Annual Performance Evaluation Forms, or any other written performance feedback, if applicable. (Excluded from the page limitation)". Answer to question #2574 states "No, offerors should not submit their CPARs." Question: Can you please clarify that CAPRS are not annual performance evaluation forms or other written performance feedback that should be submitted? Will the offeror be penalized if we don't have any other written documentation to submit?</p>	The referenced "recent customer evaluations of previous performance" has been removed in Amendment 11.
6870	<p>The Amendment 006 SF-30 has been locked by Gov signature. Can the Government please provide a signed version of the Amendment 006 SF-30 that has not been locked?</p>	No. Note that the solicitation was updated in Amendment 11 to indicate "acknowledgement of all subsequent solicitation amendments" can be done via the SF 30 or via an affirmative statement within the General Instructions Cover Page.
6871	<p>The Amendment 002 SF-30 lists the Amendment number as "1" in Box 2. Can the Government please provide a signed, unlocked version of the Amendment 002 SF-30 with the correct Amendment number in Box 2?</p>	No. Note that the solicitation was updated in Amendment 11 to indicate "acknowledgement of all subsequent solicitation amendments" can be done via the SF 30 or via an affirmative statement within the General Instructions Cover Page.
6872	<p>The Amendment 008 SF-30 has not been signed by the Government. Can the Government please provide a signed, unlocked version of the Amendment 008 SF-30?</p>	No. Note that the solicitation was updated in Amendment 11 to indicate "acknowledgement of all subsequent solicitation amendments" can be done via the SF 30 or via an affirmative statement within the General Instructions Cover Page.
6873	<p>The Amendment 009 SF-30 has not been signed by the Government. Can the Government please provide a signed, unlocked version of the Amendment 009 SF-30?</p>	No. Note that the solicitation was updated in Amendment 11 to indicate "acknowledgement of all subsequent solicitation amendments" can be done via the SF 30 or via an affirmative statement within the General Instructions Cover Page.
6874	<p>The Amendment 010 SF-30 has not been signed by the Government. Can the Government please provide a signed, unlocked version of the Amendment 010 SF-30?</p>	No. Note that the solicitation was updated in Amendment 11 to indicate "acknowledgement of all subsequent solicitation amendments" can be done via the SF 30 or via an affirmative statement within the General Instructions Cover Page.
6875	<p>A.3.7.1 instructs Offerors to fill out blocks 12,17, and 30 in the SF1449. The instructions on the form most recently released instructs Offerors to fill out blocks 12, 17, 23, 24 and 30. And, the answer to several of the industry questions state that the Offerors should also complete block 10. Please confirm which blocks the Offeror is to complete in the SF1449.</p>	The Government fills in Block 10. The Offeror shall complete SF1449 Blocks 12 (if applicable), 17, and 30 and the indicated Offeror required fill-ins in the clauses, provisions/representations and certifications, and attachments. An Offeror's Commercial and Government Entity (CAGE) Code in SAM.gov shall match the Offeror's name on the SF1449.
6879	<p>In Amendment 10, NASA changed the definition of recent to "completed or ongoing within three (3) years of the proposal due date," from "completed or ongoing within three (3) years of the solicitation release date." This invalidates our Relevant Experience Projects (REPs). Our past performance questionnaires have already been submitted by our customers. Would you consider reverting to the original definition of recency, so we can submit our planned REPs?</p>	Amendment 11 revised the recency date to 3 years from the original RFP release date.

6880	In Amendment 10, NASA changed the definition of recent to "completed or ongoing within three years of the proposal due date," from "completed or ongoing within three years of the solicitation release date." This invalidates our past performance references for which we have already submitted past performance questionnaires from our customers. Would you consider reverting to the original definition of recency, so we can submit our planned contract references?	Amendment 11 revised the recency date to 3 years from the original RFP release date.
6891	Please confirm the new recency period for REPs and Past Performance references released with Amendment 10 is February 17, 2022 - February 17, 2025 with at least 6 months of performance?	Amendment 11 revised the recency date to 3 years from the original RFP release date.
6893	Instructions state to insert our selected NAICS within Block 10 of the SF1449. Is this accurate? Isn't this a block on the SF1449 form that is required to be completed by the Government? Please confirm if offerors are to amend the SF1449 and insert the NAICS in block 10 or if the NAICS should be inserted in block 17a where contractors are to complete?	The Offeror shall include in Block 17a of the SF1449 the NAICS Code the Offeror is proposing using for competition at the master contract level. Amendment 11 reflects this change.
6896	Many offerors will have already submitted PPQs based on the original solicitation requirements, but now Amendment 10 has changed the recency qualification to within 3 years of proposal due date instead of solicitation release date. Will NASA allow Offerors to use past performance references that have already been submitted and meet the original requirements (within 3 years of solicitation release date)?	Amendment 11 revised the recency date to 3 years from the original RFP release date.
6897	The amended RFP requires offerors to include goals for AbilityOne in their commercial small business subcontracting plan. However, existing commercial subcontracting plans created pursuant to FAR 19.701 may not include separate goals for AbilityOne subcontracting. Additionally, a company's commercial plan is written to provide subcontracting goals for an entire company, not just one specific contract. Is it acceptable to provide a company's commercial subcontracting plan plus the AbilityOne Commitment Letter to satisfy SEWP VI proposal submission requirements?	The solicitation was updated in Amendment 11 to remove the subcontracting plan reference.
6898	Amendment 10 changed the recency requirement for past performance references (within three years of solicitation release vs. within three years of proposal due date). Prior to Amendment 10, customer references may have already submitted PPQs to NASA for contracts that no longer meet the RFP's recency requirement because of this change. Will Offerors need to provide new past performance references to replace previously submitted PPQs? We recommend NASA revert to the original past performance qualifications (recent defined as within three years of solicitation release date) and allow already-submitted PPQs to remain valid for offerors' proposals.	Amendment 11 revised the recency date to 3 years from the original RFP release date.
6905	<p>"Is OTTPS certification an alternative means to submitting an SCRM plan or is it in fact THE SCRM Plan? I ask because of this statement in the attached document DRD No.:3 "Contents: An annual report noting certification with the current ISO 20243 standard including a copy of a valid active Open Trusted Technology Provider™ Standard (O-TTPS) Certification."?</p> <p>So which does SEWP mean? RFP = OTTPS certification optional alternative to Attachment J. Attachment D = OTTPS required as SCRM Plan (Attachment J).</p> <p>In A.1.30.1 and DRD No 3 seem to contradict each other. In the RFP, we read this as stating that the O-TTPS (ISO20243) is an (optional) alternative to submitting the Attachment J. But the CDRL reads as if the OTTPS/ISO20243 certification is in fact the SCRM Plan (Attachment J)."</p>	As stated in A.1.30.1., post award ISO 20243 is an alternate to a C-SCRM plan. Attachment D - is updated in Amendment 11.
6931	Since the government is requiring page numbers even on attachments within the volume, can we screenshot the documents and then put them in the file but retain the header/footer of the company?	The solicitation is updated in Amendment 11 to clarify that page numbering is only required in documents with page limitations and is not required for separate, non-page limited attachments and documents.
6933	"Regarding Amendment 8 changes, FAR 52.212-4 CONTRACT TERMS AND CONDITIONS - COMMERCIAL PRODUCTS AND COMMERCIAL SERVICES. (DEC 2022) ALTERNATE I (NOV 2021) is the government looking for the vendor to fill in all the items in parenthesis?"	This was updated in Amendment 11.

6937	<p>"Amendment 8 changes, on page 102: the government notes ""For joint ventures, the Offerors shall provide a REP from the work done and qualifications held either individually by a partner to the joint venture, the work done by the joint venture itself, or any combination of both."" However on the bottom of page 103: the government notes ""For HUBZone, VOSB, SDVOSB, WOSB, EDWOSB, 8a, offerors (inclusive of first-tier subcontractors, if applicable): A total of two different REPs from different mandatory experience technical areas shall be submitted. Each Project must have had a minimum of \$2M in total value size of a single order or contract and must be described using the Exhibit 1 REP template. For offerors submitting as HUBZone, VOSB, SDVOSB, WOSB, or EDWOSB Joint Ventures, one of the REPs from different mandatory experience technical areas shall be submitted from the HUBZone, VOSB, SDVOSB, WOSB, or EDWOSB partner, or the Joint Venture itself. The HUBZone, VOSB, SDVOSB, WOSB, or EDWOSB partner project, or Joint Venture project need only have a minimum of \$1M in total value size of a single order or contract.""</p> <p>Can the government confirm an 8(a) Mentor-Protégé JV was specifically left out of the list even though it is included in the intro of the paragraph? i.e. an 8(a) could provide 2 REPs from the mentor? "</p>	The current RFP has been updated.
6939	<p>"Amendment 8 Changes - page 106, category c- Does the following mean that the Mentor Protege cannot utilize the past performance of the Mentor? ""For Small Businesses proposing in Categories C- the past performance provided shall be for similar scope efforts with a minimum average annual cost/fee incurred of \$500,000 for size to be rated relevant. For offerors submitting as Mentor-Protégé Joint Ventures, contracts may be submitted from the Protégé or the offering Mentor-Protégé Joint Venture itself. The Protégé or Mentor-Protégé Joint Venture project need only have a minimum of \$250,000 in average annual cost/fee incurred. For offerors submitting as HUBZone, VOSB, SDVOSB, WOSB, or EDWOSB Joint Ventures, contracts may be submitted from the HUBZone, VOSB, SDVOSB, WOSB, or EDWOSB partner or the Joint Venture itself. The HUBZone, VOSB, SDVOSB, WOSB, or EDWOSB partner contract, or Joint Venture contract, need only have a minimum of \$250,000 in average annual cost/fee incurred.""</p> <p>The Federal Acquisition Regulation (FAR) section that allows for the consideration of shared past performance from mentor-protégé joint ventures is FAR 15.305(a)(2)(iii). This section specifically addresses how past performance should be evaluated for small business joint ventures, including those formed under the mentor-protégé program.</p> <p>FAR 15.305(a)(2)(iii) states:</p> <p>""In the case of a small business concern as defined in 19.001, when evaluating the past performance of an offeror that is a small business joint venture as defined in 13 CFR 121.103(h), the evaluation shall consider the past performance of each party to the joint venture.""</p> <p>This means that when a small business joint venture submits an offer, the contracting officer is required to consider the past performance of all members of the joint venture—including both the mentor and the protégé. This provision ensures that the joint venture benefits from the mentor's experience, which can enhance the joint venture's competitive position in federal acquisitions."</p>	For Mentor-Protégé Joint Ventures, A Mentor may provide Past Performance References and REPs in accordance with the RFP. Amendment 11 provides this clarification.
6940	<p>Amendment 8 Changes page 107, a.12 (note, the 12 is missing) the government has indicated in Q&amp;A that item 12 in the past performance volume should be for overall contracts of the company. However, on page 109, the last sentence of the paragraph below, the government notes, "Offerors shall present a summary of relevant past performance information in matrix form as set forth below in Table 1, Sample Past Performance Matrix and accompany each category of the relevant experience. The information shall match the past performance information with the relevant experience identified in paragraph (a)(12) of this section. Offerors are advised that the matrix is a summary of the referenced contracts submitted for the past performance volume for a given scope category." This would allude to item 12 being for one contract.</p>	This was clarified in Amendment 11.
6954	Regarding comment 6792, NASA did not answer the questions. Can all of the REPs come from the mentor?	Note that this depends on the Offeror's business size. Please propose in accordance with section A.3.7.1(c) of the RFP.
6956	<p>In answer to question 2207, NASA states that "Other Than Small Businesses (OTSB) must submit a subcontracting plan. The subcontracting plan should follow the format in FAR 52.219-9 and include goals for subcontracting with AbilityOne nonprofits for applicable NAICS codes, as described in section A.1.35"</p> <p>RFP requirement for large business is a commercial subcontracting plan. Recognizing that AbilityOne partnership and target goals are addressed in the commitment letter and elsewhere in the proposal, please confirm that specific AbilityOne subcontracting goals are not required in our large business commercial subcontracting plan.</p>	Confirmed. The solicitation was updated in Amendment 11 to remove the subcontracting plan reference.
6957	For an 8(a) mentor protege JV, does any past performance and REP have to come from the protege, or can it come from the mentor? Please provide a response vs. pointing us to an amendment for interpretation	For Mentor-Protégé Joint Ventures, A Mentor may provide Past Performance References and REPs in accordance with the RFP. Amendment 11 provides this clarification.

6958	Regarding comment 2574, if we are not to submit our CPARs, can the government strike this requirement for item 9? If not, what is the government looking to receive for this item?	The referenced "recent customer evaluations of previous performance" has been removed in Amendment 11.
6962	Comment 6046 contradicts comment 3089. Please provide a revised answer.	The current RFP has been updated.
6963	"On page 103 under section ""For Category B and C"" it notes ""...For joint ventures, the Offerors shall provide a REP from the work done and qualifications held either individually by a partner to the joint venture, the work done by the joint venture itself, or any combination of both."" This seems to indicate that a JV can submit REPs from any member of the JV. However, on page 104 under ""Category C"" ""...""For Mentor-Protégé Joint Ventures, one of the REPs from different mandatory experience technical areas shall be submitted from the Protégé or Mentor-Protégé Joint Venture itself. Each Protégé or Mentor-Protégé Joint Venture project need only have a minimum of \$1M in total value size of a single order or contract."" Does a protege have to provide the REP or for 8(a) MP, can both REPs be provided by the mentor?"	The current RFP has been updated.
6968	In Amendment 10, the REP and Past Performance project date requirements were changed from completed or ongoing within three (3) years from "solicitation release date" (5/23/2024) to "proposal due date" (currently 2/17/2025). This is a big change as this impacts companies who have selected and prepared REPs and Past Performance projects that are completed or ongoing projects within three (3) years from "solicitation release date" and have completed Past Performance Questionnaires from their Government customers. We are requesting that the government please consider changing back to the original requirement for REPs and Past Performance projects to be completed or ongoing within three (3) years from "solicitation release date" (5/23/2024).	Amendment 11 revised the recency date to 3 years from the original RFP release date.
6970	A.3.7.2 (a) now states “Contracts that are completed or ongoing within three years of the proposal due date will be considered recent.” Given the number of times this solicitation has been extended and may yet be extended again, making the three year requirement based on the due date is onerous to bidders. We request that three year requirement be based on the original solicitation release date (as stated in previous amendments) or to a firm date that is not subject to change	Amendment 11 revised the recency date to 3 years from the original RFP release date.
6980	Does the offeror need to include any of the various amendments SF30 and sign them in the Volume I - Offer Volume?	The solicitation was updated in Amendment 11 to indicate "acknowledgement of all subsequent solicitation amendments" can be done via the SF 30 or via an affirmative statement within the General Instructions Cover Page.
6981	Does the offeror need to include any of the various amendments SF30 and sign them in the Volume I - Offer Volume?	The solicitation was updated in Amendment 11 to indicate "acknowledgement of all subsequent solicitation amendments" can be done via the SF 30 or via an affirmative statement within the General Instructions Cover Page.
6982	Reference: (B) Proposal Content and Page Limitations Proposal Submission Table Page 95 of 152.  There is a discrepancy between the proposal submission table and the proposal submission instructions. The table seems to be missing the header section of (c) Mandatory Experience/ Offerings to represent both Cat A and Cat B&C Mandatory Experience. Currently, the proposal submission table shows Category A Mandatory Experience letter of Authorization (LOAs) to be addressed under section (b) ISO 9001 and CMMI Certifications.  Please update table to add section (c) Mandatory Experience/Offerings as a header in the appropriate locations or confirm in writing that the Category A Mandatory Experience letter of Authorization (LOAs) should be included under (c) Mandatory Experience/ Offerings	The solicitation was updated in Amendment 11.
6983	Does the offeror only need to include the more recent SF1449 completing Blocks 12, 17, and 30 along with the offeror's fill-ins in the clauses, provisions/representations and certifications and attachments without submitting all the SF30's from the various amendments through 10?	The solicitation was updated in Amendment 11 to indicate "acknowledgement of all subsequent solicitation amendments" can be done via the SF 30 or via an affirmative statement within the General Instructions Cover Page.
6987	Reference: Exhibit 3a- Category A Solutions Spreadsheet, Information Tab, Page 102 of 152  Instructions state "One (1) of the four (4) Technical Areas shall be designated as the primary Technical Area and denoted in Column ‘C,’ ranking the identified proposed technical areas ‘1-4’, with ‘1’ representing the designated primary Technical Area and 2-4 indicating the non-primary proposed technical area. The amended Exhibit+3a-+Category+A+Solutions+Spreadsheet+Amendment+9+11.21.24.xlsx has removed the title for Column C for ranking. Is this an accidental omission?  Please clarify if Offerors are still expected to proving a ranking in Column C. If not, please update the instructions or Exhibit 3a to keep consistent between the RFP and spreadsheet.	Yes. Amendment 11 revised the wording to simply require an X in the row denoting the primary designated provider.
6988	Why for Category B and C did the government change the requirement to the following: "Offerors shall furnish relevant experience projects that are completed or ongoing within three (3) years of the proposal due date to be considered recent and be from a different requirement."? Specifically the "...the proposal due date..." in Amendment 0010? Request the government to change the requirement back to "...the solicitation release date ...". You have impacted several offerors projects they were bidding for REPS and forcing at list minute to find a subcontractor with project requirements.	Amendment 11 revised the recency date to 3 years from the original RFP release date.



6989	<p>Reference: Exhibit 3a- Category A Solutions Spreadsheet, Technical Area Tabs, Page 102 of 152</p> <p>Instruction states "The SEWP Catalog Price is provided in column 'G.'" However, Technical Area 9 has the SEWP Catalog Price in Column F.</p> <p>Please confirm the exceptions to the instructions in Technical Area 9 that the pricing is to be placed in Column 'F'.</p>	This has been updated in Amendment 11.
6997	<p>Why for Category B and C did the government change the requirement to the following: "Only contracts with performance within three years from the proposal due date will be evaluated."? Specifically the "...the proposal due date..." in Amendment 0010? Request the government to change the requirement back to "...the solicitation release date ...". You have impacted several offerors projects they were bidding for past performances and forcing at list minute to find a subcontractor with project requirements.</p>	Amendment 11 revised the recency date to 3 years from the original RFP release date.
6998	<p>In the paragraph ... "For Small Businesses proposing in Category B - .... For offerors submitting as HUBZone, VOSB, SDVOSB, WOSB, or EDWOSB ...". Did the government leave out "8a" by mistake in Amendments 8 through 10?</p>	The current RFP has been updated.
6999	<p>In the paragraph ... "For Small Businesses proposing in Category C - .... For offerors submitting as HUBZone, VOSB, SDVOSB, WOSB, or EDWOSB ...". Did the government left out "8a" by mistake in Amendments 8 through 10?</p>	The current RFP has been updated.
7004	<p>Is the Offeror required to sign all SF30's, including the ones with the Contracting Officer signature?</p>	The solicitation was updated in Amendment 11 to indicate "acknowledgement of all subsequent solicitation amendments" can be done via the SF 30 or via an affirmative statement within the General Instructions Cover Page.
7016	<p>Regarding the submission of Exhibit 4, we would like to request confirmation on whether this exhibit needs to be submitted only by the Prime Offeror, considering there is a contradiction between what is stated in the RFP: 'Each Offeror (including first-tier subcontractors, if applicable) for each NAICS code represented in Section A.1.34 NORTH AMERICAN INDUSTRY CLASSIFICATION SYSTEM (NAICS) &amp; NAICS CODES WITHIN SCOPE must complete Exhibit 4,' and the answer to Question No. 2699, which states: 'No, only the Offeror (Prime) is required to complete the NAICS Size Standard Crosswalk, Exhibit 4.' This question pertains to proposals where there is no a JV</p>	The wording has been updated in Amendment 11 - only the prime should fill out and submit the exhibit.
7018	<p>Amendment 10 changes the past performance relevancy period to within 3 years of proposal due date, vs. solicitation release, which had held from the original RFP through Amendment 9. This change, and at this late date, creates an undue burden on offerors to develop new references, and an undue burden on their government and/or commercial customers who will be asked to submit new PPQs. We respectfully request that the Government revert this requirement back to its original wording, i.e. "Contracts that are completed or ongoing within three years of the solicitation release date will be considered recent."</p>	Amendment 11 revised the recency date to 3 years from the original RFP release date.
7027	<p>Could the government please confirm that the following requirements, listed in the original solicitation release information on the SAM.gov SEWP VI web page, are required for proposal submission? (Note: These requirements have not been included in the RFP document itself.) If these requirements do apply, can the Government confirm that they can be met through a member of an MPJV instead of through the unpopulated JV itself?</p> <p>Potential offerors should ensure its company is listed in the online database(s) for the following:</p> <p>(1) System for award management: <a href="https://www.sam.gov/SAM/">https://www.sam.gov/SAM/</a></p> <p>(2) U.S. Department of Labor Veterans' Employment and Training Service, VETS-4212 Reports: <a href="https://vets4212.dol.gov/vets4212/">https://vets4212.dol.gov/vets4212/</a></p> <p>(3) Date Universal Numbering System (and the transition to the US Government's unique entity identifier (UEI)): <a href="https://www.gsa.gov/about-us/organization/federal-acquisition-service/office-of-systems-management/integrated-award-environment-iae/iae-information-kit/unique-entity-identifier-update">https://www.gsa.gov/about-us/organization/federal-acquisition-service/office-of-systems-management/integrated-award-environment-iae/iae-information-kit/unique-entity-identifier-update</a></p> <p>The successful offeror must pass an Equal Employment Opportunity (EEO) clearance before contract award (See FAR 22.805).</p>	Please propose in accordance with the current RFP. All items listed in the question shall be in the name of the MPJV that is registered in sam.gov
7028	<p>RFP instructions for SF1449 say offerors should complete boxes 12, 17, and 30. However, many Q&amp;A responses in Batch 6 say "The Offeror's past performance should relate to the NAICS code for competition as selected by the Offeror at the time of the proposal submission and as indicated in their SF 1449." Where on the SF1449 should offerors insert our primary NAICS code? (Block 10, where the NAICS code is usually listed, has already been filled out by the Government with the text "See Section A.1.34.")</p>	The Offeror shall include in Block 17a of the SF1449 the NAICS Code the Offeror is proposing using for competition at the master contract level. Amendment 11 reflects this change.
7037	<p>Questions #2947 and 6229 instruct offerors to complete reps and certs from the offering JV entity itself. However, Question #3114 instructs offerors to submit reps and certs from each member of an upopulated JV. Could the Government please confirm that reps and certs should be completed only by the offering JV entity?</p>	Reps and Certs shall come from the Offering JV and not each member.



7038	<p>The Government has provided conflicting instructions as to which partners in a MPJV are permitted/required to provide REPs or PPs: Question 3766 states that a protege JV member does not have to provide a PP reference; Question 6046 states that a protege JV member does not have to provide either an REP or PP reference; and Question 5533 says that, for REPs and PPs for MPJV offerors, the Government allows work done and qualifications held individually by each partner to the MPJV, the work done by the MPJV itself, or any combination of both.</p> <p>Amendment 10 revised instructions for SB Category B/C REPs (Section A.3.7.1.(c)) state: "For Mentor-Protégé Joint Ventures, one of the REPs from different mandatory experience technical areas shall be submitted from the Protégé or Mentor-Protégé Joint Venture itself." (This instruction permits MPJV offerors to submit at least one REP from the Mentor.)</p> <p>Amendment 10 revised instructions for SB Category B/C PPs (Section A.3.7.2.(a)) state: "...contracts may be submitted from the Protégé or the offering Mentor-Protégé Joint Venture itself." (This instruction does not permit Mentors to submit any PPs for an MPJV offeror.)</p> <p>13 CFR 125.9, which details the rules governing SBA's small business Mentor-Protégé program, permits SBs to form an approved MPJV, including with OTSBs, to assist the Protege in seeking any type of small business contract (i.e., small business set-aside, 8(a), HUBZone, SDVO, or WOSB) for which the protégé firm qualifies.</p> <p>Would the Government please confirm that a Mentor in an MPJV is permitted to provide at least one REP and PP reference?</p>	For Mentor-Protégé Joint Ventures, A Mentor may provide Past Performance References and REPs in accordance with the RFP. Amendment 11 provides this clarification.
7041	In Section A.3.7.2.(a), page 111, could the Government confirm that the terminated contracts requirement be named subsection #11 and not #1?	The current RFP is updated in Amendment 11. The terminated contracts requirements is separate information in addition to points 1 through 9.
7044	<p>The RFP States: "Failure to provide a signed SF 1449 and acknowledgement of all subsequent solicitation amendments will result in the Offeror being eliminated from competition"</p> <p>Will the government please remove "and acknowledgement of all subsequent solicitation amendments"?</p> <p>We respectfully request that SF30s subsequent to amendment 10, that the government check box 13. E."Contractor "is not" required to sign this document....."</p> <p>By checking box 13.E "Contractor "is not" required to sign this document....." offerors will not need to repeatedly update and resubmit their proposals with each amendment.</p>	The solicitation was updated in Amendment 11 to indicate "acknowledgement of all subsequent solicitation amendments" can be done via the SF 30 or via an affirmative statement within the General Instructions Cover Page.
7045	<p>Regarding MPJVs, Q&amp;A 3089 stated, "The mentor cannot submit REPs or Past Performance references." This answer is in line with the guidance set forth in the RFP.</p> <p>13 C.F.R. 125.8(e) states: Capabilities, past performance and experience. When evaluating the capabilities, past performance, experience, business systems and certifications of an entity submitting an offer for a contract set aside or reserved for small business as a joint venture established pursuant to this section, a procuring activity must consider work done and qualifications held individually by each partner to the joint venture as well as any work done by the joint venture itself previously. A procuring activity may not require the protégé firm to individually meet the same evaluation or responsibility criteria as that required of other offerors generally. The partners to the joint venture in the aggregate must demonstrate the past performance, experience, business systems and certifications necessary to perform the contract.</p> <p>Respectfully request the submission of REPs (Volume 1) and Past Performance References (Volume 2) of Mentors be allowable to comply with 13 C.F.R. 125.8(e).</p>	For Mentor-Protégé Joint Ventures, A Mentor may provide Past Performance References and REPs in accordance with the current RFP. Amendment 11 provides this clarification.
7047	We are a SDVOSB planning to submit a Category C proposal. Please explain the adjusted section reading, "For HUBZone, VOSB, SDVOSB, WOSB, EDWOSB, 8a, offerors (inclusive of first-tier subcontractors, if applicable): A total of two different REPs from different mandatory experience technical areas shall be submitted. Each Project must have had a minimum of \$2M in total value size of a single order or contract and must be described using the Exhibit 1 REP template. For offerors submitting as HUBZone, VOSB, SDVOSB, WOSB, or EDWOSB Joint Ventures, one of the REPs from different mandatory experience technical areas shall be submitted from the HUBZone, VOSB, SDVOSB, WOSB, or EDWOSB partner, or the Joint Venture itself. The HUBZone, VOSB, SDVOSB, WOSB, or EDWOSB partner project, or Joint Venture project need only have a minimum of \$1M in total value size of a single order or contract." Does this adjusted section mean that all HUBZone, VOSB, SDVOSB, WOSB, or EDWOSB partner, or the Joint Venture itself can no longer utilize two REPs from their small business first-tier subcontractor that is covered under a Meaningful relationship commitment letter?	The language in the current RFP has been clarified in Amendment 11. The question is unclear since a Meaningful Relationship Commitment Letter is not required for first-tier subcontractors.

7049	IAW A.3.7.2(a)(9) and Q&A 2555: "Customer Evaluations ... are excluded from the page limitations." / Q&A 4840: "Yes. The offeror needs to submit ... CPARS for the past performances being submitted." / Q&A 1761: "Yes, customer-written performance feedback issued in recent CPARS is acceptable as 'other written performance feedback' for the requirement in Past Performance Volume, (a) Information from Offeror #9." (Ref Q&As 3366 and 6458 that both say CPARS should be fully contained in stated page limits.) Could the Government please confirm that CPARS may be submitted for PPs in response to item #9, and that they are excluded from the 10-page limit for the PP volume?	The referenced "recent customer evaluations of previous performance" has been removed in Amendment 11.
7050	For LOAs, please remove the language that "The POC must be a US Citizen..." Were an offeror to request validation of the POC's citizenship it would be a violation of The Privacy Act (5 U.S.C. 552).	The requirement is updated in Amendment 11 to remove the citizenship requirement.
7052	Answer number 3089 in Batch 6 of the Q&A states "The mentor cannot submit REPs or Past Performance references." This directly contradicts the Category B instructions for Small Businesses and the Category C instructions (Page 104 of Amendment 0010) which both state "For Mentor-Protégé Joint Ventures, one of the REPs from different mandatory experience technical areas shall be submitted from the Protégé or the Mentor-Protégé Joint Venture itself." Please clarify the instructions for use of Mentor REPs and Past Performance for Mentor Protege Joint Ventures.	For Mentor-Protégé Joint Ventures, A Mentor may provide Past Performance References and REPs in accordance with the RFP. Amendment 11 provides this clarification.
7053	Amendment 10 RFP Section A.3.7.2(a) indicates that bidders should submit past performance "[c]ontracts that are completed or ongoing within three years of the proposal due date" to be considered. This is a change from the original requirement that contracts be completed or ongoing within three years of the solicitation date. This change to the requirement language has negatively impacted some bidders by making their intended past performance references no longer relevant due to the difference between the solicitation date and response date as well as the significant shift in the response due date. Will the Government please consider reverting the language back to within three years of the "original" solicitation date to not penalize bidders, especially small businesses, who may have more limited relevant experience?	Amendment 11 revised the recency date to 3 years from the original RFP release date.
7059	A.3.7.1(a)(3) requires offerors to submit a copy of CTA agreements. Are offerors required to submit a copy of Teaming Agreements (TAs) if these are traditional prime / subcontractor agreements (not CTAs)?	If proposing a Contractor Team Arrangement (CTA) to satisfy the requirements of this contract, a copy of the agreement must be provided and be in accordance with FAR 9.6. The CTA shall include the names of the team members and a description of the responsibilities of each team member. An Offeror may submit a proposal under an existing CTA with a prime/subcontractor relationship or Joint Venture only if the existing Joint Venture or prime has a corresponding UEI Number in <a href="https://www.sam.gov">https://www.sam.gov</a> and all the proposal submission documents are in the name of the existing Joint Venture or prime. Joint Ventures without a corresponding UEI Number in <a href="https://www.sam.gov">https://www.sam.gov</a> will not be evaluated or considered for award.
7061	The RFP does not show that the Past Performance Matrix is excluded from page limits, but Batch 3 Q&A #2900 states that it is excluded – can the Government please clarify whether the Matrix is included or excluded from the 10-page limit?	Amendment 11 clarifies that the matrix is included in the 10 page limit.
7062	As Batch 3 Q&A numbers 2232, 2335, and 2594 provide conflicting answers, can the Government please clarify whether the list to whom PPQs were sent is included or excluded from the 10-page limit?	Amendment 11 clarified that the list is excluded from the page count.
7066	Can a SDVOSB JV that has one qualifying past performance project of it's own be permitted to use a past performance reference of its SB JV partner, provided that SB's project conforms to the higher threshold?	This question is unclear. Please propose in accordance with the current RFP.
7077	Offerors are required to submit past performances that fall within the scope of the specified NAICS codes. For Category A, one of the required NAICS codes is 339112. However, we have a past performance under NAICS code 339113. Is there a possibility of including this NAICS code as well?  Additionally, we have past performances where the scope of work aligns with Category A, but the NAICS codes under which those contracts were performed do not fall within the specified Category A NAICS codes. Can we provide these contracts if we include a relevance description?	1) NAICS code 339113 was added to Amendment 11; 2) yes.
7080	In Amendment 10 at A.3.7.2 (a) Past Performance, the Government has changed the definition of "Recent" from "within three years of the solicitation release date" to "within three years of the proposal due date". The Proposal Due date is a moving target which will continually exclude projects as it moves out in time. This creates a burden on Government procurement officers and third-party prime contractors who have already performed this work on behalf of our bid. Will the Government consider reversing this change?	Amendment 11 revised the recency date to 3 years from the original RFP release date.

7084	<p>Please review the information for the past performance volume. The paragraph below references details that are no longer being asked - i.e. reference to a12. "All Offerors shall present a summary of relevant past performance information in matrix form as set forth below in Table 1, Sample Past Performance Matrix and accompany each category of the relevant experience. The information shall match the past performance information with therelevant experience identified in paragraph (a)(12) of this section. Offerors are advised that the matrix is a summary of the referenced contracts submitted for the past performance volume for a given scope category. The required matrix information below is only provided as an example. In the first column of the matrix, insert the Contract Identifier – either a contract number, customer name, or other unique identifier that clearly identifies the contract and matches it with the past performance information submitted pursuant to the instructions of paragraph (a)(1). In the othercolumns of the matrix, indicate the work the Offeror has performed that is similar or related to each element of the current requirement as presented in the matrix. If the Offeror performed as subcontractor, insert an “S” accompanied by a subscript number to indicate the subcontract tier. If the Offeror performed as a prime contractor, insert a “P” in the appropriate block."</p>	The solicitation has been updated in Amendment 11.
7085	<p>Original Question 3766, 3767, 5533- Past Performance - The response to question 3766 states that protégé JV members do not have to provide past performance. However, the updated wording in Amendment 8 states that Past Performance must be provided by the protégé or the MP JV itself. Providing MP JV experience would constitute protégé experience. The response to question 5533 states that information for REPs and past performance may be provided by any member of the mentor protégé JV or the MP JV itself. Would the Government please decisively clarify the instructions to be consistent with 13 CFR 125.8(e) which will allow REPs and Past Performance to be provided from the Mentor Protégé JV itself, or the Mentor and/or Protégé individually?</p>	For Mentor-Protégé Joint Ventures, A Mentor may provide Past Performance References and REPs in accordance with the RFP. Amendment 11 provides this clarification.
7087	<p>Question Response 3089, 6046 - REPs and Past Performance - Regarding submissions for Mentor Protégé Joint Ventures in Category C Small Business, the response to question 3089 states: “The mentor cannot submit REPs or Past Performance references.” The question and response to 6046 states: Q: “Is the protégé of a mentor protégé joint venture required to submit any REP or PP references?” A: “No” These responses are in direct conflict with the RFP instructions that state that only one REP is required from the Protégé or JV itself: “For Mentor-Protégé Joint Ventures, one of the REPs from different mandatory experience technical areas shall be submitted from the Protégé or Mentor-Protégé Joint Venture itself.” For Past Performance the instructions state: “For offerors submitting as Mentor-Protégé Joint Ventures, contracts may be submitted from the Protégé or the offering Mentor-Protégé Joint Venture itself.” Would the Government please decisively clarify the instructions to be consistent with 13 CFR 125.8(e) which will allow REPs and Past Performance to be provided from the Mentor Protégé JV itself, or the Mentor and/or Protégé individually?</p>	For Mentor-Protégé Joint Ventures, A Mentor may provide Past Performance References and REPs in accordance with the RFP. Amendment 11 provides this clarification.
7092	<p>Q&amp;A Batch 4 Question 3785</p> <p>SEWP response “The NAICS code being used for competition is the NAICS code selected by the Offeror when submitting the proposal and as provided by the Offeror on their SF1449.</p> <p>Category A SF1449 from Amendment 10, Block 10 is pre-populated with “50% FOR: NORTH AMERICAN INDUSTRY CLASSIFICATION STANDARD (NAICS): See Section A.1.34”</p> <p>a. We are small business under 541519e. Do we enter the NAICS code 541519e and Size standard in Block 10?</p> <p>b. Do we change the percentage to reflect 100% small business?</p>	a) The Offeror shall include in Block 17a of the SF1449 the NAICS Code the Offeror is proposing using for competition at the master contract level. Amendment 11 reflects this clarification.
7094	<p>What is mentioned by attachments in the following "...fill-ins in the clauses, provisions/representations and certifications, and attachments..." statement? Are they just the SF30s or any other attachments?</p> <p>If we have to include SF30s for all the amendments, then we are not able to sign them as they are already signed. How should we approach this?</p>	Whatever attachments are required in response to the General Instructions. The solicitation was updated in Amendment 11 to indicate "acknowledgement of all subsequent solicitation amendments" can be done via the SF 30 or via an affirmative statement within the General Instructions Cover Page.
7096	<p>When talking about the "...indicated Offeror required fill-ins in the clauses, provisions/representations..." , is just Part V of the solicitation that has to be submitted or some additional elements as well?</p> <p>If submitting as a Joint Venture with multiple partners, who needs to include fill-in clauses? Is it just the managing partners or each of the individual JV partners that have to provide the fill-in clauses separately?</p>	The Offeror shall complete SF1449 Blocks 12 (if applicable), 17, and 30 and the indicated Offeror required fill-ins in the clauses, provisions/representations and certifications, and attachments. An Offeror’s Commercial and Government Entity (CAGE) Code in SAM.gov shall match the Offeror’s name on the SF1449. The signed SF1449 and the pages with the required fill-ins must be submitted with the proposal. By signing and submitting the SF1449, the Offeror has read, understands, and agrees to the terms and conditions of the current RFP unless otherwise noted when the proposal submitted.
7097	Referring to the conflicting information in Q&A 6604 and RFP section A.3.7.2(a)(9), will NASA please clarify whether Offerors are required to submit CPARS within Volume II for the three references submitted with our proposal?	No. The referenced section A.3.7.2(a)(9) has been removed in Amendment 11.
7099	In light of Q&A 3089, will NASA clarify the permissible use of REP/PP from mentors in a Mentor-Protégé Joint Venture (MPJV)? This appears to conflict with guidelines in FAR 19.708, FAR 52.219-9, and Small Business Administration (SBA) rules.	For Mentor-Protégé Joint Ventures, A Mentor may provide Past Performance References and REPs in accordance with the RFP. Amendment 11 provides this clarification.

7107	The RFP Section “Information from Offeror’s (a)” requires an offeror to provide the following information in their response, “The current contract expenditures incurred to date, the date in which the expenditures have been incurred through, and the Average Annual Value to Date”. Question is, if a contract has been closed is it acceptable to calculate the annual value based on the governments final FPDS contract value posted (e.g. \$X millions divided by period of performance) or is a statement that the contract is closed, and this requirement is not required an acceptable response?	The question is unclear. Please propose in accordance with the current RFP.
7109	In Amendment 10, the Past Performance (PP) requirement changed to specify that they should be within the last 3 years from the proposal submission/due date, whereas previously it was from the solicitation release date. This change significantly adds to the complexity of the response, as it creates a moving target with each amendment. Each time, we are required to adjust the entire process, including resubmitting PPQs for past performance and re-evaluating project eligibility. Would it be possible to revert back to the original requirement reducing the additional ambiguity and hardship for the entities responding to this solicitation (i.e. based on the solicitation release date?)	Amendment 11 revised the recency date to 3 years from the original RFP release date.
7110	In Amendment 10, the Relevant Experience Project (REP) requirement changed to specify that they should be within the last 3 years from the proposal submission/due date, whereas previously it was from the solicitation release date. This change significantly adds to the complexity of the response, as it creates a moving target with each amendment. Each time, we are required to adjust the entire process, including re-evaluating project eligibility, rewriting the responses for REPs. Would it be possible to revert back to the original requirement reducing the additional ambiguity and hardship for the entities responding to this solicitation (i.e. based on the solicitation release date?)	Amendment 11 revised the recency date to 3 years from the original RFP release date.
7112	You have mentioned that for socio-economic tracks like HUBZone, SDB, VOSB, SDVOSB, WOSB, EDWOSB, and 8(a), the requirements for Past Performance (PP) and Relevant Experience Projects (REP) are different than for small businesses. We are a self-certified SDB based on our SAM.gov profile. Are there any additional requirements we need to meet to qualify as an SDB?	Please refer to the SBA for all eligibility requirements. Please propose in accordance with the current RFP.
7114	Ref A.3.7.2 (a) Past Performance final paragraph (“1. List any contracts terminated (partial or complete) within the past three years and basis for termination (convenience or default).....Include contracts that were “de-scoped” by the customer because of performance or cost problems.”) For Mentor-Protégé Joint Ventures (MP JV), since the past performance references are required from either the Protégé or the JV itself, we understand that this requirement applies only to the Protégé or the JV itself (and not to the Mentor). Please confirm.	List any contracts terminated from the JV, Mentor, and Protégé.
7117	RFP section A.3.7.2(a)(9) states that Offerors shall provide recent customer evaluations of previous performance including Award Fee Evaluation results, Fee Determination Official letters, Annual Performance Evaluation Forms, or any other written performance feedback, if applicable. Question #5188 states that offerors shall not submit CPARs information, while Question #4135 confirms that CPARs would in fact satisfy this requirement. I respectfully request that the final RFP clarify that CPARs satisfy the recent customer evaluation requirement.	The referenced "recent customer evaluations of previous performance" has been removed in Amendment 11.
7123	Q&A is contradictory about the information required of EACH of the PP references versus information required of the company as a whole, most recent RFP Amendment 10 clarifies some items, but inconsistency still exists: a. The original point 12 (performance history) appears to have been removed in Amendment 8 and Amendment 10 – but there are instructions for what appears to be x2 requirements. a.1. Will the USG confirm that the Past Performance Matrix is to be provided with details on EACH of the PP references provided and NOT on the company as a whole? a.1.a. If this is to be provided as a whole, should it be provided as its own section? a.2. Will the USG confirm that the Past Performance History section is SEPARATE from the Matrix and includes performance history from the Offeror as a WHOLE? a.2.a. If this is to be provided as a whole, should it be provided as its own section?	a) This was updated in Amendment 11; a.1.) Yes. The matrix is to be provided with details on each of the PP references; a.2.) No, the Past Performance History should relate to the identified relevant experience areas.
7124	Prior Customer Evaluations – PPQ’s are noted as outside of page count (the details on who these have been sent to), but Q&A also notes that these should be provided at the front of the PP Volume. In order to manage page count, might this small table with POC details from the PPQ submissions be submitted at the end of the Volume?	The POC list should be included in the Volume II cover page.
7125	Q&A is inconsistent as to what is in or out of page count for the PP Volume, in some instances stating the PPQ table, the evaluation information, the matrix and the terminations data. Please confirm what specifically is required to be provided IN page count for the PP volume?	The Current RFP lists what is included and not included within the Proposal Submission Table in PROPOSAL CONTENT AND PAGE LIMITATIONS section. Amendment 11 clarifies that the matrix is included in the 10 page count.
7133	Q&A stated proposal validity period should be provided in Volume 1 – but does not provide detail as to where this should be provided?  Should this be a separate defined section of the Offer Volume? OR would inclusion of this information on the SF1449 be sufficient?	Offeror shall provide this information in the Offer Volume General Instructions Cover Page.
7136	• Some Q&A indicated that the POCs in Volume 2 should appear at the beginning of the volume, and some Q&A indicated that the POCs should be placed at the end of the Volume. According to the solicitation instructions they should appear at the end of Volume 2. Which is correct location in Volume 2?	The POC list should be included in the Volume II cover page.

7137	<p>1. In Amendment 10 Section A.3.7.2 (a) and in A.4.3 it states, Prime Offerors shall furnish the information requested below for a minimum of one but no more than three recent similar contracts. Contracts that are completed or ongoing within three years of the proposal due date will be considered recent. This is a drastic departure from previous versions of the RFP and a direct conflict with numerous answers to questions provided. We request that the Government return this requirement to “within three years of solicitation release.” This change will entail reviews and in some cases substitutions of sections of the proposal that have been set for months while the due date has continued to fluctuate.</p>	Amendment 11 revised the recency date to 3 years from the original RFP release date.
7142	<p>* The Government stated during an industry day that the Government will follow up with the POCs from Past Performance Questionnaires (PPQs) if they are not submitted to the Government, but in released Q&amp;As and Amended Solicitations the Government has also stated that it is the responsibility of the offeror to ensure that PPQs are submitted to the Government by the proposal due date. Which is accurate and will the Government contact the POCs if the PPQs are not submitted on time to verify/obtain them?</p>	Offerors will not be negatively affected if the customer failed to provide a questionnaire as long as the Offeror has ensured that the references are notified and have verified that the questionnaire is completed and submitted.
7144	<p>Q&amp;A Batch 4 notes the use of a Cover Letter for, “Identify any consultants, generative artificial intelligence, and/or subcontractors used in writing this proposal”. No mention of a Cover Letter exists in the solicitation.</p> <p>Will the USG please confirm that there is no requirement for a cover letter and that the information on consultants, generative AI and/or subcontractors used in writing the proposal can be provided in the Offer Volume I, as noted in the instructions?</p>	The instructions have been updated in Amendment 11.
7145	<p>Amendment 10 RFP section A.3.7.2 updated the recency period of past performance references from "within three years of the solicitation release date" to "within three years of the proposal due date." This change means Offerors will need to identify and secure new references and PPQs if previously identified references fall outside the recency period due to proposal deadline changes. This places additional burden on government agencies who must process new PPQ requests and could reduce competition if replacement references cannot be secured in time. Can the government please revert back to using the solicitation release date as the fixed reference point for assessing recency?</p>	Amendment 11 revised the recency date to 3 years from the original RFP release date.
7146	<p>Exhibit 4 – NAICS crosswalk</p> <p>Confirm that File is to be supplied in ONLY excel and not in pdf as well?</p> <p>Confirm that file is to be supplied as ONLY a separate file and NOT also within the Volume I submission?</p> <p>If the Offeror will be competing under a NAICSs other than the NAICSs that is listed at the top of the Exhibit 4 – shall the Offeror correct the NAICSs at the top of Exhibit 4?</p>	<p>Confirmed that excel files are submitted as excel files as stated in the RFP; Confirmed that all documents including excel files are submitted as separate files within the appropriate Volume folder; the Offeror should not alter the referenced line in Exhibit 4. Note that the referenced line was updated in Amendment 11.</p>
7150	<p>The 1449 does not have block 28 checked this is the block that requires offerors signature, I know the RFP clearly states the 1449 MUST be signed and we understand and will sign but this could cause confusion.</p> <p>Amendments 1,2,3,4,5,6,8 SF-30's are signed by the government and cannot be edited for any field, additionally block 13.E. IMPORTANT: Contractor ___ is not ___ is required to sign this document and return ___ copies to the issuing office is not checked.</p> <p>Amendments 7, 9 SF-30's are editable and we can fill in the contractor information and sign but block 13.E. IMPORTANT: Contractor ___ is not ___ is required to sign this document and return ___ copies to the issuing office is not checked.</p> <p>We can printout Amendments 1,2,3,4,5,6,8 SF-30's sign and type in the appropriate data then scan them and then incorporate into our Volume 1 response. Is this what you would like us to do? We normally sign the SF-30's to acknowledge the amendments but with no blocks checked are the SF-30's required to be returned signed and incorporated into Volume 1?</p>	The solicitation was updated in Amendment 11 to indicate "acknowledgement of all subsequent solicitation amendments" can be done via the SF 30 or via an affirmative statement within the General Instructions Cover Page.
7151	<p>Will the government allow OTSB to submit a separate plan for AbilityOne for this opportunity as a CDRL or reporting requirement, as we are not allowed to include the AbilityOne goals in our approved Commercial Small Business Subcontracting Plan?</p>	The solicitation was updated in Amendment 11 to remove the subcontracting plan reference.
7152	<p>Will the government allow OTSB to submit a separate report for AbilityOne for this opportunity as a CDRL or reporting requirement, as we are not allowed to include the AbilityOne goals in our approved Commercial Small Business Subcontracting Plan?</p>	The solicitation was updated in Amendment 11 to remove the subcontracting plan reference.

7155	<p>Amendment 10, Page 107 A.3.7.2 PAST PERFORMANCE VOLUME (a) INFORMATION FROM THE OFFEROR</p> <p>For small businesses proposing in categories B &amp; C, the solicitation states:</p> <p>“For offerors submitting as Mentor-Protégé Joint Ventures, contracts may be submitted from the Protégé or the offering Mentor-Protégé Joint Venture itself.”</p> <p>Question 1: What can the Mentor’s contribution be to Past Performance if submitting as a Mentor Protégé JV? As the instructions now state, everything must come from the Protégé or the JV itself.</p> <p>Question 2: If the Mentor can contribute to the Past Performance if submitting as a Mentor Protégé JV, what are the project qualification criteria for the Mentor’s project?</p>	For Mentor-Protégé Joint Ventures, A Mentor may provide Past Performance References and REPs in accordance with the RFP. Amendment 11 provides this clarification.
7157	Can a joint venture (JV) submit its agreement document, or is a meaningful relationship letter required, or both?	A MRCL is not required for a JV. A Joint Venture Agreement is required. Please see updated amendment 11.
7159	Amendment 8 Exhibit 4 Cat A includes NAICS 333316, however this NAICS is not on SAM. Could the Government please clarify and/or correct?	The NAICS code has been updated in Amendment 11.
7165	Batch 3 response to question #4499 states "the offeror should populate Block 10 with the applicable NAICS code." However Batch 3 response to question #4899, as well as in various other responses, the Government only identifies "the Offeror must complete SF1449 Blocks 12 (if applicable), 17, and 30", excluding the requirement to have to fill in Block 10. Can the Government please clarify/correct?	The Offeror shall include in Block 17a of the SF1449 the NAICS Code the Offeror is proposing using for competition at the master contract level. Amendment 11 reflects this clarification.
7172	Batch 3 response to question #2110 states that JV's must provide a meaningful relationship commitment letter. However, Batch 3 response to question #1889 states that SBA Mentor-Protégé Joint Ventures do NOT need to submit a Meaningful Relationship Commitment Letter. Can the Government please confirm that a meaningful relationship commitment letter is required for unpopulated MP JVs?	A MRCL is not required for a JV. Please see updated amendment 11.
7173	Batch 6 response to question #6117 states "Offerors sharing resources from a Parent Company, Affiliate, Division, and/or Subsidiary within a corporate structure for evaluation purposes will need to provide a Meaningful Relationship Commitment Letter." Can the Government please confirm that a meaningful relationship commitment letter is required for unpopulated MP JVs?	A MRCL is not required for a JV. Please see updated amendment 11.
7174	Batch 3 response to question #2601 states "A copy of the Joint Venture Agreement is required to demonstrate the Meaningful Relationship". Can the Government please confirm that a meaningful relationship commitment letter is required for unpopulated MP JVs and that providing the Joint Venture Agreement satisfies this requirement?	A MRCL is not required for a JV. A Joint Venture Agreement is required. Please see updated amendment 11.
7183	Reponse to question #4795 states "Offerors are to number, identify, and date all pages of Volumes I, II, and III including exhibits and other Government-provided fillable files, even if excluded from page limitations" However, for Government provided documents to be included as part of the proposal we do not understand how the Government would like us to number, identify, and date all pages. Can the Government please clarify and provide exact instructions on how they would like offerors to meet this requirement?	Instructions were clarified in Amendment 11.
7187	Please confirm that for unpopulated MP JVs that reps and certs are required from the bidding JV entity as well as both members of the MP JV.	Reps and Certs shall come from the Offering JV and not each member.
7191	Does the Government require all SF30s that have been provided to date to be included as part of the proposal?	No. The solicitation was updated in Amendment 11 to indicate "acknowledgement of all subsequent solicitation amendments" can be done via the SF 30 or via an affirmative statement within the General Instructions Cover Page.
7194	RFP p. 108 states "Offeror’s (including JVs) and proposed first-tier subcontractors’ past prime or subcontract experiences shall be limited to no more than three (3) reference contracts for the Offeror (including JVs) and no more than one (1) reference Contract for each first-tier subcontractor for which performance occurred within the last three (3) years of the release date of the final SEWP VI RFP." Should the reference date be due date or release date?	Amendment 11 revised the recency date to 3 years from the original RFP release date.
7195	Response to question 4135 states that the Government IS considering CPARs as "formal customer evaluation documents". However, response to question #2574 states "Offerors should not submit their CPARs". Understanding that these 2 responses contradict each other on whether or not CPARs can be submitted as "formal customer evaluation documents/recent customer evaluations", can the Government please clarify?	The referenced "recent customer evaluations of previous performance" has been removed in Amendment 11.
7196	If CPARs are the only "formal customer evaluation documents/recent customer evaluations" that an offeror has for a submitted past performance, with the offeror be rated lower if CPARs can not be submitted to meet this requirement?	The referenced "recent customer evaluations of previous performance" has been removed in Amendment 11.
7201	Response to question #5726 states that offerors should respond to the requirement to "identify any consultants, generative artificial intelligence, and/or subcontractors used in writing this proposal" as part of the cover letter. However, we do not see a requirement to provide a cover letter. Can the Government please clarify?	The solicitation was updated in Amendment 11 to clarify information to be included in the General Instructions Cover Page.

7213	Amendment 10 changed the past performance experience requirement from "within (3) years of solicitation release" to "within (3) years of proposal due date" This presents a large issue for many offerors who may have limited past performance to use and rather than being able to leverage the past performances they originally planned, may now be required to not submit a past performance volume and receive a "neutral" rating. Changing this requirement after offerors have invested almost an entire year developing proposal files, making refinements to those proposal files based on amendments / Q&As, potentially paying consultants to support these volumes, and already submitting PPQs to the customers of these past performances that are no longer viable to be used based on this change. We do not believe that changing this requirement so late in the game is fair to offerors and results in wasted time, effort, and money that many small businesses do not have. Many small businesses have invested a lot of money into NASA SEWP proposal efforts for the Government to change this requirement so late. Would the Government consider changing this requirement back to the 3 years of solicitation release requirement in originally was?	Amendment 11 revised the recency date to 3 years from the original RFP release date.
7214	Amendment 10 changed the REP experience requirement from "within (3) years of solicitation release" to "within (3) years of proposal due date" This presents a large issue for many offerors who may have limited experience to use and rather than being able to leverage the efforts they originally planned, may now no longer be eligible to compete due to this change of REP experience requirement. Changing this requirement after offerors have invested almost an entire year developing proposal files, making refinements to those proposal files based on amendments / Q&As, and potentially paying consultants to support these files. We do not believe that changing this requirement so late in the game is fair to offerors and results in wasted time, effort, and money that many small businesses do not have. Many small businesses have invested a lot of money into NASA SEWP proposal efforts for the Government to change this requirement so late. Would the Government consider changing this requirement back to the 3 years of solicitation release requirement in originally was?	Amendment 11 revised the recency date to 3 years from the original RFP release date.
7218	In A.4.3 the RFP defines recency as performance occurring within the last three years of the proposal due date.” This change is a significant impact to the ability of companies to identify past performance with a potentially moving target. As you are aware, this RFP was released in May 2024 and has been amended 10 times including the changing of the submission date by several months. Would the government consider changing the past performance recency period to 3 years from the date of RFP release to ensure companies will not have to make changes based on the submission date changes? Alternatively, would the government consider the recency as 5 years from the proposal submission date?	Amendment 11 revised the recency date to 3 years from the original RFP release date.
7220	<p>In answer to Q&amp;A question 6567, it was stated “Confirmed. This is allowable, provided that no proposal evaluation elements are shared and/or no resources from the parent company are committed. Subsidiary A and Subsidiary B are considered separate offerors and can leverage a MRCL for each offer that cites corporate reach-back services.”</p> <p>This answer as it is worded now contradicts itself, as well as contradicts GAO’s ruling on the use of meaningful involvement as demonstrated in IAP World Services, Inc.; EMCOR Government Services, B-407917.2 et al., GAO stated:</p> <p>“An agency properly may attribute the experience or past performance of a parent or affiliated company to an offeror where the firm’s proposal demonstrates that the resources of the parent or affiliate will affect the performance of the offeror. Perini/Jones, Joint Venture, B-285906, Nov. 1, 2000, 2002 CPD ¶ 68 at 4. The relevant consideration is whether the resources of the parent or affiliated company—its workforce, management, facilities or other resources—will be provided or relied upon for contract performance such that the parent or affiliate will have meaningful involvement in contract performance. Ecompex, Inc., B-292865.4 et al., June 18, 2004, 2004 CPD ¶ 149 at 5. While it is appropriate to consider an affiliate’s performance record where the affiliate will be involved in the contract effort or where it shares management with the offeror, it is inappropriate to consider an affiliate’s record where that record does not bear on the likelihood of successful performance by the offeror. National City Bank of Indiana, B-287608.3, Aug. 7, 2002, 2002 CPD ¶ 190 at 10.”</p> <p>Per that ruling, in order to use meaningful involvement, the corporate affiliate must demonstrate they will have access to the referenced affiliated company’s specific resources as well as parent corporation resources. If a company cannot demonstrate this, the award to that company is grounds for a protest. With this in mind, please</p>	Question 6567 was incorrect in stating that no resources from the parent company are committed. In accordance with the current RFP a Offeror shall demonstrate that the resources of the parent or affiliate or predecessor company (its workforce, management, facilities, or other resources) shall be provided or relied upon for contract performance such that the parent or affiliate or predecessor will have meaningful involvement in contract performance as documented in the Meaningful Relationship Commitment Letter. 6567 should have stated: Confirmed. This is allowable, Subsidiary A and Subsidiary B are considered separate offerors and can leverage a MRCL for each offer that cites corporate reach-back services.



7223	<p>Reference: Amendment 10 – SEWP IV RFP 80TECH240001</p> <p>The RFP states: “If applicable, Offerors may provide the past performance of a parent or affiliate or predecessor company to an Offeror (including Joint Venture companies as prime offerors and/or a parent or affiliated company being otherwise proposed as a subcontractor on this effort where the Offerors proposal demonstrates that the resources of the parent or affiliate or predecessor will affect the performance of the Offeror.”</p> <p>The wording of this section seems to state that if two affiliated companies from the same corporate structure are teamed in a JV or subcontractor/prime relationship and past performance or relevant experience is used from both the prime offeror and their affiliated company as a JV partner or tier 1 small business subcontractor, it will be considered meaningful involvement despite any JV or teaming agreements in place and require the same demonstration of shared resources traditionally used in meaningful involvement commitment letters.</p> <p>This contradicts the intention of meaningful involvement and GAO rulings on it’s use. Please clarify on the use of references in past performance and relevant experience if a JV or Prime Offeror/Tier 1 Subcontractor are affiliated companies from the same corporate structure. We recommend removing this language and that if a JV arrangement or prime/subcontractor teaming arrangement are used between affiliated companies from the same corporate structure and references are used from both JV partners or the prime offeror/tier 1 subcontractor the requirements for past performance/corporate experience are the same as if they are non-affiliated companies.</p>	The language in the current RFP has been clarified in Amendment 11. A MRCL is not required for first-tier subcontractors.
7229	9. Reference RFP A.3.6, Proposal Submission Table, pages 95-96, Mission Suitability Volume III, Proposal C-SCRM Attestation form. Offerors are permitted by the RFP to submit an O-TTPS certificate instead of this form. Will the Government please confirm that the O-TTPS certificate is exempt from page limits and not that in the Proposal Submission Table?	Confirmed that the O-TTPS certificate is exempt from page limit.
7231	Since the implementation of the SBA and NAICS size standard changes from 3 to 5 years, some emerging larges are in a transition window. Would the government consider changing the recency requirement for the Relevant Experience Projects to a 5 year window as other vehicles have so smaller companies could apply additional large projects to meet the Category B OTSB \$30M total contract value size threshold?	Amendment 11 revised the recency date to 3 years from the original RFP release date.
7237	Amendment 10 FAR 9.104-1(a) : If an unpopulated MP JV does not possess a line of credit, would a line of credit for each member of the MP JV suffice this requirement?	To determine if an Offeror is responsible in accordance with FAR 9.104-1(a), Offeror is instructed to submit information which demonstrates the Offeror's financial capability to perform the contract. Lines of credit from MPJV members that demonstrate the Offeror's financial capability would be acceptable.
7239	<p>Per Amendment 10, the period of performance for the past performance contracts must be within 3 years of the proposal due date. We believe this could result in a significant change from the prior requirement, which was 3 years from the RFP release date.</p> <p>We respectfully request that the government consider reverting to the original requirement of using the RFP release date for the following reasons: For the past several months, offerors have been working on their past performance contracts and requesting PPQs based on the RFP release date. The proposal submission date is subject to change, leading to a constant review of offerors' selected past performance contract references. In addition, this change will create a significant burden for government contracting officers/CORs if offerors are required to request that contracting officers/CORs complete and submit PPQs again.</p>	Amendment 11 revised the recency date to 3 years from the original RFP release date.
7240	<p>Please verify that offerors are required to list contracts that were de-scoped due to contractor poor performance and not contracts that were descope by the government for reasons unrelated to poor contractor performance.</p> <p>The current solicitation language on Page 111 concerning contract scope changes presents a significant risk for protests. Requiring offerors to list all terminations or de-scopes captures an overwhelming number of government-initiated scope changes unrelated to contractor performance. These changes, often due to budget shifts or mission realignments, will far outweigh instances tied to poor performance and obscure the intent of identifying the most qualified offerors. Offerors may struggle to ensure they've captured every instance of a contract change, putting their proposals at risk of elimination. Without clarifying that the focus is solely on contracts where the contractor's performance negatively impacted the outcome, the broad requirement could result in unclear evaluations and increase the likelihood of protests from offerors who were eliminated due to appearing as if they haven't met this vague requirement.</p>	List any contracts terminated (partial or complete) within the past three years and basis for termination (convenience or default). Include the contract number, name, and the telephone number and e-mail address of the terminating officer (please verify information). Include contracts that were "de-scoped" by the customer because of performance or cost problems. (Excluded from the page limitation). <revised response>

7248	<p>Regarding a previous question and answer: Q: Page 57, A.1.30.1 References to ISO 20243-1:2018 and 20243-2:2018 are outdated, they were withdrawn and replaced by 20243-1:2023 and 20243-2:2023.</p> <p>A: The Solicitation has been updated to remove the reference to 2018.</p> <p>Please see the November 18th response we received from the O-TTPS Certification Authority: "I apologize for the confusion, please allow me to clarify. While the ISO 20243:2023 may be published, there is no current O-TTPS Certification that is technically equivalent to it yet. The O-TTPS Certification is currently on Version 1.1.1 and the technically equivalent ISO/IEC 20243:2018. Once Version 1.2 and the technically equivalent ISO/IEC 20243:2023 is released, we will be sure to reach out to all active certificate holders notifying them of its availability and the option to convert their certificate so long as they meet any updated and/or changed requirements."</p>	The current RFP wording does not require a specific version of the ISO 20243. As stated in the current RFP: a "valid active Open Trusted Technology Provider™ Standard (O-TTPS) Certification to attest to meeting the ISO 20243 standard" can be submitted.
7253	<p>SF1449: Are offerors allowed to update block 10 of the SF1449 to read the correct NAICS and size standard (prime) for our offer? Or are we supposed to leave the data already listed there ("See Section A.1.34" with the size standard field blank)?</p>	The Offeror shall include in Block 17a of the SF1449 the NAICS Code the Offeror is proposing using for competition at the master contract level. Amendment 11 reflects this clarification.
7255	The Government removed StarTech from the updated List of Preferred Vendors (Enclosure 1). Was this intentional? Will the Government consider putting StarTech back on this list?	Startech.com was restored to Enclosure 1 in Amendment 11.
7256	Amendment 09 released a new version of Exhibit 4-NAICS Size Standard Crosswalk. On the category A tab, NAICS 333316 is still listed yet this NAICS was removed from the SBA list prior to 2022 and has migrated to 333310. Can the government please amend Exhibit 4 to reflect this change.	The solicitation was updated in Amendment 11 to update the noted NAICS code.
7259	If we are the prime offeror with a team of two subcontractors (both of which are NOT a Parent Company, Affiliate, Division, and/or Subsidiary) do we need to submit a Meaningful Relationship Commitment Letter? Or will the Contractor Teaming Arrangement fulfill this requirement?	No, a letter is not required.
7260	The solicitation says that the "SEWP VI in scope NAICS being used for competition" .... should be "noted on the SF1449". With the release of Amendment 10, there is no indication in the SF1449 as to where the NAICS code should be included. What Block on the SF1449 do we note the NAICS code used for competition at the master contract level?	The Offeror shall include in Block 17a of the SF1449 the NAICS Code the Offeror is proposing using for competition at the master contract level. Amendment 11 reflects this clarification.
7261	In item (c) Mandatory Experience, the RFP now includes the following statement: All Categories: Offerors must provide separate and different experiences for their Relevant experience projects to address more than one technical area. Is the Government now requiring REPs to be submitted utilizing Exhibit 1 of the solicitation, for Category A, Mandatory Experience, Offer Volume?	This was updated in Amendment 11 to clarify this applies only to Category B and C.
7265	“The subcontracting plan from Other Than Small Businesses (OTSBs) shall include the goals of the AbilityOne NPAs and their associated NAICS codes. Contract holders shall allocate a target goal of at least 2% of the overall value of all task orders placed under AbilityOne NAICS codes. Question: “Would the Government confirm that If the Offeror adds a statement ONLY in the subcontracting plan such as, it will plan to meet a target goal of at least 2% of the overall value of all task orders placed under AbilityOne NAICS codes and NOT provide a target dollar value equating to the 2% percentage goal of the overall value of all task orders placed under AbilityOne NAICS Code, the Offeror will be compliant with this stated requirement?	The solicitation was updated in Amendment 11 to remove the subcontracting plan reference.
7266	<p>80TECH24R0001 Amendment 10 Request For Proposals.pdf (Page 103, 106 &amp; 117) = Amendment 0010 changes the definition of recent projects. Will the government please revert the language regarding the definition of what you consider “recent” back to the previous language throughout the solicitation documentation related to REPs, Past Performance, instruction, and evaluation criteria?</p> <p>Previous versions of the solicitation (as recent as Amendment 0008 11/14/2024) defined recent as “completed or ongoing within three years of the solicitation release date”, and the recent Amendment 10 changed this language to “completed or ongoing within three years of the proposal due date”.</p> <p>This material change to solicitation language has significant impacts to small business offerors who have been tracking and developing compliant proposal responses since the solicitation original release/issue date of 05/23/2024. REPs have already been delivered to customers, executed, and returned to the government. This new change introduces substantial undue burden and costs to offerors. Additionally, the change requires significant efforts of rework to response content, development of new content, modifications to pursuit strategies, and/or potentially requiring small business offers to now make a no bid determination based on this material change.</p>	Amendment 11 revised the recency date to 3 years from the original RFP release date.

7269	80TECH24R0001+Amendment+10+Request+For+Proposals, A.3.2 COMMUNICATIONS REGARDING THIS SOLICITATION page 91 Any questions or comments regarding this solicitation shall reference SEWP VI and cite the solicitation number and be directed to the following Government representative: Name: Jim Griffin What is Jim Griffin's title?	The Contracting Officer
7270	80TECH24R0001+Amendment+10+Request+For+Proposals, A.3.7.1(c) Mandatory Experience/ Offerings Pages 103 and 104 Question 3089 On page 103, the RFP states, "For joint ventures, the Offerors shall provide a REP from the work done and qualifications held either individually by a partner to the joint venture, the work done by the joint venture itself, or any combination of both." On page 104, the RFP states, "For Mentor-Protégé Joint Ventures, one of the REPs from different mandatory experience technical areas shall be submitted from the Protégé or the Mentor-Protégé Joint Venture itself." Answer to Question 3089 states that "the mentor cannot submit REPs or Past Performance references" for a SBA approved Mentor-Protege JV. The RFP references indicate that a JV can provide a REP from individual partners to the JV (which would include the Mentor of a Mentor-Protégé JV), with the restriction (from page 104) that one of the REPs shall be submitted from the Protégé or the Mentor-Protégé Joint Venture itself. This guidance appears to be in conflict with the Government's response to question 3089, which states that the mentor cannot submit REPs or Past Performance references for a SBA approved Mentor-Protege JV. Can the Government please confirm that a Mentor of a SBA approved Mentor Protégé Joint Venture can provide REPs, provided that the Protege or Mentor-Protégé JV itself provides 1 REP from a different mandatory experience technical area?	For Mentor-Protégé Joint Ventures, A Mentor may provide Past Performance References and REPs in accordance with the RFP. Amendment 11 provides this clarification.
7271	80TECH24R0001+Amendment+10+Request+For+Proposals, A.3.7.2(a) Mandatory Experience/ Offerings Page 103 Contracts that are completed or ongoing within three years of the proposal due date will be considered recent. While we understand that using the proposal due date to limit REPs will allow Offerors to use recent REPs over the past 8 months, this change also disqualifies Offeror REPs that would have been valid from the solicitation release date. In addition, any further extensions to the solicitation may continue to disqualify additional Offeror REPs. Will the Government allow "contracts that are completed or ongoing within three years of either the solicitation release date or the proposal due date?" This would allow for Offerors to include recent REPs and not penalize Offerors for REPs that was valid prior to Amendment 10.	Amendment 11 revised the recency date to 3 years from the original RFP release date.
7272	80TECH24R0001+Amendment+10+Request+For+Proposals, A.3.7.2(a) Information from the Offeror Page 106 Contracts that are completed or ongoing within three years of the proposal due date will be considered recent. While we understand that using the proposal due date to limit past performance references will allow Offerors to use recent past performance over the past 8 months, this change also disqualifies Offeror past performance references that would have been valid from the solicitation release date. In addition, any further extensions to the solicitation may continue to disqualify additional Offeror past performance. Will the Government allow "contracts that are completed or ongoing within three years of either the solicitation release date or the proposal due date?" This would allow for Offerors to include recent past performance and not penalize Offerors for past performance that was valid prior to Amendment 10.	Amendment 11 revised the recency date to 3 years from the original RFP release date.
7273	80TECH24R0001+Amendment+10+Request+For+Proposals, A.3.7.1(c) Mandatory Experience/ Offerings Page 104 On page 104, the RFP states, "For offerors submitting as HUBZone, SDB, VOSB, SDVOSB, WOSB, or EDWOSB Joint Ventures, one of the REPs from different mandatory experience technical areas shall be submitted from the HUBZone, SDB, VOSB, SDVOSB, WOSB, or EDWOSB partner, or the Joint Venture itself." When the RFP refers to "the Mentor-Protege Joint Venture itself," please confirm that the Government is referring to the Mentor-Protege as a whole, based on the GAO ref B-420544.8 and .7, where GAO found that "If the solicitation's terms place requirements on protégés that are the same as other offerors or don't consider the mentor-protégé team as a whole, then it may be seen as violating SBA rules."	For Mentor-Protégé Joint Ventures, A Mentor may provide Past Performance References and REPs in accordance with the RFP. Amendment 11 provides this clarification.
7274	80TECH24R0001+Amendment+10+Request+For+Proposals, A.3.7.1(a) Information from the Offeror Page 106 On page 106, the RFP states, "For joint ventures, the Offerors shall provide past performance for the work done and qualifications held either individually by a partner to the joint venture, the work done by the joint venture itself, or any combination of both." When the RFP refers to "the Mentor-Protege Joint Venture itself," please confirm that the Government is referring to the Mentor-Protege as a whole, based on the GAO ref B-420544.8 and .7, where GAO found that "If the solicitation's terms place requirements on protégés that are the same as other offerors or don't consider the mentor-protégé team as a whole, then it may be seen as violating SBA rules."	For Mentor-Protégé Joint Ventures, A Mentor may provide Past Performance References and REPs in accordance with the RFP. Amendment 11 provides this clarification.

7276	<p>In several answers in the seven released batches of answers to questions, the government indicated that offerors are not to include CPARS in the proposal response, however, the RFP states, “9. For the references submitted with the Offeror’s proposal, Offeror shall provide recent customer evaluations of previous performance...”</p> <p>a. CPARS are an element that fall under recent customer evaluations. We understand that we are not to provide CPARS in lieu of a PPQ, but can Offerors still provide CPARS to meet the requirement of the above reference?</p>	The referenced "recent customer evaluations of previous performance" has been removed in Amendment 11.
7278	<p>Page 99, Section A.3.7.1 OFFER VOLUME General Instructions, Number 5 indicates the AbilityOne Commitment Letter shall identify plans to subcontract with qualified nonprofit agencies for SEWP opportunities within identified NAICS Codes. The letter received from AbilityOne does not identify specific NAICS codes but instead references NAICS codes found in section A.1.35. The NAICS codes are listed in section A.1.34 (Pg 62-64) of Amendment 10 released documents. Do offerors need to obtain new AbilityOne commitment letters with Amendment 10 referenced section numbers?</p>	No. The only letter required for the proposal is the Commitment Letter issued by either SourceAmerica or NIB Central Nonprofit Agency (CNAs) and signed by the Prime Contractor and the CNA. The Prime Contractor does not need to include an additional letter with the NAICS listed. Offerors <u>do not</u> need to re-contact SourceAmerica/AbilityOne to request a revised letter with Amendment 10 referenced section numbers.
7280	<p>Per NASA's answers to various Q&amp;A (such as Q5269), “The AbilityOne Commitment Letter must include” ...“List of NAICS codes for which the Offeror plans to subcontract with AbilityOne organizations”. However, the letter format received directly from SourceAmerica / AbilityOne does not contain specific NAICS codes. Do offerors need to re-contact SourceAmerica / AbilityOne to request a revised letter?</p>	The only letter required for the proposal is the Commitment Letter issued by either SourceAmerica or NIB Central Nonprofit Agency (CNAs) and signed by the Prime Contractor and the CNA. The Prime Contractor does not need to include an additional letter with the NAICS listed. Offerors <u>do not</u> need to re-contact SourceAmerica/AbilityOne to request a revised letter.
7283	<p>Can NASA please confirm that for the Volume I: Offer Volume Representations and Certifications requirement, offerors are only required to provide paragraph (B) of FAR 52.212-3, along with any FAR clauses that are not currently within their SAM record?</p>	Yes.
7284	<p>In Batch 3 Q&amp;A 2449 and 5356, the Government confirms that the total cost incurred is the amount invoiced to date. The Government is not requiring updated PPQs, and many Offerors already had their customers submit the PPQs to the Government in accordance with the original deadline. Therefore, is it acceptable if the total cost incurred is now higher in the proposal than what was noted originally on the PPQ?</p>	If Past Performance Reference information has changed then an updated PPQ shall be submitted. <revised response>
7285	<p>Q3022 asks, 'If an Offeror receives a Pass rating for Volume I and a Satisfactory or Neutral rating for Volume II, will the Government please further explain the specific types of “inconsistencies” that could impact the Volume III Mission Suitability High Confidence rating?'</p> <p>NASA's response stated: 'Relying heavily on subcontractors in Past Performance, but not conveying any information related to those subcontractors in Mission Suitability.'</p> <p>Could NASA please clarify how offerors should convey information related to those subcontractors in the Mission Suitability Volume? Specifically, do offerors need to explicitly list which capabilities are provided by the prime contractor versus those provided by subcontractor(s)?</p>	There are no specific requirements as to how such information would be conveyed - that is determined by the Offeror. There is no requirement to explicitly list which capabilities are provided by the prime contractor versus those provided by subcontractor(s)
7286	<p>In Batch 3, Q&amp;As 2449 and 5356, the Government confirms that the total cost incurred is the amount invoiced to date. The Government is not requiring updated PPQs, and many Offerors already had their customers submit the PPQs to the Government in accordance with the original deadline. Therefore, is there a way the Government would like Offerors to clearly indicate why there may be any discrepancies, because additional costs have been incurred since the PPQs were submitted?</p>	If Past Performance Reference information has changed then an updated PPQ shall be submitted.
7288	<p>In Batch 3, Q&amp;A 2487, the Government uses a very broad definition for what qualifies as a reference and would therefore severely impact what goes against page count. If an Offeror relies on a reference to point to content of substance (e.g., referring the Government to an REP scope description to get around page limitations rather than addressing the content requirements of the Mission Suitability volume on its own face value), a reasonable person would agree that should count against the page limit. However, referencing something like an ISO certification by stating, "Using our ISO 9001:2015 processes, we do x, y and z" as part of a management approach, should not cause Offerors to lose an entire page just because the Government has the ability to look at the certificate. There is nothing about that statement that requires the Government to look at the certificate. It is common practice for Offerors to write things like this in proposals even when no certificate is required as part of the response.</p> <p>Please revise this requirement to specify that a reference will only count against the page limit if the Offeror directs the Government to look at that alternative location for the answer to a requirement. If the Offeror does not request that, the Government should not look at the reference material when conducting its evaluation.</p>	Amend A.3.7 PROPOSAL VOLUMES If any reference to documentation is made by the offeror, in order for that reference to be considered, such documentation shall be cited at the page, section, and paragraph level and shall be included in the proposal and counts against the page count as defined in A.3.6(B).

7304	<p>As of Amendment 10, the instructions for the Past Performance Volume currently state:</p> <p>For Small Businesses proposing in Category B- the past performance provided shall be for similar scope efforts with a minimum average annual cost/fee incurred of \$1,000,000 for size to be rated relevant. For offerors submitting as Mentor-Protégé Joint Ventures, contracts may be submitted from the Protégé or the offering Mentor-Protégé Joint Venture itself.</p> <p>Given the Small Business Administration language regarding Mentor Protegee JVs, we suggest this language be updated to include past performance being allowable from the Mentor as well as the Protégé.</p>	For Mentor-Protégé Joint Ventures, A Mentor may provide Past Performance References and REPs in accordance with the RFP. Amendment 11 provides this clarification.
7305	<p>The instructions for the Past Performance Volume currently state:</p> <p>For Small Businesses proposing in Categories C- the past performance provided shall be for similar scope efforts with a minimum average annual cost/fee incurred of \$500,000 for size to be rated relevant. For offerors submitting as Mentor-Protégé Joint Ventures, contracts may be submitted from the Protégé or the offering Mentor-Protégé Joint Venture itself.</p> <p>Given the Small Business Administration language regarding Mentor Protegee JVs, we suggest this language be updated to include past performance being allowable from the Mentor as well as the Protégé.</p>	For Mentor-Protégé Joint Ventures, A Mentor may provide Past Performance References and REPs in accordance with the RFP. Amendment 11 provides this clarification.
7306	<p>Referring to Relevant Experience Project (REP), specific to Category, B, the instructions currently state:</p> <p>For Mentor-Protégé Joint Ventures, one of the REPs from different mandatory experience technical areas shall be submitted from the Protégé or the Mentor-Protégé Joint Venture itself. Each Protégé or Mentor-Protégé Joint</p> <p>Given the Small Business Administration language regarding Mentor Protegee JVs, we suggest this language be updated to include past performance being allowable from the Mentor as well as the Protégé.</p>	For Mentor-Protégé Joint Ventures, A Mentor may provide Past Performance References and REPs in accordance with the RFP. Amendment 11 provides this clarification.
7307	<p>While listed in the section header (RFP Section Category B For HUBZone, VOSB, SDVOSB, WOSB, EDWOSB, 8a offerors, Page 103), the RFP fails to identify 8a Mentor Protegee JVs in the current list of: For HUBZone, VOSB, SDVOSB, WOSB, EDWOSB Joint Ventures.</p> <p>Can the RFP please be updated to identify and include 8a as a distinct socio economic category for Mentor Protegee JVs as part of this list?</p>	This has been updated in Amendment 11.
7308	Reference the 80TECH24R0001 Amendment 10 Request for Proposals, sections A.3.7.1(b) and A.4.1(2), Phase 1: Regarding ISO 9001:2015, "Certification of Conformity/Conformance" is not an official document title used by Registrars. Please confirm the Government is asking for a copy of the Offeror's ISO 9001:2015 certification.	Yes. The wording has been updated in Amendment 11.
7309	<p>RFP Section Category C For HUBZone, VOSB, SDVOSB, WOSB, EDWOSB, 8a offerors, Page 103: Referring to Relevant Experience Project (REP), specific to Category, B, the instructions currently state:</p> <p>For Mentor-Protégé Joint Ventures, one of the REPs from different mandatory experience technical areas shall be submitted from the Protégé or Mentor-Protégé Joint Venture itself.</p> <p>Given the Small Business Administration language regarding Mentor Protegee JVs, we suggest this language be updated to include past performance being allowable from the Mentor as well as the Protégé.</p>	For Mentor-Protégé Joint Ventures, A Mentor may provide Past Performance References and REPs in accordance with the RFP. Amendment 11 provides this clarification.
7310	<p>RFP For Small Businesses proposing in Category B, Page 105: Referring to Past Performance Specific to Category B, the instructions currently state:</p> <p>For offerors submitting as HUBZone, VOSB, SDVOSB, WOSB, or EDWOSB Joint Ventures, contracts may be submitted from the HUBZone, VOSB, SDVOSB, WOSB, or EDWOSB partner or the Joint Venture itself.</p> <p>This list does not include 8a amongst the current socio economic categories. We suggest the RFP be updated to include 8a.</p>	The current RFP has been updated.
7311	<p>RFP For Small Businesses proposing in Category C, Page 106: Referring to Past Performance Specific to Category C, the instructions currently state:</p> <p>For offerors submitting as HUBZone, VOSB, SDVOSB, WOSB, or EDWOSB Joint Ventures, contracts may be submitted from the HUBZone, VOSB, SDVOSB, WOSB, or EDWOSB partner or the Joint Venture itself.</p> <p>This list does not include 8a amongst the current socio economic categories. We suggest the RFP be updated to include 8a.</p>	The current RFP has been updated.

7312	Reference the 80TECH24R0001 Amendment 10 Request for Proposals, sections A.3.7.1(b) and A.4.1(2), Phase 1: To eliminate confusion, please reword in the amendment the ISO 9001:2015 language from "Certification of Conformity/Conformance" to "certification" or "Certificate of Registration," which is the formal title used by Registrars.	The wording has been updated in Amendment 11.
7317	Per amendment 10, the period of performance for the past performance contracts needs to be within 3 years of the proposal due date. This is a significant change from the prior requirement which was 3 years from RFP release date. We kindly request the government to consider changing this to RFP release date for the following reasons: offerors have been working on selecting their past performance contracts and requesting PPQs based on the RFP release date. The proposal submission date is a moving target, and it creates constant revisiting of selected contracts. In addition, this will create significant burden for government contracting officers if offerors have to request that contracting officers complete and submit PPQs once more.	Amendment 11 revised the recency date to 3 years from the original RFP release date.
7318	The Government removed Kensington from the updated List of Preferred Vendors (Enclosure 1). Was this intentional? Will the Government consider putting Kensington back on this list?	Kensington is a subsidiary under ACCO Brands Corp. which is listed in Enclosure 1. Subsidiaries can be submitted as designated providers if the parent company is listed in Enclosure 1.
7323	We understand that offerors can use a JV project for Past Performance where the Offeror's proposal demonstrates that the resources of the parent or affiliate or predecessor will affect the performance of the Offeror.  However, if we are submitting a proposal on our own as a HUBzone or 8a, can we use our JV Past Performance (which we are majority partner) without committing the other JV partner's resources for SEWP? Using this project would be to just demonstrate the work we have done in relation to the technical content areas.  If we can use the project as described above, do we still need an MCRL? We are majority owner of the JV but will not be submitting our overall SEWP proposal (in category C) as the JV.	Please propose in accordance with the current RFP. In accordance with the current RFP: For joint ventures, the Offerors shall provide past performance for the work done and qualifications held either individually by a partner to the joint venture, the work done by the joint venture itself, or any combination of both. Subject to the requirements of 13 CFR 125.11, a small business concern that has been a member of a joint venture may elect to use the past performance of the joint venture (whether or not the other joint venture partners were small business concerns) where the small business does not independently demonstrate past performance necessary for award. Please be advised in accordance with 13 CFR 125.11: "A small business cannot identify and use as its own experience and past performance work that was performed exclusively by other partners to the joint venture."
7339	The solicitation says "For the references submitted with the Offeror's proposal, Offeror shall provide recent customer evaluations of previous performance including Award Fee Evaluation results, Fee Determination Official letters, Annual Performance Evaluation Forms, or any other written performance feedback, if applicable. (Excluded from the page limitation)."  Annual Performance Evaluation Forms are generally CPARS, but certain question answers seem to conflict with one another (see answers to questions 3366, 4840)  Can NASA confirm that CPARS are acceptable as the Annual Performance Evaluation Form cited and, if submitted, go into the past performance volume and are excluded from the page count.	The referenced "recent customer evaluations of previous performance" has been removed in Amendment 11.
7340	Regarding the 10 page limit for Volume II, there have been conflicting Q&A statements regarding what is included. and then several answers exclude many items from the 10 pages. Can the government please restate exactly what is included in the 10 page limit and what is not?	Further clarification as to page limited documentation has been added in Amendment 11.
7342	For Category B, the Government states "For Mentor-Protégé Joint Ventures, one of the REPs from different mandatory experience technical areas shall be submitted from the Protégé or the Mentor-Protégé Joint Venture itself."  According to 13 CFR 125.8(e), "...a procuring activity must consider work done and qualifications held individually by each partner..." and "[t]he partners to the joint venture in the aggregate must demonstrate the past performance, experience, business systems and certifications necessary to perform the contract." Will NASA reconsider its evaluation of mentor-protégé joint venture (MPJV) members to fully evaluate qualifications from both MPJV members?  <a href="https://www.ecfr.gov/current/title-13/chapter-I/part-125/section-125.8">https://www.ecfr.gov/current/title-13/chapter-I/part-125/section-125.8</a>	For Mentor-Protégé Joint Ventures, A Mentor may provide Past Performance References and REPs in accordance with the RFP. Amendment 11 provides this clarification.
7343	RFP Amendment 10, A.3.7.1(a)#6, pg. 100-If we submit the proposal as a joint venture, should we submit letters from certified United States banks for all partners or submit a document that details the disclosure of each participant's responsibility for financial management of the venture, funding requirements, limitation of liabilities, and any other information which describes the financial arrangement.	The wording is clarified in Amendment 11. The references to "letters from certified United States banks" and "annual reports" are example documents that could be used to demonstrate financial capability. Any information that demonstrates the Offeror's financial capability to perform the contract. is acceptable.
7348	The Government states that offerors must inform the Government of issues with submission within 72 hours of proposal due date. This means that offerors must submit their proposals 4 days in advance to ensure that no issues are encountered. This means that the actual due date would be 13 February 2025. If this is the case, would the Government allow for a four (4) day grace period extension to whatever due date they issue for the next amendment?	No.
7355	If CPARs are the only "formal customer evaluation documents/recent customer evaluations" that an offeror has for a submitted past performance, will the offeror be rated lower if CPARs are not allowed to be submitted (per response to question #2574) to meet this requirement?	The referenced "recent customer evaluations of previous performance" has been removed in Amendment 11.

7369	The change in Amendment 10 that modifies the recency requirement for REPs from within 3 years of the solicitation date to the proposal due date is a significant change this late after the solicitation release. Offerors made bid/no-bid decisions and drafted their proposals based on the initial requirement. At this point, 7 months since the initial RFP release, companies have made substantial investments. This change both reduces the options for companies, but adds uncertainty, since the due date may continue to be delayed. Can the Government revert the requirement back to within 3 years of the solicitation date? An alternative is to allow REPs from within 4 years of the proposal due date.	Amendment 11 revised the recency date to 3 years from the original RFP release date.
7375	The change in Amendment 10 that modifies the recency requirement for Past Performance Projects from within 3 years of the solicitation date to the proposal due date is a significant change this late after the solicitation release. Offerors made bid/no-bid decisions, sent questionnaires to clients, and drafted their proposals based on the initial requirement. At this point, 7 months since the initial RFP release, companies have made substantial investments. This change both reduces the options for companies, but adds uncertainty, since the due date may continue to be delayed. Can the Government consider reverting the requirement to allow Past Performance Projects from within 3 years of the solicitation date? An alternative is to allow Past Performance Projects from within 4 years of the proposal due date.	Amendment 11 revised the recency date to 3 years from the original RFP release date.
7379	Amendment 10, RFP, Section A.3.7.1(c) Category B and C, page 103 states, “For joint ventures, the Offerors shall provide a REP from the work done and qualifications held either individually by a partner to the joint venture, the work done by the joint venture itself, or any combination of both.” The Answer to question 3089 states that, "The mentor cannot submit REPs or Past Performance references." This appears to directly conflict with the verbiage on page 103. Whether the offering company is a Mentor Protege Joint Venture or regular Joint Venture, the statement on page 103 should apply to both types of Joint Ventures. Will the Government please clarify that Joint Ventures may use experience REPs from either member of the Joint Venture?	For Mentor-Protégé Joint Ventures, A Mentor may provide Past Performance References and REPs in accordance with the RFP. Amendment 11 provides this clarification.
7380	Amendment 10, RFP, Section A.3.7.1(c) Category B and C, page 103 states, “For joint ventures, the Offerors shall provide a REP from the work done and qualifications held either individually by a partner to the joint venture, the work done by the joint venture itself, or any combination of both.” Additionally, in CFR 125.8(e) relevant to Mentor Protege Joint Ventures, the CFR states, “Capabilities, past performance and experience. When evaluating the capabilities, past performance, experience, business systems and certifications of an entity submitting an offer for a contract set aside or reserved for small business as a joint venture established pursuant to this section, a procuring activity must consider work done and qualifications held individually by each partner to the joint venture as well as any work done by the joint venture itself previously. A procuring activity may not require the protégé firm to individually meet the same evaluation or responsibility criteria as that required of other offerors generally. The partners to the joint venture in the aggregate must demonstrate the past performance, experience, business systems and certifications necessary to perform the contract.”  The answer to question 3089 seems to be in direct conflict with the statement on page 103 of the solicitation and violates the intent of CFR 125.8(e) governing Mentor Protege relationships where Protege companies can rely on Mentor experience and past performance.  Can the Government clarify that Mentor Protégé Joint Ventures may rely on the experience and past performance of their Mentor member?	For Mentor-Protégé Joint Ventures, A Mentor may provide Past Performance References and REPs in accordance with the RFP. Amendment 11 provides this clarification.
7381	Amendment 10, RFP, Section A.3.7.1(c) Category B and C, page 104 and 105 provides information regarding HubZone, SDB, VOSB, SDVOSB, WOSB, EDWOSB, and 8a offerors. However, when referencing the socio-economic categories in subsequent areas of this section the Government removes the 8a designation from the list of categories.  Will the Government please clarify that the listing of socio-economic categories includes 8a in all instances that the socio-economic categories are repeatedly listed throughout Section A.3.7.1(c)?	Yes. This is clarified in Amendment 11.
7382	The solicitation says “For the references submitted with the Offeror’s proposal, Offeror shall provide recent customer evaluations of previous performance including Award Fee Evaluation results, Fee Determination Official letters, Annual Performance Evaluation Forms, or any other written performance feedback, if applicable. (Excluded from the page limitation).” Annual Performance Evaluation Forms are generally CPARS, but certain question answers seem to conflict with one another (see answers to questions 3366, 4840) Can NASA confirm that CPARS are acceptable as the Annual Performance Evaluation Form cited and if the Government would only like the most recent CPARS to be included or ALL CPARS that have been issued for each referenced past performance?	The referenced "recent customer evaluations of previous performance" has been removed in Amendment 11 and therefore an "Annual Performance Evaluation Form" is not required.



7383	<p>Amendment 10, RFP, Section A.3.7.1(c) Category B and C, page 104 and 105 under Mandatory Experience Offerings provides information regarding minimum values under Small Businesses, Mentor Protege Joint Ventures, HubZone, SDB, VOSB, SDVOSB, WOSB, EDWOSB, and 8a, and HubZone, SDB, VOSB, SDVOSB, WOSB, EDWOSB, and 8a Joint Ventures offerors under the "For Small Business" details. However, the solicitation fails to address values for HubZone, SDB, VOSB, SDVOSB, WOSB, EDWOSB, and 8a Mentor Protege Joint Venture offerors.</p> <p>Will the Government please clarify that HubZone, SDB, VOSB, SDVOSB, WOSB, EDWOSB, and 8a Mentor Protégé Joint Ventures are bound to the same minimum values as those that are HubZone, SDB, VOSB, SDVOSB, WOSB, EDWOSB, and 8a Joint Ventures?</p>	The current RFP has been updated.
7384	<p>Amendment 10, RFP, Section A.3.7.1(c) Category B and C, page 107 under Past Performance provides information regarding minimum values under Small Businesses, Mentor Protege Joint Ventures, HubZone, SDB, VOSB, SDVOSB, WOSB, EDWOSB, Joint Ventures offerors under the "For Small Business" details. However, the solicitation fails to address values for HubZone, SDB, VOSB, SDVOSB, WOSB, EDWOSB, and 8a offerors and HubZone, SDB, VOSB, SDVOSB, WOSB, EDWOSB, and 8a Mentor Protege Joint Venture offerors.☐</p> <p>Will the Government please provide the minimum values HubZone, SDB, VOSB, SDVOSB, WOSB, EDWOSB, and 8a offerors and HubZone, SDB, VOSB, SDVOSB, WOSB, EDWOSB, and 8a Mentor Protégé Joint Venture offerors are bound by?</p>	Please propose in accordance with updated instructions in the current RFP.
7387	<p>Amendment 10, RFP, Section A.3.7.1(a).6, page 100 requests offerors to supply information to determine if the Offeror is responsible in accordance with FAR 9.104-1(a) to include a certified letter and annual report. It asks offerors to supply additional details regarding how Joint Ventures, Teaming Arrangements or other business combinations will handle their financial arrangement. However, the request does not define how an unpopulated JV should supply information to show their financial capability.☐</p> <p>Will the Government clarify that the JV members should individually supply a letter from their certified US bank indicating the available amount of credit each business has and a copy of each company's annual report, if available?</p>	The wording is clarified in Amendment 11. The references to "letters from certified United States banks" and "annual reports" are example documents that could be used to demonstrate financial capability. To determine if an Offeror is responsible in accordance with FAR 9.104-1(a), Offeror is instructed to submit information which demonstrates the Offeror's financial capability to perform the contract. the current RFP provides instructions for information required If a teaming arrangement, joint venture, or other business combination is contemplated.
7390	<p>"Amendment 10, RFP, under Category B, page 104 "Each Protégé or Mentor-Protégé Joint Venture project need only have a minimum of \$2.5M in total value size of a single order or contract." Later on the same page, "The HUBZone, SDB, VOSB, SDVOSB, WOSB, or EDWOSB partner project, or Joint Venture project need only have a minimum of \$2M in total value size of a single order or contract."☐</p> <p>For a Mentor-Protégé Joint Venture that is WOSB and 8a certified, the first project we submit (from the Protégé) must have a minimum of \$2.5M or \$2M in total value size of a single order or contract to be considered compliant?</p>	Please propose in accordance with updated instructions in the current RFP.
7392	<p>"Amendment 10, RFP, under Category B, page 104 ""Each Protégé or Mentor-Protégé Joint Venture project need only have a minimum of \$2.5M in total value size of a single order or contract."" . Later on the same page, ""The HUBZone, SDB, VOSB, SDVOSB, WOSB, or EDWOSB partner project, or Joint Venture project need only have a minimum of \$2M in total value size of a single order or contract."" "For a Mentor-Protégé Joint Venture that is WOSB and 8a certified, can the second project we submit - coming from the mentor - have a minimum of \$2M in total value size for a single order or contract and be considered compliant?</p>	Please propose in accordance with updated instructions in the current RFP.
7393	<p>"Amendment 10, RFP, under Category C, page 104 reads "For Mentor-Protégé Joint Ventures, one of the REPs from different mandatory experience technical areas shall be submitted from the Protégé or Mentor-Protégé Joint Venture itself."☐</p> <p>For a Mentor-Protégé Joint Venture that is WOSB and 8a certified, can the second REP come from the mentor?</p>	For Mentor-Protégé Joint Ventures, A Mentor may provide Past Performance References and REPs in accordance with the RFP. Amendment 11 provides this clarification.
7394	<p>Amendment 10, RFP, under Category C, page 104 reads</p> <p>"For Mentor-Protégé Joint Ventures, one of the REPs from different mandatory experience technical areas shall be submitted from the Protégé or Mentor-Protégé Joint Venture itself."</p> <p>For a Mentor-Protégé Joint Venture that is WOSB and 8a certified, can the second REP come from the first-tier subcontractor to the MPJV?</p>	For Mentor-Protégé Joint Ventures, A Mentor may provide Past Performance References and REPs in accordance with the RFP. Amendment 11 provides this clarification.
7399	How can we best demonstrate that we meet the \$150,000 monetary threshold for costs incurred to satisfy the past performance requirement, given the common discrepancy between contract value and actual costs incurred?	Please propose in accordance with the current RFP. The formula provided in the RFP demonstrates actual costs incurred.
7402	<p>"At section A.3.5, the RFP's instructions state: ""Offerors sharing resources from other entities by way of a Meaningful Relationship within a Corporate Structure (including its Parent Company/Holding Company or any one or more of its affiliates, subsidiaries, business units, joint ventures, or any other types of independent business structures) may only submit one Offer (e.g., proposal) from that Corporate structure.""</p> <p>Please add the words ""per Category"" to the end of the sentence. That is necessary for subsidiaries under a parent company to each submit a proposal for a different Category."</p>	The wording was updated in Amendment 11.

7403	<p>Section A.3.7.2 (a) states: "The Government will not consider performance on a newly-awarded contract that has no documented performance history (i.e., projects that have been under contract for less than six months prior to proposal due date."</p> <p>For Category A, product orders often have a period of performance of 30-60 days to deliver products. For example, a SEWP V orders can be awarded for \$2M+ in products, then delivered, and closed out within 4-8 weeks. Once the order is fulfilled and completed, that is all the information the government needs to rate the contractor's performance.</p> <p>NASA should accept such contracts that meet the TCV requirement, are relevant to the NAICS code used for competition, have been successfully completed and contractually closed, and have documented performance history.</p> <p>Will NASA please amend the RFP's instructions to make an exception to recency for Category A? We suggest the following language: "The Government will not consider performance on a newly-awarded contract that has no documented performance history (i.e., projects that have been under contract for less than six months prior to proposal due date, except for completed contracts with documented performance history that are submitted for Category A."</p>	Amendment 11 revised the recency date to 3 years from the original RFP release date.
7404	<p>In response to Comment 2273, NASA states "The specific NAICS code being used for competition will be indicated in Exhibit 4: Offeror NAICS Size Standard Crosswalk." However, Exhibit 4 has no area to denote which NAICS the Offeror has selected as their primary NAICS code used for competition.</p> <p>Will the Government please issue a revised Exhibit 4 that includes a field for offerors to select the specific NAICS used for competition?</p>	No. The Offeror shall include in Block 17a of the SF1449 the NAICS Code the Offeror is proposing using for competition at the master contract level. Amendment 11 reflects this clarification. The notation is not required in Exhibit 4.
7405	<p>The RFP states" The offeror must provide past performance submissions as it relates to the SEWP VI in scope NAICS code being used for competition at the master contract level, as noted on the SF1449." However, block 10 of the SF1449 is pre-filled by the Government with "See Section A.1.34".</p> <p>Please confirm that past performance submissions must be relevant to the NAICS code being used for competition at the master contract level, as noted in Exhibit 4 and in the SEWP submission portal?</p>	Past performance submissions must be relevant to the NAICS code being used for competition at the master contract level, as noted in Block 17a of the SF1449 which must match what is selected in the SEWP submission portal.
7407	<p>Amendment 10, Page 107 A.3.7.2 PAST PERFORMANCE VOLUME (a) INFORMATION FROM THE OFFEROR</p> <p>For small businesses proposing in categories B &amp; C, the solicitation states: "For offerors submitting as Mentor-Protégé Joint Ventures, contracts may be submitted from the Protégé or the offering Mentor-Protégé Joint Venture itself."</p> <p>Question 1: What can the Mentor's contribution be to Past Performance if submitting as a Mentor Protégé JV? As the instructions now state, everything must come from the Protégé or the JV itself.</p> <p>Question 2: If the Mentor can contribute to the Past Performance if submitting as a Mentor Protégé JV, what are the project qualification criteria for the Mentor's project?</p>	The current RFP has been updated.
7408	<p>The Government's response to Q6045 and Q6043 contradict each other. Please confirm that the answer to Q6045 is correct: If an MRCL is required to show ownership of acquired contracts not yet novated, the restriction that only one proposal may use the MRCL sharing proposal evaluation elements DOES NOT apply if one of the proposals is from a Mentor Protégé JV?</p>	This question is unclear. Please propose in accordance with the current RFP.
7409	<p>Prior to Amendment 10, the solicitation defined recency as "within 3 years from the solicitation release date" (5/23/2024). Offerors have made large investments of time and dollars to prepare REP and PP submissions based on that definition of recency.</p> <p>However, Amendment 10 changed the definition of recency for both REPs and PPs to within 3 years of the proposal due date (currently 2/17/2025). This change invalidates any REP or PP submission with an end date between 5/24/2021 - 2/16/2022. NASA did not provide any warning or rationale for this sudden change.</p> <p>This makes a negative financial impact to many offerors, particularly to Small Business, who must now identify alternate qualifying REP and PP submissions, write all new narratives, and process new PPQs with their customers. This change may also cause some otherwise qualified bidders to become unable to bid SEWP VI.</p> <p>Therefore, we respectfully request that NASA change the recency definition back to "within 3 years of the solicitation release date."</p>	Amendment 11 revised the recency date to 3 years from the original RFP release date.
7411	<p>In a Joint Venture, can one of the partner in the venture submits the past performance and project experience of one of its subsidiary company. e.g the joint venture is among three companies A, B and C. Can the subsidiary (X)of the venture partner A submit its past performance and project experiences?</p>	If a MRCL is submitted, yes.

7412	<p>Q5385 states: "Representations and certifications are only required to be completed for the Offering entity. Members of joint ventures and first-tier subcontractors under a CTA do not need to provide separate representations and certifications."</p> <p>Q3114 contradicts this, stating: "You are required to submit Representations and Certifications from each individual member of the unpopulated joint venture."</p> <p>Please clarify which answer is correct?</p>	<p>The Offeror shall complete SF1449 Blocks 12 (if applicable), 17, and 30 and the indicated Offeror required fill-ins in the clauses, provisions/representations and certifications, and attachments. An Offeror's Commercial and Government Entity (CAGE) Code in SAM.gov shall match the Offeror's name on the SF1449. The signed SF1449 and the pages with the required fill-ins must be submitted with the proposal. By signing and submitting the SF1449, the Offeror has read, understands, and agrees to the terms and conditions of the current RFP unless otherwise noted when the proposal submitted.</p>
7413	<p>The Q&amp;A #3089 in the sixth batch of Q&amp;A, it states that a (large business) mentor cannot submit REP or Past Performance references to qualify in the small business categories. However, on page 104 of RFP from Amendment 10, it states that at least one REP shall be submitted from the protege or mentor-protege JV itself. It implies that two of the three references may be submitted by the mentor. Please clarify whether the mentor from a mentor-protege JV can submit REP and Past performance references.</p>	<p>For Mentor-Protégé Joint Ventures, A Mentor may provide Past Performance References and REPs in accordance with the RFP. Amendment 11 provides this clarification.</p>
7415	<p>Please clarify the date offerors are to use when calculating the Average Annual Value for an ongoing project. Previous answers (Question # 6783 &amp; 3334) stated offerors were to use the RFP Submission Date or date when PPQ was signed. Other answers don't specify what date offerors are to be using (Question #5356).</p>	<p>Amendment 11 updated this information to coincide with the solicitation release date.</p>
7421	<p>The SF30 forms for Amendments 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 and 6 have been signed by the government and are locked from editing. Would the government consider posting unlocked files so they can be completed and signed electronically?</p>	<p>No. The solicitation was updated in Amendment 11 to indicate "acknowledgement of all subsequent solicitation amendments" can be done via the SF 30 or via an affirmative statement within the General Instructions Cover Page.</p>
7426	<p>A.3.7.2 Past Performance Volume, Page 107, RFP Statement: "The RFP states, "For Other Than Small Businesses proposing in Category A &amp; B- the past performance provided shall be for similar scope efforts with a minimum average annual cost/fee incurred of \$2,500,000 for size to be rated relevant."</p> <p>Question/Comment: Section A.1.8 PROCEDURES FOR ORDERS (page 42) lists ordering procedures for both Fixed Price and Fixed Price Incentive Task Orders. Considering that orders may be issued as both Fixed Price and Fixed Price Incentive Task Orders, will the Government consider inclusion of both Cost/Fee and FFP contract types within the Past Performance Volume to indicate maximum relevance to Task Orders awarded under SEWP VI?</p>	<p>The current RFP does not restrict the use of Cost/Fee and FFP contract types.</p>
7430	<p>A.3.7.2 (a), Past Performance Volume, page 108: The RFP states that past performance must have taken place "within the last three (3) years of the release date of the final SEWP VI RFP." Please confirm that the release date of the final SEWP VI RFP was May 23, 2024, prior to the strategic pause that occurred during the SEWP VI procurement.</p>	<p>Amendment 11 revised the recency date to 3 years from the original RFP release date.</p>
7435	<p>A.3.6 Proposal Preparation - General Instructions (b) Proposal Content and Page Limitations, Page 95, RFP Statement: "No mention of Volume I Cover Page in Proposal Format Table"</p> <p>Question/Comment: The Solicitation Table does not include a Volume I Cover Page. Can the Government please confirm that offerors may include a Cover Page for Volume I?</p>	<p>Yes. (revised response)</p>
7436	<p>Under section (a) TECHNICAL APPROACH (SUBFACTOR A), the RFP reads that For All Categories, "for points 1 and 2 of this section the Offeror must provide a summary description of their overall technical offerings and general capabilities in accordance with the proposed Category scope (see Attachment A-SEWP Scope, Section A.2. SCOPE)."</p> <p>Question: Could NASA please confirmed that Offerors for Categories B and C are not to write to concentrate in each of the 11 technical areas, but rather write in general terms?</p>	<p>Yes. Amendment 8 updated the instructions for the Technical Approach to clarify it is based on the offeror's general technical capabilities with regard to the SEWP scope and Acquisition Objectives and not on the sample Technical Areas.</p>
7437	<p>3. In RFP section A.3.7.2 (Past Performance Volume), it states: "If the NAICS code for the past performance submission does not match the Offeror's NAICS code used on the SF1449 or for references that are not assigned a NAICS code (e.g., commercial contracts), the offeror shall include the description within the past performance volume that explains how the work performed relates to the NAICS code used to compete as noted on the SF1449." Could you please confirm whether we should populate Field 10 (Size Standard) on the SF1449 with the NAICS code being used to compete for this opportunity?</p>	<p>The Offeror shall include in Block 17a of the SF1449 the NAICS Code the Offeror is proposing using for competition at the master contract level. Amendment 11 reflects this clarification.</p>
7438	<p>Amendment 10 now defines "recent" for Past Performance as contracts completed or ongoing within three years of the proposal due date, whereas the original language considered contracts within three years of the solicitation release date. The same applies to relevant experience.</p> <p>We have been preparing proposals based on the original wording for over a year, and changing this requirement at the last minute would present an unfair challenge. Given that the proposal due date has been extended multiple times, this change could exclude contracts that were previously within the three-year requirement. This change may also create complications for offerors with contracts nearing the three-year threshold based on the original date.</p> <p>Could the Government reconsider using the solicitation release date instead of the proposal due date to define "recent" contracts, as originally outlined, to ensure fairness and consistency?</p>	<p>Amendment 11 revised the recency date to 3 years from the original RFP release date.</p>

7439	<p>Amendment 10 now defines “recent” for Relevant Experience as projects completed or ongoing within three years of the proposal due date, whereas the original language considered projects within three years of the solicitation release date. The same definition applies for Past Performance.</p> <p>We have been preparing proposals based on the original wording for over a year, and changing this requirement at the last minute would present an unfair challenge. Given that the proposal due date has been extended multiple times, this change could exclude contracts that were previously within the three-year requirement. This change may also create complications for offerors with contracts nearing the three-year threshold based on the original date.</p> <p>Could the Government reconsider using the solicitation release date instead of the proposal due date to define “recent” contracts, as originally outlined, to ensure fairness and consistency?</p>	Amendment 11 revised the recency date to 3 years from the original RFP release date.
7441	<p>In Comment 1745, “the government states the Contractor Team Arrangements are defined in accordance with 9.601 of the FAR”; FAR 9.601 defines one form of a CTA as “A potential prime contractor agrees with one or more other companies to have them act as its subcontractors”,</p> <p>In comment 2308, the government states “A CTA differs from first-tier subcontracting agreements in that CTAs involve a formal partnership or joint venture where all members are considered primes, whereas subcontracting agreements involve a prime contractor and one or more subcontractors.”</p> <p>In A.3.6 (B) (7), the government states “an offeror can propose as the prime contractor one time per category and can propose one additional time as a member of a joint venture or CTA.</p> <p>Given the potential to interpret each of these statements differently, please confirm that an offeror can submit a prime bid with subcontractors under a standard teaming agreement and submit a bid as part of a joint venture.</p>	Please propose in accordance with the current RFP.
7443	<p>We kindly request clarification regarding the past performance submission requirements for standard Small business Joint Ventures (JVs) and NOT Mentor-Protégé JV under Section A.3.7.2 (a), where the SB JV holds designations under 8a for example-</p> <p>In A.3.7.2 (a), paragraph 3, it states:</p> <p>“For joint ventures, the Offerors shall provide past performance for the work done and qualifications held either individually by a partner to the joint venture, the work done by the joint venture itself, or any combination of both.”</p> <p>However, in the sections for "Small Businesses proposing in Category B" and "Small Businesses proposing in Category C" (page 107), it appears that only the JV itself or the partner holding the specific designation (e.g., HUBZone, 8(a), WOSB, SDB, VOSB, SDVOSB, or EDWOSB) may submit past performance. This seems to contradict the broader allowance stated in paragraph 3.</p> <p>Could you please clarify:</p> <p>Do the requirements in Categories B and C restrict past performance submissions solely to the JV itself or the designated JV partner?</p> <p>Or, as stated in paragraph 3, can both partners of a JV (including 8(a), HUBZone, WOSB, SDB, VOSB, SDVOSB, or EDWOSB JVs that are not Mentor-Protégé JVs) submit past performance individually, in addition to the JV’s work?</p> <p>If yes, what is the qualification criteria (project value) for the non HubZone, WOSB, SDB, VOSB, SDVOSB, ESDWOSB, 8(a) JV partner’s past performance project?</p>	Please refer to Amendment 11.
7445	Can the government clarify their definition of SDB for purposes of past performance submissions under a non MP JV?	No.
7446	<p>A.3.7.2 Past Performance Volume (a) Information From The Offeror, Page 109, RFP Statement: "9. For the references submitted with the Offeror’s proposal, Offeror shall provide recent customer evaluations of previous performance including Award Fee Evaluation results, Fee Determination Official letters, Annual Performance Evaluation Forms, or any other written performance feedback, if applicable. (Excluded from the page limitation)."</p> <p>Question: Can the Government please confirm that offerors may satisfactorily address question 9 (recent customer evaluations of previous performance) by stating that we have provided an appendix with recent customer evaluations of our submitted Past Performance References?</p>	The referenced "recent customer evaluations of previous performance" has been removed in Amendment 11.
7448	The RFP requires that "The subcontracting plan from Other Than Small Businesses (OTSBs) shall include the goals of the AbilityOne NPAs and their associated NAICS codes." FAR 19.704(d) states that "Once a contractor's commercial plan has been approved, the Government shall not require another subcontracting plan from the same contractor while the plan remains in effect, as long as the product or service being provided by the contractor continues to meet the definition of a commercial product or commercial service." If a contractor has already has a commercial small business subcontracting plan that is administered by another agency (e.g. GSA), it would not contain AbilityOne NPAs as a demographic category. How should contractors in this situation address this requirement?	The solicitation was updated in Amendment 11 to remove the subcontracting plan reference.

7449	<p>We are bidding as a SDVOSB Joint Venture (JV) and have structured our proposal to meet the requirements outlined in the original RFP and all amendments up to Amendment 7. Specifically, all the past performance (PP) in our proposal is being provided by the non-set-aside partner, which was permitted under the original RFP requirements. However, the recent amendment now mandates that PPs must come from the set-aside partner or the Joint Venture itself.</p> <p>This change creates a significant challenge for our proposal, as we have been actively working on this submission for the past six months, allocating substantial time, effort, and resources under the understanding of the prior requirements. The sudden revision at this late stage jeopardizes our submission, as it renders our current past performance non-compliant despite being acceptable under the original framework. We respectfully request that the RFP requirements for past performance be amended to revert to their previous form, allowing PPs to come from any partner in the Joint Venture. This change would ensure that our efforts and investment over the last six months are not wasted and that we can proceed with a compliant proposal.</p>	The current RFP has been updated.
7454	<p>We are bidding as a SDVOSB Joint Venture (JV) and have structured our proposal to meet the requirements outlined in the original RFP and all amendments up to Amendment 7. Specifically, all the relevant Experience Projects (REPs) in our proposal are being provided by the non-set-aside partner, which was explicitly permitted under the original RFP requirements. However, the recent amendment now mandates that REPs must come from the set-aside partner or the Joint Venture itself.</p> <p>This change creates a significant challenge for our proposal, as we have been actively working on this submission for the past six months, allocating substantial time, effort, and resources under the understanding of the prior requirements. The sudden revision at this late stage jeopardizes our submission, as it renders our current REPs non-compliant despite being acceptable under the original framework. We respectfully request that the RFP requirements for REPs be amended to revert to their previous form, allowing REPs to come from any partner in the Joint Venture. This change would ensure that our efforts and investment over the last six months are not wasted and that we can proceed with a compliant proposal.</p>	The current RFP has been updated.
7458	<p>The RFP states: "The subcontracting plan from Other Than Small Businesses (OTSBs) shall include the goals of the AbilityOne NPAs and their associated NAICS codes. Contract holders shall allocate a target goal of at least 2% of the overall value of all task orders placed under AbilityOne NAICS codes."</p> <p>Does the 2% goal listed here apply to all offerors, including small businesses (which would not be submitting subcontracting plans) or is this language only instructing OTSBs to include a 2% goal in their subcontracting plan?</p>	The solicitation was updated in Amendment 11 to remove the subcontracting plan reference.
7461	<p>A.3.7.1 states that "For offerors submitting as HUBZone, SDB, VOSB, SDVOSB, WOSB, or EDWOSB Joint Ventures, one of the REPs from different mandatory experience technical areas shall be submitted from the HUBZone, SDB, VOSB, SDVOSB, WOSB, or EDWOSB partner, or the Joint Venture itself."</p> <p>Please confirm that if a joint venture consists of two similarly situated partners (e.g., two SDVOSBs), all REPs can come from a single partner.</p>	Please propose in accordance with the RFP Amendment 11.
7462	<p>A.3.7.2 states that "For offerors submitting as HUBZone, SDB, VOSB, SDVOSB, WOSB, or EDWOSB Joint Ventures, contracts may be submitted from the HUBZone, SDB, VOSB, SDVOSB, WOSB, or EDWOSB partner or the Joint Venture itself"</p> <p>Please confirm that if a joint venture consists of two similarly situated partners (e.g., two SDVOSBs) all past performance references can come from either partner</p>	Please propose in accordance with the RFP Amendment 11.
7465	<p>Exhibit 1: Relevant Experience Project Cover Page, RFP Statement: "Exhibit 1: Relevant Experience Project Cover Page. This attachment is in support of solicitation 80TECH24R0001. Refer to Section A.3.7.1(b) of the solicitation for further information."</p> <p>Question: Can the Government please confirm that the REP is to follow A.3.7.1(c) mandatory experience and not A.3.7.1(b) ISO 9001 and CMMI Certification?</p>	Exhibit 1 has been updated in Amendment 11.
7466	<p>In Q&amp;A Batch #6, Question 3089, the government stated that for SBA-approved Mentor-Protégé JVs, the mentor cannot submit REPs or Past Performance references to qualify in small business categories. However, in RFP Amendment 10, it states:</p> <p>"For joint ventures, the Offerors shall provide a REP from the work done and qualifications held either individually by a partner to the joint venture, the work done by the joint venture itself, or any combination of both."</p> <p>"For offerors submitting as HUBZone, SDB, VOSB, SDVOSB, WOSB, or EDWOSB Joint Ventures, one of the REPs from different mandatory experience technical areas shall be submitted from the HUBZone, SDB, VOSB, SDVOSB, WOSB, or EDWOSB partner, or the Joint Venture itself."</p> <p>Can the government please clarify whether REPs can be provided by the mentor, the protégé, or the MPJV itself and that only one REP must come from the protégé or the MPJV itself to satisfy this requirement?</p>	For Mentor-Protégé Joint Ventures, A Mentor may provide Past Performance References and REPs in accordance with the RFP. Amendment 11 provides this clarification.

7467	According to prior Q&A, Exhibit 5 should be submitted in its original excel format, but it contains a signature line. Should it instead be converted to pdf and signed? Should both excel and pdf copies be submitted?	Exhibit 5 has been updated in Amendment 11.C86
7471	"A.3.7.1 - Exhibit 3a - Category A Solutions Spreadsheet - The RFP states that the Offeror should rank the technical areas in Column C of the exhibit (on page 102 under the 'Information Tab' instructions); however, the revised Exhibit 3a (from Amendment 9) no longer has a column for rank. Should the technical areas be ranked?"	Exhibit 3a has been updated in Amendment 11.
7475	With respect to : "Only contracts with performance within three years from the proposal due date will be evaluated", The latest change in A10 said that REPS and PPRs are valid only 3 years prior to the NEW due date in Feb 2025. Since the original RFP was released in May 2024 that is 9 fewer months which can affect SB's REPS negatively. This is 30% of the total recency period. And this date could change. We request that the PPR recency date to start from the original RFP posting date (May 2024).	Amendment 11 revised the recency date to 3 years from the original RFP release date.
7478	How should average annual cost be calculated for completed projects that lasted less than one year? For example, a contract valued at \$500,000 took place over a six month period. Would this project have an average annual cost of \$1,000,000, based on a \$500,000/0.5 year calculation?	Yes.
7479	A.3.7.2 - (a) INFORMATION FROM THE OFFEROR - The referenced paragraph '(a)(12)' in the last paragraph no longer exists. Can the Government please update?	The solicitation was updated in Amendment 11.
7483	Upon receipt of Amendment 7, portions of Block 10 of the SF1449 were already completed. Specifically, there is an X by Small Business, 50% was also inserted in the box above North American Industry Classification Standards (NAICS), and the words "See Section A.1.34" on the Size Standard. The SF1449 included with Amendments 8 and 10 are the same. Question: What is the purpose for the Government including these items and will the Government confirm that the Offeror may remove or replace these items to complete Block 10 in accordance with the instructions included in Batch 3 Q&A where the Government responded to four separate questions requiring such: Q.4392, Q.4499, Q.4505, and Q.4510?	The Offeror shall include in Block 17a of the SF1449 the NAICS Code the Offeror is proposing using for competition at the master contract level. Amendment 11 reflects this clarification.
7484	"Amendment 10, RFP, under Category B, page 104 " For HUBZone, SDB, VOSB, SDVOSB, WOSB, EDWOSB, 8a offerors (inclusive of first-tier subcontractors, if applicable): A total of two different REPs from different mandatory experience technical areas shall be submitted. Each Project must have had a minimum of \$4M in total value size of a single order or contract and must be described using the Exhibit 1 REP template. For offerors submitting as HUBZone, SDB, VOSB, SDVOSB, WOSB, or EDWOSB Joint Ventures, one of the REPs from different mandatory experience technical areas shall be submitted from the HUBZone, SDB, VOSB, SDVOSB, WOSB, or EDWOSB partner, or the Joint Venture itself. The HUBZone, SDB, VOSB, SDVOSB, WOSB, or EDWOSB partner project, or Joint Venture project need only have a minimum of \$2M in total value size of a single order or contract. My understanding of this requirement is that a stand-alone SDB, VOSB, SDVOSB, WOSB, EDWOSB, 8a offeror has to meet a higher bar (\$4M) than a Joint Venture that likely includes a large business member (\$2M). Is it the Government's intention to give an advantage to a JV that likely includes a large business, or have I misunderstood this requirement.	RFP has been updated.
7485	"Amendment 10, RFP, under Category C, pages 104 and 105 " For HUBZone, SDB, VOSB, SDVOSB, WOSB, EDWOSB, 8a, offerors (inclusive of first-tier subcontractors, if applicable): A total of two different REPs from different mandatory experience technical areas shall be submitted. Each Project must have had a minimum of \$2M in total value size of a single order or contract and must be described using the Exhibit 1 REP template. For offerors submitting as HUBZone, SDB, VOSB, SDVOSB, WOSB, or EDWOSB Joint Ventures, one of the REPs from different mandatory experience technical areas shall be submitted from the HUBZone, SDB, VOSB, SDVOSB, WOSB, or EDWOSB partner, or the Joint Venture itself. The HUBZone, SDB, VOSB, SDVOSB, WOSB, or EDWOSB partner project, or Joint Venture project need only have a minimum of \$1M in total value size of a single order or contract. My understanding of this requirement is that a stand-alone SDB, VOSB, SDVOSB, WOSB, EDWOSB, 8a offeror has to meet a higher bar (\$2M) than a Joint Venture that likely includes a large business member (\$1M). Is it the Government's intention to give an advantage to a JV that likely includes a large business, or have I misunderstood this requirement.	RFP has been updated.
7486	In the general instructions for past performance on page 106, it states "For joint ventures, the Offerors shall provide past performance for the work done and qualifications held either individually by a partner to the joint venture, the work done by the joint venture itself, or any combination of both." However, further down on specific instructions on past performance for Category B on page 107, it states "For offerors submitting as Mentor-Protégé Joint Ventures, contracts may be submitted from the Protégé or the offering Mentor-Protégé Joint Venture itself." The latter excludes the Mentor experience. Please confirm that the past performance can come individually by a partner to the joint venture, the joint venture itself, or any combination of both.	For Mentor-Protégé Joint Ventures, A Mentor may provide Past Performance References and REPs in accordance with the RFP. Amendment 11 provides this clarification.

7487	In the general instructions for past performance on page 106, it states “For joint ventures, the Offerors shall provide past performance for the work done and qualifications held either individually by a partner to the joint venture, the work done by the joint venture itself, or any combination of both.” However, further down on specific instructions on past performance for Category C on page 107, it states “For offerors submitting as Mentor-Protégé Joint Ventures, contracts may be submitted from the Protégé or the offering Mentor-Protégé Joint Venture itself.” The latter excludes the Mentor experience. Please confirm that the past performance can come individually by a partner to the joint venture, the joint venture itself, or any combination of both.	For Mentor-Protégé Joint Ventures, A Mentor may provide Past Performance References and REPs in accordance with the RFP. Amendment 11 provides this clarification.
7493	The original Solicitation and amendments 1-9 stated “Contracts that are completed or ongoing within three years of the solicitation release date will be considered recent.” Amendment 10 stated “Only contracts with performance within three years from the proposal due date will be evaluated.”  The offeror requested and has had customers provide past performance references based on the original RFP and Amendments 1-9 “completed or ongoing within three years of the solicitation release date.” Based on amendment 10 our past performance references need to be resubmitted by our references. This change could result in hundreds of PPQ’s having to be resubmitted by all offerors and buy the associated entity providing the evaluation, we request you change the RFP back to what the requirement was from the being of the SEWP VI RFP.	Amendment 11 revised the recency date to 3 years from the original RFP release date.
7499	Through Amendment 8, Contracts that were completed or ongoing within three years of the solicitation release date were considered recent. However, Amendment 10 changed from solicitation release date to proposal due date. This three (3) year relevancy is now a moving target. With each extension there is significant potential re-work for offerors and potential elimination of the past performance reference(s) and PPQ(s) already submitted with each extension. Is there a rationale for this change to help offerors understand?	Amendment 11 revised the recency date to 3 years from the original RFP release date.
7506	Comment ID 5269 states the AbilityOne Commitment Letter must include...(3) list of NAICS codes for which the Offeror plans to subcontract with AbilityOne organizations. The signed standard commitment letter provided to us by SourceAmerica and NIB does not include the NAICS codes for which we plan to subcontract to AbilityOne.  Follow-On Question: Does SEWP require us to request a revised letter from SourceAmerica/NIB to meet this requirement and include the NAICS codes for which we plan to subcontract to AbilityOne?	No. The only letter required for the proposal is the Commitment Letter issued by either SourceAmerica or NIB Central Nonprofit Agency (CNAs) and signed by the Prime Contractor and the CNA. The Prime Contractor does not need to include an additional letter with the NAICS listed. Offerors <u>do not</u> need to re-contact SourceAmerica/AbilityOne to request a revised letter to include the NAICS codes for which they plan to subcontract to AbilityOne.
7513	Section A.3.6(B)(7) page 97 Only one proposal per scope category will be accepted per offeror. An Offeror can propose as the prime contractor one time per category and can propose one additional time as a member of a joint venture (JV) or Contractor Team Arrangement (CTA) in that same category. A firm cannot propose as a member of a JV or CTA for a category and also simultaneously propose for the same category as a member of a different JV or CTA.  By the definition of FAR 9.601, a CTA can be a Prime/Subcontractor relationship. Is there a limit to the number of proposals a subcontractor can participate on?  If not a Prime Offeror, is there a limit on the number of proposals a subcontractor can support?	An Offeror can propose as the prime contractor one time per category and can propose one additional time as a member of a joint venture (JV) or Contractor Team Arrangement (CTA) in that same category. For example, it is permissible for XYZ, Corp to propose as a prime contractor in Category A, and form a JV with 123, LLC to propose in category A. This example applies to all categories as well as CTAs.  The above limitations do not preclude a prime contractor from acting as a first-tier subcontractor on one or more proposals within a category if they are not providing REP or Past Performance references for another Offeror's proposal. These limitations apply only to the number of prime Offeror proposals a company can participate in (as a CTA/JV or standalone prime), not on the number of times they can act as a first-tier subcontractor. (original response revised)
7514	"Amendment 10, RFP, under Category C, page 107 " For Small Businesses proposing in Category B- the past performance provided shall be for similar scope efforts with a minimum average annual cost/fee incurred of \$1,000,000 for size to be rated relevant.  For offerors submitting as Mentor-Protégé Joint Ventures, contracts may be submitted from the Protégé or the offering Mentor-Protégé Joint Venture itself. The Protégé or Mentor-Protégé Joint Venture project need only have a minimum of \$500,000 in average annual cost/fee incurred. For offerors submitting as HUBZone, SDB, VOSB, SDVOSB, WOSB, or EDWOSB Joint Ventures, contracts may be submitted from the HUBZone, SDB, VOSB, SDVOSB, WOSB, or EDWOSB partner or the Joint Venture itself. The HUBZone, VOSB, SDVOSB, WOSB, or EDWOSB partner contract, or Joint Venture contract, need only have a minimum of \$500,000 in average annual cost/fee incurred. My understanding of this requirement is that a stand-alone SDB, VOSB, SDVOSB, WOSB, EDWOSB, 8a offeror has to meet a higher bar (\$1,000,000) than a Joint Venture that likely includes a large business member (\$500,000). Is it the Government’s intention to give an advantage to a JV that likely includes a large business, or have I misunderstood this requirement.	RFP has been updated.



7515	<p>"Amendment 10, RFP, under Category C, page 107 " For Small Businesses proposing in Categories C- the past performance provided shall be for similar scope efforts with a minimum average annual cost/fee incurred of \$500,000 for size to be rated relevant.</p> <p>For offerors submitting as Mentor-Protégé Joint Ventures, contracts may be submitted from the Protégé or the offering Mentor-Protégé Joint Venture itself. The Protégé or Mentor-Protégé Joint Venture project need only have a minimum of \$250,000 in average annual cost/fee incurred. For offerors submitting as HUBZone, SDB, VOSB, SDVOSB, WOSB, or EDWOSB Joint Ventures, contracts may be submitted from the HUBZone, SDB, VOSB, SDVOSB, WOSB, or EDWOSB partner or the Joint Venture itself. The HUBZone, SDB, VOSB, SDVOSB, WOSB, or EDWOSB partner contract, or Joint Venture contract, need only have a minimum of \$250,000 in average annual cost/fee incurred. My understanding of this requirement is that a stand-alone SDB, VOSB, SDVOSB, WOSB, EDWOSB, 8a offeror must meet a higher bar (\$500,000) than a Joint Venture that likely includes a large business member (\$250,000). Is it the Government's intention to give an advantage to a JV that likely includes a large business, or have I misunderstood this requirement.</p>	RFP has been updated.
7516	<p>A.3.7.2(a) Pages 106, 108, and 117</p> <p>Only contracts with performance within three (3) years from the solicitation release proposal due date will be evaluated.</p> <p>We respectfully request that this change to the three (3) year look back period to proposal due date be reversed to the original definition- solicitation release date for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Many PPQs have already been completed and submitted to NASA SEWP VI based on the previous "recency" definitions - what will the Government process be for matching new projects with their corresponding PPQs?</li> <li>2. The Proposal Due date could change again based on the holiday schedule and the numbers of additional questions from Industry that will need to be addressed and published - this causes a major problem for Industry to select projects that meet the "recency" element for past performance projects.</li> <li>3. Industry has been working on proposals since May 23, 2024 - seven (7) months - and this is a major change to the qualification of recency of a past performance project. It was mentioned by Joanne at Industry Day that proposals have been received and are in evaluation - how can the Government have two sets of evaluation factors for recency? Does the Government propose that Offeror's that have already submitted the SEWP VI proposal, where the new "recency" definition eliminates one or more of their past performance projects, withdrawl and reissue an amended proposal?</li> <li>4. Section A.3.7.2(a) on page 108 states the following: The combined total of the Offeror's (including JVs) and proposed first tier subcontractors' past prime or subcontract experiences shall be limited to no more than three (3) reference contracts</li> </ol>	Amendment 11 revised the recency date to 3 years from the original RFP release date.
7517	<p>A.3.7.2(a) Page 110</p> <p>The information shall match the past performance information with the relevant experience identified in paragraph (a)(12) of this section.</p> <p>Request for clarification:</p> <p>Item "12" has been removed from the solicitation but still referenced in the instructions.</p>	The solicitation was updated in Amendment 11.
7519	<p>Throughout the Solicitation Sections III and IV (i.e., Instructions and Evaluation), the term "offeror" is used in various forms. Examples are numerous including but not limited to "Offeror," "offeror," "Prime offeror," "Prime Offeror," "Offerors," "prime contractor," "small business offeror," and "Mentor-Protege Joint Venture Offeror." In some cases, the form of the word seems to communicate some significance (e.g., potential awardee with privity of contract, signatory on SF 1449). However, definitions are not provided and form and usage vary throughout the Instructions and Evaluation sections (i.e., III and IV), terms continue to be used interchangeably. How are prospective offerors expected to correctly interpret these variations? Will the NASA SEWP PMO please provide definitions, unless there is no significance intended?</p>	The Offeror is the name of the company on the SF1449 unless otherwise specified in the RFP.

7521	<p>""Only one proposal per scope category will be accepted per offeror. An Offeror can propose as the prime contractor one time per category and can propose one additional time as a member of a joint venture (JV) or Contractor Team Arrangement (CTA) in that same category. A firm cannot propose as a member of a JV or CTA for a category and also simultaneously propose for the same category as a member of a different JV or CTA.""</p> <p>There are two types of CTA - one in which each prime acts as an equal to the other which is CTA type 9.601(1) and then a prime/subcontractor CTA type 9.601(2). The RFP as well as previously answered questions do not make it clear whether or not this requirement applies to both types of CTAs.</p> <p>Scenario: Company XYZ is bidding as a Prime contractor in Category C.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Company XYZ is then also part of a CTA type 9.601(2) acting as a subcontractor under Company ABC's prime bid.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Company XYZ is part of a second CTA type 9.601(2) as a subcontractor under a second prime bidder named Company WWW.</p> <p>Essentially, Company XYZ is bidding as a prime in Category C and is part of TWO CTAs type 9.601(2). So, they are part of three bids in Category C. Is this allowed?</p> <p>This question is primarily based around which type of CTA the quoted RFP text above applies to. Are there any limits on the number of times a company can act as a subcontractor to a prime offeror under CTA Type 9.601(2) in a category if they are also submitting their own prime bid in that same category? If there are limitations, what are those limitations?"</p>	Please propose in accordance with the RFP Amendment 11.
7523	The solicitation instructs "the Offeror" to "complete the SF1449 Blocks 12 (if applicable), 17, and 30." Box 12 is pre-populated with "Net 30." Other sections of the Solicitation reference Box 10 of the 1449, specifically the NAICS code. Box 10 is also pre-populated. Should "the Offeror" overwrite the information in Box 10, since the existing reference is to numerous NAICS?	The Offeror shall include in Block 17a of the SF1449 the NAICS Code the Offeror is proposing using for competition at the master contract level. Amendment 11 reflects this clarification.
7525	The solicitation states that "failure to provide a signed SF 1449 and acknowledgement of all subsequent solicitation amendments will result in the Offeror being eliminated from competition." Block 11 of the SF 30s for Amendments issued through Amendment 10 is checked and provides multiple options for responding (e.g., submit signed copies of all Amendments, submit a single acknowledgement of all Amendments instead of the Amendments). Are all block 11 response options intended?	The solicitation was updated in Amendment 11 to indicate "acknowledgement of all subsequent solicitation amendments" can be done via the SF 30 or via an affirmative statement within the General Instructions Cover Page.
7533	Several responses state that a formal agreement between a prime and an AbilityOne subcontractor is due upon award. Please define the term "upon award" (i.e., same date as award or a specific number of business days after award notification).	<b>The term "Upon Award" means at the time of the award of the NASA SEWP VI GWAC Contract. The Formal Agreement (I.E., subcontracting Agreement, Teaming Agreement etc.) between the Prime Contractor and the AbilityOne Nonprofit Agency as subcontractor is due at the time of the award of the NASA SEWP VI GWAC Contract which will be which will be incorporated into the contract as Attachment H. More detailed subcontracts between the Prime and NPA(s) may need to be incorporated as the task orders level.</b>
7535	Vendors were told during the most recent SEWP VI webinar that the "master level NAICS" be inserted into the SF1449 Block 10. However, Amendment 10's SF 1449 Block 10 is already pre-filled. Can the Government clarify where offerors should indicate the master level NAICS code?	The Offeror shall include in Block 17a of the SF1449 the NAICS Code the Offeror is proposing using for competition at the master contract level. Amendment 11 reflects this clarification.
7540	<p>Comment: RFP Amendment 10 Section A.3.7.1 seems clear that only a CTA is required for a Prime/Sub offeror (#3) and a MRCL is required only for an offeror sharing resources from a Parent Company, Affiliate, Division, and/or Subsidiary within a corporate structure for evaluation purposes (#4). However multiple answers to questions contradict and/or confuse these instructions (QA 2812, 5342 and others).</p> <p>Question: Will the Government please clarify in a conformed version of the RFP whether a MRCL is required or not for a bidder proposing as a FAR 9.6 Prime/sub CTA?</p>	Please propose in accordance with the RFP Amendment 11.
7541	<p>Comment: RFP Amendment 10 Section A.3.7.1 seems clear that only a CTA is required for a Prime/Sub offeror (#3) and a MRCL is required only for an offeror sharing resources from a Parent Company, Affiliate, Division, and/or Subsidiary within a corporate structure for evaluation purposes (#4). However multiple answers to questions contradict and/or confuse these instructions (QA 2812, 5342 and others).</p> <p>Question: Will the Government confirm that our interpretation of the instructions is correct?</p>	Offerors proposing as a CTA with first-tier subcontractors are not required to provide MRCLs from subcontractors. The MRCL requirements apply to Parent Company, Affiliate, Division, and/or Subsidiary within a corporate structure.

7542	<p>"Only one proposal per scope category will be accepted per offeror. An Offeror can propose as the prime contractor one time per category and can propose one additional time as a member of a joint venture (JV) or Contractor Team Arrangement (CTA) in that same category. A firm cannot propose as a member of a JV or CTA for a category and also simultaneously propose for the same category as a member of a different JV or CTA." There are two types of CTA - one in which each prime acts as an equal to the other which is CTA type 9.601(1) and then a prime/subcontractor CTA type 9.601(2). The RFP as well as previously answered questions do not make it clear whether or not this requirement applies to both types of CTAs.</p> <p>Scenario: Company A is acting as a subcontractor under CTA type 9.601(2) with SB Prime "XYZ" where Company A is providing a past performance to prime offeror XYZ in Category C.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Company A is also acting as a subcontractor under CTA type 9.601(2) with SB Prime "ABC" where Company A is providing a past performance to prime offeror ABC in Category C.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Company A also joins Prime Contractor "WWW"s team a subcontractor under CTA type 9.601(2) in Category C but does not provide a past performance project.</p> <p>In this scenario, Company A is NOT bidding as a prime offeror themselves, they are only acting as a subcontractor on multiple teams under CTA type 9.601(2) in the same category. So Company A is a subcontractor under three CTA type 9.601(2) teams in the same category and is NOT submitting a bid as a prime in that category.</p> <p>Is this allowed? If it is allowed, are there any limitations to how and the number of times this can be done?</p> <p>Essentially what we are asking is are there any limits to the number of times a company can be a subcontractor to a prime offeror per category, if that subcontractor is not bidding as a prime in that category?</p>	Please propose in accordance with the RFP Amendment 11.
7545	<p>Amendment 10, Section A.3.7.1.c Category B and C, page 103 indicates, "For joint ventures, the Offerors shall provide a REP from the work done and qualifications held either individually by a partner to the joint venture, the work done by the joint venture itself, or any combination of both." However, the response to question 3089 states, "The mentor cannot submit REPs or Past Performance references." This seems to contradict the wording on page 103. Whether the joint venture is a Mentor Protege Joint Venture or a standard Joint Venture, the provision on page 103 should apply equally to both types of Joint Ventures.</p> <p>Question: Can the Government confirm whether Joint Ventures are allowed to use REPs from either member of the Joint Venture?</p>	For Mentor-Protégé Joint Ventures, A Mentor may provide Past Performance References and REPs in accordance with the RFP. Amendment 11 provides this clarification.
7546	<p>In amendment 10, the RFP Section A.3.7.1(c) Category B and C, page 103, specifies, "For joint ventures, the Offerors shall provide a REP from the work done and qualifications held either individually by a partner to the joint venture, the work done by the joint venture itself, or any combination of both." Furthermore, CFR 125.8(e) related to Mentor Protege Joint Ventures states, "Capabilities, past performance and experience. When evaluating the capabilities, past performance, experience, business systems and certifications of an entity submitting an offer for a contract set aside or reserved for small business as a joint venture established pursuant to this section, a procuring activity must consider work done and qualifications held individually by each partner to the joint venture as well as any work done by the joint venture itself previously. A procuring activity may not require the protégé firm to individually meet the same evaluation or responsibility criteria as that required of other offerors generally. The partners to the joint venture in the aggregate must demonstrate the past performance, experience, business systems and certifications necessary to perform the contract." In the Government responses to questions, answer to question 3089 appears to conflict directly with the statement on page 103 of the RFP and seems to violate the CFR 125.8(e), which allows Protege companies to rely on Mentor experience and past performance.☐</p> <p>Question: Could the Government please clarify if Mentor Protege Joint Ventures are permitted to use the experience and past performance of their Mentor member?</p>	For Mentor-Protégé Joint Ventures, A Mentor may provide Past Performance References and REPs in accordance with the RFP. Amendment 11 provides this clarification.
7547	<p>On pages 104 and 105 of Amendment 10, Section A.3.7.1.c for Category B and C, the Government outlines information for various socio-economic categories including HubZone, SDB, VOSB, SDVOSB, WOSB, EDWOSB, and 8a offerors. However, in later parts of this section, the Government omits the 8a designation from the list of categories. Question: Can the Government confirm that the socio-economic categories repeatedly listed throughout Section A.3.7.1.c should include the 8a designation in all instances?</p>	The current RFP has been updated.
7548	<p>Amendment 10, RFP, Section A.3.7.1(c) Category B and C, pages 104 and 105, under Mandatory Experience Offerings, details minimum values for Small Businesses, Mentor Protege Joint Ventures, HubZone, SDB, VOSB, SDVOSB, WOSB, EDWOSB, and 8a, as well as HubZone, SDB, VOSB, SDVOSB, WOSB, EDWOSB, and 8a Joint Ventures under the "For Small Business" category. However, the solicitation does not address the minimum values for HubZone, SDB, VOSB, SDVOSB, WOSB, EDWOSB, and 8a Mentor Protege Joint Venture offerors. Question: Could the Government confirm that HubZone, SDB, VOSB, SDVOSB, WOSB, EDWOSB, and 8a Mentor Protégé Joint Ventures are subject to the same minimum values as HubZone, SDB, VOSB, SDVOSB, WOSB, EDWOSB, and 8a Joint Ventures?</p>	Yes.

7549	<p>Batch 4 Q&amp;A (published 12/02/2024) Q&amp;A 5295, 5610, 5755, 5774, 5801, 5963, 5981, 6353, 6371 (and more)</p> <p>Numerous answers to questions state that Offerors are to identify the NAICS Code used to compete on the SF 1449. It is not clear where Offerors are to provide the NAICS Code being used for competition. SF 1449, Block 10 states: ""NORTH AMERICAN INDUSTRY CLASSIFICATION STANDARD (NAICS): See Section A.1.34."" There is a fillable block directly below to provide ""SIZE STANDARD"" only.</p> <p>Can the Government please clarify where Offerors are to provide the NAICS Code being used for competition in the SF 1449?</p>	The Offeror shall include in Block 17a of the SF1449 the NAICS Code the Offeror is proposing using for competition at the master contract level. Amendment 11 reflects this clarification.
7553	<p>Amendment 10, RFP, Section A.3.7.1(a).6, page 100, requests offerors to provide information to determine if the Offeror is responsible in accordance with FAR 9.104-1(a), including a certified letter and annual report. It also asks for additional details on how Joint Ventures, Teaming Arrangements, or other business combinations will manage their financial arrangements. However, the request does not specify how an unpopulated JV should demonstrate financial capability. Question: Can the Government clarify that JV members should individually provide a letter from their certified US bank indicating the available amount of credit each business has and a copy of each company's annual report, if available?</p>	The wording is clarified in Amendment 11. The references to "letters from certified United States banks" and "annual reports" are example documents that could be used to demonstrate financial capability. To determine if an Offeror is responsible in accordance with FAR 9.104-1(a), Offeror is instructed to submit information which demonstrates the Offeror's financial capability to perform the contract. the current RFP provides instructions for information required If a teaming arrangement, joint venture, or other business combination is contemplated.
7555	<p>According to Amendment 10, RFP, under Category B, page 104, "Each Protégé or Mentor-Protégé Joint Venture project need only have a minimum of \$2.5M in total value size of a single order or contract." Later on the same page, it states, "The HUBZone, SDB, VOSB, SDVOSB, WOSB, or EDWOSB partner project, or Joint Venture project need only have a minimum of \$2M in total value size of a single order or contract." It is unclear what value the Socio-Economic category MPJV should submit. Question: For a WOSB and 8a certified Mentor-Protégé Joint Venture, does the first project submitted by the Protégé need to have a minimum of \$2.5M or \$2M in total value size of a single order or contract to be compliant?</p>	The current RFP has been updated. Please propose in accordance with the current RFP.
7558	<p>As stated in the Amendment 10 solicitation, under Category B, page 104, "Each Protégé or Mentor-Protégé Joint Venture project need only have a minimum of \$2.5M in total value size of a single order or contract." Later on the same page, it mentions, "The HUBZone, SDB, VOSB, SDVOSB, WOSB, or EDWOSB partner project, or Joint Venture project need only have a minimum of \$2M in total value size of a single order or contract." It is unclear which values apply if a Mentor provides a project to satisfy the requirements under a Socio Economic category Mentor Protege Joint Venture. Question: For a WOSB and 8a certified Mentor-Protégé Joint Venture, can the second project submitted by the mentor have a minimum value of \$2M for a single order or contract and still be compliant?</p>	The current RFP has been updated. Please propose in accordance with the current RFP.
7559	What is the intent of the inconsistent use of SDB and 8(a) throughout this section and Volume II?	This has been updated in Amendment 11.
7560	<p>Amendment 10 solicitation Category C, page 104, specifies, "For Mentor-Protégé Joint Ventures, one of the REPs from different mandatory experience technical areas shall be submitted from the Protégé or Mentor-Protégé Joint Venture itself." It is unclear whether a Mentor to the Mentor Protege Joint Venture can supply a project to satisfy the requirements when the Protege does not have the experience on their own. Question: For a WOSB and 8a certified Mentor-Protégé Joint Venture, can the second REP be submitted by the mentor partner?</p>	For Mentor-Protégé Joint Ventures, A Mentor may provide Past Performance References and REPs in accordance with the RFP. Amendment 11 provides this clarification.
7561	<p>According to the Amendment 10 solicitation Category C, page 104, "For Mentor-Protégé Joint Ventures, one of the REPs from different mandatory experience technical areas shall be submitted from the Protégé or Mentor-Protégé Joint Venture itself." Question: Can the second REP from a WOSB and 8a certified Mentor-Protégé Joint Venture be submitted by a first-tier subcontractor to the MPJV?</p>	The current RFP has been updated.
7570	<p>13 CFR 125.2(g) states clearly that there are three (3) criteria which must be satisfied in order to utilize this authority: (1) the prime contractor offeror must be a small business; (2) the prime contractor small business offeror must include a proposed team of small business subcontractors; and (3) the prime contractor small business offeror must specifically identify the first-tier subcontractor(s) in the proposal. Of significance here is criterion #2 as cited within this question which requires that the prime contractor small business offeror must include a proposed team of small business subcontractors. How then is it that the NASA SEWP VI Contracting Office intends to apply the authority at 13 CFR 125.2(g) to the NASA SEWP VI solicitation such that prime contractor small business offerors will be credited with information / qualifications from first-tier subcontractors that are other than small businesses (i.e., the proposed team does not consist of small business subcontractors and therefore does not satisfy criterion #2 as cited within this question / is present within 13 CFR 125.2(g)) in a scenario where the capabilities, past performance, and experience of the small.</p>	Please refer to Amendment 11.
7572	<p>Question: Could the Government please provide editable 1449s so we could use a computer to add the required information, rather than printing the document, filling it out by hand, then scanning the document back to an electronic copy.</p>	The 1449s are editable.
7575	<p>Can the Protégé member [8(a)] of a Mentor-Protégé Joint Venture submit a REP or past performance reference from an affiliated company, provided that a MRCL is included, and the affiliate company or its references are not being submitted as another Offeror? If allowed, are there specific conditions or requirements that must be satisfied for the affiliate's past performance to be considered valid? According to FAR 15.305(a)(2) (iii), past performance evaluations should consider information related to predecessor or affiliate companies, key personnel, or subcontractors.</p>	The current RFP has been updated.

7578	Q&A Item 3089 states that "The Mentor cannot submit REPs or Past Performance references," while Q&A Item 6046 specifies that "the Protégé of a Mentor-Protégé joint venture is not required to submit any REP or PP references." This creates ambiguity regarding the Mentor's role in submitting past performance. Can the Government clarify whether the Mentor of a Mentor-Protégé joint venture is permitted to submit REPs and past performance references, and if not, how this aligns with the language in RFP Amendment 10, pages 106-107?	For Mentor-Protégé Joint Ventures, A Mentor may provide Past Performance References and REPs in accordance with the RFP. Amendment 11 provides this clarification.
7580	In response to Q&A item 2137, NASA indicated that both an AbilityOne Commitment Letter and a subcontracting plan are required for SBA 8(a) Program participants submitting an offer. However, Q&A item 5804 suggests that the Small Business Subcontracting Plan is only applicable to "Other Than Small Business Offerors" in Categories A and B. Additionally, RFP sections A.1.32 and A.1.35 emphasize subcontracting plans for Other Than Small Businesses. Could the Government clarify if a Mentor-Protégé JV that is an 8(a) Small Business is required to submit both the AbilityOne Commitment Letter and the subcontracting plan, or if only the AbilityOne Commitment Letter is sufficient?	The solicitation was updated in Amendment 11 to remove the subcontracting plan reference.
7587	Section A.3.6 (a) (2) of the RFP states, "Volumes I, II, and III shall be numbered and identified with the offeror's name, RFP number, and date." Question: Can Volume I page numbers be excluded in certain areas or entirely as PDF files will have to be combined for this volume?	The solicitation was updated in Amendment 11 to clarify the information is only needed for page limited documents.
7592	Amendment 10 at A.3.7.2 (a). Assuming that a prime does not have a past performance that satisfies the minimum average annual cost/fee incurred requirement in Category A, could past performance from a first tier sub that satisfies the past performance and related requirements lead to a satisfactory determination for past performance?	The question is unclear since it depends on the Prime Offeror's business size. Please propose in accordance with the current RFP.
7593	"Acceptable information includes: letters from certified United States banks indicating the available amount of credit for the business and the company's annual report." This statement includes the word AND, by using AND here, is the government stating that BOTH a letter of credit AND the company's annual report are REQUIRED? Or is the government saying that both of these are acceptable and will accept one or the other, meaning that only one type of documentation is required?	The wording is clarified in Amendment 11. The references to "letters from certified United States banks" and "annual reports" are example documents that could be used to demonstrate financial capability. Any information that demonstrates the Offeror's financial capability to perform the contract is acceptable.
7594	A.3.7.2(a) states, "For offerors submitting as Mentor-Protégé Joint Ventures, contracts may be submitted from the Protégé or the offering Mentor-Protégé Joint Venture itself" rather than "shall." Does this mean that contracts may in fact be submitted by the protege, mentor, the JV itself, or any combination?	For Mentor-Protégé Joint Ventures, A Mentor may provide Past Performance References and REPs in accordance with the RFP. Amendment 11 provides this clarification.
7596	Code of Federal Regulations (CFR), Title 13, Business Credit and Assistance was amended on December 18, 2024. This amendment may affect various small businesses SEWP VI offerors. 89 FR 102492 HUBZone Program Updates and Clarifications, and Clarifications to Other Small Business Programs has an effective date of January 16, 2025. The pending final rule publication may affect CFR § 125.9 What are the rules governing SBA's small business mentor-protégé program? and other set-aside programs. The SBA rule attempts to clarify various points that have been misinterpreted. For example, "although SBA's current regulation provides that a procuring activity may not require the protégé firm to individually meet the same evaluation or responsibility criteria as that required of other offerors generally, it does not provide guidance on what a procuring activity could require." Therefore, SBA proposed to "permit a procuring activity to require some past performance at a dollar level below what would be required of joint venture mentor partners or of individual offerors." The example provided by SBA showed "how this could work. In the example, where offerors must generally demonstrate successful performance on five contracts with a value of at least \$20 million, a procuring activity could require a protégé joint venture partner to demonstrate one or two contracts valued at \$10 million or \$8 million." Is it the NASA SEWP PMO's intent to apply a different version of this upcoming rule to each Category and Proposal Volume? For example, no differences exist in Category A, Volume I mandatory experience and both Category B and C Mandatory Experience seem to apply the rule differently. Volume II Past Performance requirements also vary. In some cases, Proteges must meet the same or higher requirements than all other offerors and in all cases they are evaluated the same as all other offerors?	The current RFP has been updated.
7600	The change in the definition of recency is alarming and we are hopeful that it is an error. Since the original posting of the SEWP VI RFP, recency has been 3-years from the publishing of the RFP. Now, it appears that recency is tied to the offer submission date. Please clarify the definition of recency AND if the intention is to leave it tied to offer submission, please reconsider.	Amendment 11 revised the recency date to 3 years from the original RFP release date.
7605	Can the Government please confirm that past performance that dates back three years from the solicitation release date (not proposal due date) is acceptable	Amendment 11 revised the recency date to 3 years from the original RFP release date.
7610	Once the Government completes all updates to the solicitation, will you please issue an updated packet of exhibits so bidders can have the most recent and compliant worksheets in one place?	No.
7613	If a company is a certified Hubzone company at the time of proposal submission, but their Hubzone certification expires by the time their proposal is evaluated, will that company still be held to the submission requirements for Hubzone companies or will that company be judged by the regular small-business standards? Therefore having to provide more project references at higher dollar thresholds?	No.

7614	<p>On page 96, Section A.3.6 (B) PROPOSAL CONTENT AND PAGE LIMITATIONS the RFP states ""The Government intends to evaluate proposals and award contract(s) without discussions with offerors (except clarifications as described in FAR 15.306(a)). Therefore, the offeror's initial proposal shall contain the offeror's best technical terms. The Government reserves the right to conduct discussions if the Contracting Officer later determines them to be necessary.""</p> <p>Can the Government please clarify the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. What constitutes a situation where discussions are initiated?</li> <li>2. How will offerors be notified if discussions become necessary?"</li> </ol>	1. No. ; 2. E-mail.
7621	Will the government clarify the expectations for acknowledging all solicitation amendments? Is a statement within the Offer Volume stating each amendment number and date of release sufficient or does the Government expect a signed SF30 for each released amendment? If SF30s are required, will the government re-release the SF30s for Amendments 1, 2, 3, 5, 4, 6, 8, and 10 to have a proper electronic signature incorporated?	The references to "letters from certified United States banks" and "annual reports" are example documents that could be used to demonstrate financial capability. Any information that demonstrates the Offeror's financial capability to perform the contract is acceptable.
7622	Will the government please verify whether offeror's will be evaluated as responsible sources IAW FAR 9.104-1(a) as stated in section A.3.7.1.(a).6 or IAW FAR 9.104 as stated in A.4.2? There is a discrepancy between the instructions and evaluation criteria. This leads to confusion as to the amount of information required to satisfy the FAR 9.104 responsibility requirements since financial responsibility is but one aspect of FAR 9.104.	A.4.2. is updated in Amendment 11.
7624	Will the government clarify if an Offeror "shall" provide recent customer evaluations or "may" provide customer evaluations? The instructions for this section states that an "Offeror shall provide recent customer evaluations... if applicable". Per the responses to questions 2574 and 6604, offeror's are to not submit CPARs as part of their proposal., however, if CPAR records are the only record of previous performance available how is an offeror expected to satisfy the requirement? Will an offeror be penalized for not submitting recent customer evaluations?	The referenced "recent customer evaluations of previous performance" has been removed in Amendment 11.
7632	If a company is certified as HUBZONE at the time of proposal submission and proposal evaluation, but is no longer HUBZONE by the time of AWARD, will that company be prevented from receiving an award since they did not qualify to the standard SB requirements or will they still be eligible for award since there is no "Hubzone Only" SEWP category, only small business and they are still a small business at award?	Please review A.1.49 of the current RFP.
7653	<p>"Failure to provide a signed SF 1449 and acknowledgement of all subsequent solicitation amendments will result in the Offeror being eliminated from competition."</p> <p>It is understood that the SF1449 must be signed and included with the proposal. But regarding the "acknowledgement of all subsequent solicitation amendments" - in lieu of signing each of the 10 SF30s for the amendments, will the government accept a statement of acknowledgement of all amendments within Volume 1?</p>	The solicitation was updated in Amendment 11 to indicate "acknowledgement of all subsequent solicitation amendments" can be done via the SF 30 or via an affirmative statement within the General Instructions Cover Page.
7654	<p>Regarding A.3.7.2 (a) 9, "The reference states ""Offeror shall provide recent customer evaluations of previous performance including Award Fee Evaluation results, Fee Determination Official letters, Annual Performance Evaluation Forms, or any other written performance feedback, if applicable. (Excluded from the page limitation).""</p> <p>Previous responses from the Government indicate that CPARS is not acceptable for this requirement.</p> <p>If the Government will not accept CPARS as 'any other written performance feedback', will the Government please identify examples of other acceptable forms of customer feedback, including items such as customer correspondence?"</p>	The referenced "recent customer evaluations of previous performance" has been removed in Amendment 11.
7655	Regarding A.3.7.2 (a) 9, Will a vendor be considered non-compliant if we do not have any recent customer feedback or performance feedback?	The stated reference was removed in amendment 11.
7663	Under A.3.7.1 (a)-3, Will the Government please clarify if the Offeror is required to submit a copy of the Contractor Teaming Agreement if has a prime-subcontractor teaming arrangement?	Yes.
7669	Can the Government confirm the intent behind having prime contractors reach out to AbilityOne for TOs that do not require subcontractors in question 5646?	Offerors must provide AbilityOne subcontractors with first preference for all task orders, even smaller task orders that do not require subcontractor support and could be performed 100% in-house by the prime. The prime may only perform the work themselves if the AbilityOne subcontractor is unable to perform the work.

7675	<p>We respectfully submit that NASA’s RFP appears to be defective as it contains terms inconsistent with SBA regulations governing Mentor-Protégé Joint Ventures (MP JVs). Specifically, the SBA regulations allow MP JV submissions to leverage the aggregate capabilities of its partners’ past performance, experience, business systems and certifications to demonstrate the capability of a MP JV to perform a contract [See 13 C.F.R. § 125.8(e)].</p> <p>Amendment 8 of the RFP added language in which NASA intentionally excluded the ability of a MP JV from utilizing any contracts from the Mentor Member in satisfying the REPs and Past Performance requirements [“For offerors submitting as Mentor-Protégé Joint Ventures, contracts may be submitted from the Protégé or the offering Mentor-Protégé Joint Venture itself.” See 80TECH24R0001- SEWP VI RFP amendment 10 pp107, 118]. In fact, when directly asked about the ability of MP JVs to use a Mentor’s experience, NASA’s Q&amp;A responses explicitly state that MP JVs cannot rely on contracts from its Mentor to support its REPs and Past Performance requirements [See Question 3089 of Q&amp;A Batch 6 dated 12/16/24].</p> <p>This is contrary to current, and newly enacted (effective January 16, 2025), SBA regulations [See 89 Fed. Reg. 102492]. In the final rule issued on December 17, 2024, the SBA clarifies that a “procuring activity has discretion whether or not to require a protégé member of a joint venture to demonstrate some level of past performance and/or experience.” The final SBA rule goes on to state that Agencies can “rely solely on the past performance and experience of the mentor or non-similarly situated joint venture partner.” To be clear, the language of the rule remains unchanged in that Agencies are still not permitted to exclude the use of a Mentor’s past performance and experience on behalf of the MP JV for its past performance and experience. This most recent SBA final rule explicitly states that “[t]he partners to the joint venture in the aggregate must demonstrate the past performance, experience, business systems and certifications necessary to perform the contract (emphasis added).” The SBA explains that its clarification and expansion of 13 CFR 125.8 (e) is not a change to the</p>	The current RFP has been updated.
7676	Could NASA please confirm that the requirement "All pages of Volumes I, II and III shall be numbered and identified with the Offeror's name, RFP Number, and date" excludes Government-provided exhibits, such as Exhibits 3a and 5?	Amendment 11 clarifies that the page numbering requirement is only applicable to page limited documents and therefore does not apply to Exhibits 3a and 5.
7677	Can Government please clarify the "recency" criteria for relevant and past performance experience projects? The RFP (Amendment 10) Page 103 states "Offerors shall furnish relevant experience projects that are completed or ongoing within three (3) years of the proposal due date to be considered recent and be from a different requirement.". The recency is generally considered "from the date of solicitation".	Amendment 11 revised the recency date to 3 years from the original RFP release date.
7678	Could the Government please change the requirement: "All Categories: Offerors must provide separate and different experiences for their Relevant experience projects to address more than one technical area" language to state specifically Categories B&C to mitigate confusion on whether REPs are required from Category A.	The solicitation was updated in Amendment 11.
7679	Many offerors completed AbilityOne Commitment Letters prior to the updated RFP language requiring “identified NAICS Codes”, and with anticipated NAICS Code updates chose to reference the NASA SEWP VI RFP in lieu of explicitly listing relevant NAICS Codes. Will the government accept a reference to the NASA SEWP VI NAICS Codes to meet the “identified NAICS Codes” requirement in AbilityOne Commitment letters?	Yes. The Commitment Letter you were issued is acceptable.
7682	Can the Government clarify the reference to "all" in the sentence "The offeror shall provide the following information on all past/current contract references that meet the above criteria for the prime offeror." The word all, especially since it precedes a numbered question list, implies Government would like the following 8 questions answered for all its past performance in the three years, particularly as bullet 9 then specifies for the references submitted with the proposal.	Amendment 11 clarifies that the reference is to the submitted past performance references.
7686	Can the Government clarify the reference to (a)(12) in the section "The information shall match the past performance information with the relevant experience identified in paragraph (a)(12) of this section." We are unable to find a(12).	The solicitation was updated in Amendment 11.
7691	The solicitation states, "Identify any consultants, generative artificial intelligence, and/or sub-contractors used in writing this proposal (if any) and the extent to which their services will be available in the subsequent performance of this effort." There is a question concerning the phrase, "and the extent to which their services will be available". While it is clear in the case of consultant and subcontractors the extent to which their services will be available, what does this mean in the context of generative artificial intelligence? Often these systems are commercial systems and would only remain available if their creators, such as Google or OpenAI, continue to make them available. Also, whether or not an generative artificial intelligence is available for supporting performance after SEWP award does not seem to be useful information. Would the Government consider removing the requirement to explain the extent to which the services of a generative artificial intelligence will be available in the subsequent performance of the SEWP effort after award?	The solicitation was updated in Amendment 11.
7696	If past performance is a software license and support with a term of 1yr, but is paid for and activated up front, would the current expenditure be the total contract amount or prorated to the total amount of months that have passed?	Please propose in accordance with the current RFP. The formula provided in the current RFP demonstrates actual costs incurred.



7700	Could NASA update the Proposal Submission Table in A.3.6(B) to reflect that the SF-1449, Reps and Certs, AbilityOne Commitment Letter, the Meaningful Relationship Commitment Letter, Financial Information required by A.3.7.1(a)(6), and SF-30s should be included in the Offer volume?	Amendment 11 clarifies that General Instructions Documentation (i.e. all files required to respond to the General Instructions) are included in Volume I.
7703	Can NASA clarify whether all 10 SF-30s (and any additional issued SF-30s) should be combined into one file?	The solicitation was updated in Amendment 11 to indicate "acknowledgement of all subsequent solicitation amendments" can be done via the SF 30 or via an affirmative statement within the General Instructions Cover Page.
7707	We have a project that has contract start date of 07/24/2024 and performance start date is 09/01/2024. Can Government please confirm if such project will be acceptable if it meets all other criteria for relevant experience and past performance? Also, please confirm the date of contract under RFP Section A.3.7.2 (a) question #5 is referring to contract start date or performance start date?	No. Refer to A.3.7.2(a).
7708	Now that the REP and Past Performance recency requirements have been changed to be based on the proposal DUE date vs the original solicitation date, if the government extends the due date for the proposal again, does it intend to maintain that the recency requirement is that projects be within 3 years of the Amendment 10 due date of 2/17/25? If the proposal is extended again and this language is not changed, it could potentially cause more bidders to no longer have qualifying projects and create a rush to find a new qualifying project and have a PPQ signed and submitted in a very short period of time.	Amendment 11 revised the recency date to 3 years from the original RFP release date.
7709	Comment ID 3986 states that "The term "Fee" in PPQ Section 6 refers to any amount charged by the contractor that is over and above the cost of performing the work. This includes profit or any other markup applied to the costs incurred." Is SEWP asking for contractors to state how much profit they made on their Past Performance deals? Or do is this referring to any increase in contract value after the initial award was made (via mod or otherwise)?	The question is unclear. The Past Performance Questionnaire is to be submitted by the Reference POC. Please propose in accordance with the current RFP.
7712	Can the Government clarify the reference to "All categories" for REPs in A.3.7.1(c)? We believe REPs are not required for Category A.	The solicitation was updated in Amendment 11.
7713	Would NASA remove the reference to all categories for the REP requirements in A.3.7.1(c)?	The solicitation was updated in Amendment 11.
7715	We are submitting this question to seek clarification and request an amendment to the RFP as it pertains to the Past Performance Volume so that it is in accordance with applicable law. The RFP currently states under Section A.3.7.2(a), that for joint ventures, "the Offerors shall provide past performance for the work done and qualifications held either individually by a partner to the joint venture, the work done by the joint venture itself, or any combination of both." However, in that same section, and with respect to small businesses proposing in categories B and C, the RFP states that for "offerors submitting as Mentor-Protégé Joint Ventures, contracts may be submitted from the Protégé or the offering Mentor-Protégé Joint Venture itself." These statements appear to conflict. Please confirm that a mentor-protégé joint venture may submit the experience of the mentor as part of the past performance volume and in accordance with 13 C.F.R. § 125.8(e).	For Mentor-Protégé Joint Ventures, A Mentor may provide Past Performance References and REPs in accordance with the RFP. Amendment 11 provides this clarification.
7718	In response to question 3089, "For SBA approved Mentor-Protégé JVs, is there a limitation on the number of REPs or Past Performance that can be submitted by the large business mentor to qualify in the small business categories?" government responded, "The mentor cannot submit REPs or Past Performance references." However, this restriction is only mentioned in the Past Performance sections of Amendment 10, and contradicts the instructions laid out in the RFP for REPs: "For Mentor-Protégé Joint Ventures, one of the REPs from different mandatory experience technical areas shall be submitted from the Protégé or the Mentor-Protégé Joint Venture itself." This clearly indicates that as long as at least one REP is from the protégé or the M-P JV, others may also be included that are from the mentor. Can offerors include REPs from mentors in M-P JV submissions?	For Mentor-Protégé Joint Ventures, A Mentor may provide Past Performance References and REPs in accordance with the RFP. Amendment 11 provides this clarification.
7724	A.3.7.2(a) Information from the Offeror, Item 10, Past Performance History, page 110 states: "...and matches it with the past performance information submitted pursuant to the instructions of paragraph (a)(1)." What is (a)(1)? Should this be updated to say A.3.7.2(a)?	The solicitation was updated in Amendment 11.
7726	A.3.7.2(a) Information from the Offeror, Item 10, Past Performance History (page 110) states "All Offerors shall present a summary of relevant past performance information in matrix form as set forth below in Table 1, Sample Past Performance Matrix and accompany each category of the relevant experience. The information shall match the past performance information with the relevant experience identified in paragraph (a)(12) of this section." The requirement refers to "paragraph (a)(12). There is no (a)(12). Should this be updated to say (a)(10) as in the summary matrix shall match the "one but no more than three" contracts identified in response to A.3.7.2(a) Information from the Offeror?	The solicitation was updated in Amendment 11.
7727	The "Exhibit 2b" (Category B PPQ), released with Amendment 02 to address form issues, still contains problems with the evaluators' ability to enter feedback. Specifically, the Acrobat Form properties for the five Text Fields in Section 6 differ from the other text fields in the file and text over roughly 80 characters fails. We believe the Text Field Property for Appearance Font Size should be set to "Auto" and the Options should include "Scroll Long Text", to mirror the other text fields in the PDF and allow evaluators to enter their feedback more completely. Will the government provide an updated template, or allow offerors to adjust these settings prior to sending the PPQ to their customers to complete?	There are no known issues with the current Exhibit 2.
7729	Can the Government clarify if there was supposed to be content with the bullet 3, under category B? We would like to ensure we do not miss a requirement.	The solicitation was updated in Amendment 11.

7732	<p>Would the Government change the three (3) year look back period from the current "proposal due date" to the original definition of the "solicitation release date"? The following reasons justify reverting back to the solicitation release date:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The Proposal Due date could change again due to the current additional questions being submitted which causes a major problem for offerors to select projects that must meet a changing recency requirement.</li> <li>2. Many Past Performance Questionnaires (PPQs) have been submitted to the Government. How are offerors and the Government going to be able to match the PPQs to projects?</li> </ol>	<p>Amendment 11 revised the recency date to 3 years from the original RFP release date.</p> <p>The government will utilize the most recent PPQ submitted from the POC list the Offeror provides in their proposal.</p>
7738	<p>Are the Potential offerors required to be listed in the online database(s) for the following at the time of responding to SEWP VI or they have to register once they're selected for an award?</p> <p>Initial Solicitation Post- 5.23.24</p> <p>U.S. Department of Labor Veterans' Employment and Training Service, VETS-4212</p> <p>Reports: <a href="https://vets4212.dol.gov/vets4212/">https://vets4212.dol.gov/vets4212/</a></p>	At time of award.
7748	The reference to ranking the four technical areas is in RFP Section A.3.7.1 (c), however the column header for ranking is missing in the latest-provided Exhibit 3a, Information Tab.	The solicitation was updated in Amendment 11.
7749	Can the Government clarify what the ranking of the technical areas means or indicates?	The exhibit has been updated in Amendment 11 to remove the word ranking and only require an X be placed in the row for the Offeror's primary designated provider.
7757	Please clarify - can small businesses Offerors submit relevent experience and past performance performed as a second-tier subcontractor?	Please propose in accordance with the current RFP.
7760	<p>How should an offeror complete the PPQ for projects performed as an unpopulated JV? Our JV is comprised of the contract's prime contractor and our organization; however, because the JV is unpopulated, our company is a second-tier subcontractor to the JV.</p> <p>In this instance, who should be the PPQ recipient and what portion of the contract value should our organization to provide the annual value contract?</p>	In accordance with the RFP: Subject to the requirements of 13 CFR 125.11, a small business concern that has been a member of a joint venture may elect to use the past performance of the joint venture (whether or not the other joint venture partners were small business concerns) where the small business does not independently demonstrate past performance necessary for award. Please be advised in accordance with 13 CFR 125.11: "A small business cannot identify and use as its own experience and past performance work that was performed exclusively by other partners to the joint venture.
7761	How does the Government define "Significant Subcontractor" versus "team member" listed on the PPQ (Exhibit 2)?	Significant Subcontractor means First-Tier Subcontractor.
7762	For a project performed under an unpopulated JV (including the prime contractor and our company), how should we complete the PPQ? Specifically, who should be listed as the recipient, and how should we report our share of the contract value?	In accordance with the RFP: Subject to the requirements of 13 CFR 125.11, a small business concern that has been a member of a joint venture may elect to use the past performance of the joint venture (whether or not the other joint venture partners were small business concerns) where the small business does not independently demonstrate past performance necessary for award. Please be advised in accordance with 13 CFR 125.11: "A small business cannot identify and use as its own experience and past performance work that was performed exclusively by other partners to the joint venture.
7771	For categories B and C, companies in one of the socioeconomic groups (HUBZone, SDB, VOSB, SDVOSB, WOSB, or EDWOSB) that have past performance references with an AAV between \$500k and \$1m (for category B) or \$250k and \$500k (for category C) are disadvantaged by the current instructions. These companies are not permitted to use these references if submitting as a solo prime or as part of a prime-sub CTA, but the references become allowable if these companies are part of a joint venture of the same socioeconomic status. It is restrictive of competition to only apply the lower AAV requirement to joint ventures, as companies in the affected AAV range can qualify by forming a joint venture with a partner that does not contribute to the team in any way other than changing the type of offeror from a solo company to a joint venture. Will the government permit the lower AAV threshold to be used by solo prime HUBZone, SDB, VOSB, SDVOSB, WOSB, or EDWOSB offerors?	No, please propose in accordance with the current RFP.
7773	<p>Per Section A.3.7(a) Proposal Volume, General Instructions, second para on Page 98: Failure to provide a signed SF1449 and acknowledgement of all subsequent solicitation amendments will result in the Offeror being eliminated from Competition.</p> <p>Is the Government aware that an SF 1449 or SF 30 form was not provided for Amendment 9? And does the Government plan on uploading a SF 30 to show changes/Amendments so that industry can submit it with proposal submission?</p>	The solicitation was updated in Amendment 11 to indicate "acknowledgement of all subsequent solicitation amendments" can be done via the SF 30 or via an affirmative statement within the General Instructions Cover Page.
7775	<p>Initial Solicitation Post- 5.23.24-</p> <p>Potential offerors should ensure its company is listed in the online database(s) for the following:</p> <p>(3) Date Universal Numbering System (and the transition to the US Government's unique entity identifier (UEI)) - It's an invalid URL link. Is having a DUNS and UEI considered sufficient to satisfy this requirement?</p>	<p>The URL was just a link to an informational page provided by GSA concerning UEI's.</p> <p>The requirement is that the Potential Offeror must ensure they are listed on the appropriate Government DUNS and UEI online database.</p>
7778	<p>According to Amendment 10, solicitation Section A.3.7.1.(c) Category B and C, page 103, it is stated that "For joint ventures, the Offerors shall provide a REP from the work done and qualifications held either individually by a partner to the joint venture, the work done by the joint venture itself, or any combination of both." In contrast, the answer to question 3089 asserts that "The mentor cannot submit REPs or Past Performance references." This appears to be in direct conflict with the language on page 103. The policy on page 103 should be applicable to both Mentor Protege Joint Ventures and regular Joint Ventures.</p> <p>Could the Government please clarify if Joint Ventures can utilize experience REPs from either member of the Joint Venture?</p>	For Mentor-Protégé Joint Ventures, A Mentor may provide Past Performance References and REPs in accordance with the RFP. Amendment 11 provides this clarification.

7779	In Section A.1.30.1 of the NASA SEWP VI RFP, it lists NIST 800-171r3. Should that reference instead be NIST 800-161r1?	The solicitation was updated in Amendment 11.
7781	According to Amendment 10, Section A.3.7.1(c) Category B and C, page 103, it is stated, "For joint ventures, the Offerors shall provide a REP from the work done and qualifications held either individually by a partner to the joint venture, the work done by the joint venture itself, or any combination of both." Additionally, CFR 125.8(e) relevant to Mentor Protege Joint Ventures outlines, "Capabilities, past performance and experience. When evaluating the capabilities, past performance, experience, business systems and certifications of an entity submitting an offer for a contract set aside or reserved for small business as a joint venture established pursuant to this section, a procuring activity must consider work done and qualifications held individually by each partner to the joint venture as well as any work done by the joint venture itself previously. A procuring activity may not require the protégé firm to individually meet the same evaluation or responsibility criteria as that required of other offerors generally. The partners to the joint venture in the aggregate must demonstrate the past performance, experience, business systems and certifications necessary to perform the contract." The response to question 3089 seems to contradict the verbiage on page 103 and goes against the intent of CFR 125.8(e) governing Mentor Protege relationships, which permits Protege companies to use the experience and past performance of their Mentor. Would the Government please clarify whether Mentor Protege Joint Ventures can rely on the experience and past performance of their Mentor partner?	For Mentor-Protégé Joint Ventures, A Mentor may provide Past Performance References and REPs in accordance with the RFP. Amendment 11 provides this clarification.
7782	Will the Government confirm that the requirement to include a CTA agreement is intended for a CTA as defined under FAR 9.601(1) and not a conventional prime/subcontractor agreement as defined under FAR 9.601(2)?	Please propose in accordance with the current RFP.
7783	Amendment 10, pages 104 and 105, Section A.3.7.1(c) Category B and C, there is a detailed listing of socio-economic categories including HubZone, SDB, VOSB, SDVOSB, WOSB, EDWOSB, and 8a offerors. However, subsequent references in this section exclude the 8a category from the list. Will the Government please clarify whether the 8a designation should be consistently included in all references to socio-economic categories throughout Section A.3.7.1(c)?	Yes, this is updated in Amendment 11.
7784	On pages 104 and 105 of Amendment 10, Section A.3.7.1(c) for Category B and C, under Mandatory Experience Offerings, the document specifies minimum values for Small Businesses, Mentor Protege Joint Ventures, HubZone, SDB, VOSB, SDVOSB, WOSB, EDWOSB, and 8a offerors. It also provides details for HubZone, SDB, VOSB, SDVOSB, WOSB, EDWOSB, and 8a Joint Ventures under the "For Small Business" section. However, it does not address the minimum values for HubZone, SDB, VOSB, SDVOSB, WOSB, EDWOSB, and 8a Mentor Protege Joint Ventures. Could the Government please confirm that HubZone, SDB, VOSB, SDVOSB, WOSB, EDWOSB, and 8a Mentor Protégé Joint Ventures are required to adhere to the same minimum values as their Joint Venture counterparts?	The current RFP has been updated.
7786	On page 107 of Amendment 10, Solicitation Section A.3.7.1(c) Category B and C, under Past Performance, the document outlines minimum values for Small Businesses, Mentor Protege Joint Ventures, HubZone, SDB, VOSB, SDVOSB, WOSB, and EDWOSB Joint Ventures under the "For Small Business" section. However, it does not specify the minimum values for HubZone, SDB, VOSB, SDVOSB, WOSB, EDWOSB, and 8a offerors, nor for HubZone, SDB, VOSB, SDVOSB, WOSB, EDWOSB, and 8a Mentor Protege Joint Ventures. Could the Government provide clarity on the minimum values that HubZone, SDB, VOSB, SDVOSB, WOSB, EDWOSB, and 8a offerors, as well as HubZone, SDB, VOSB, SDVOSB, WOSB, EDWOSB, and 8a Mentor Protégé Joint Ventures, must adhere to?	Please propose in accordance with the current RFP.
7788	Section A.3.7.1(a).6, page 100, of Amendment 10 requests offerors to submit information to determine if the Offeror is responsible according to FAR 9.104-1(a), including a certified letter and annual report. The request also asks for additional details on the financial arrangements of Joint Ventures, Teaming Arrangements, or other business combinations. However, it does not specify how an unpopulated JV should demonstrate financial capability. Could the Government clarify that each JV member should provide a letter from their certified US bank indicating the amount of available credit and, if available, a copy of each company's annual report?	The wording is clarified in Amendment 11. The references to "letters from certified United States banks" and "annual reports" are example documents that could be used to demonstrate financial capability. To determine if an Offeror is responsible in accordance with FAR 9.104-1(a), Offeror is instructed to submit information which demonstrates the Offeror's financial capability to perform the contract. the current RFP provides instructions for information required If a teaming arrangement, joint venture, or other business combination is contemplated.
7791	On page 104 of the Amendment 10 RFP for Category B, the Government states, "Each Protégé or Mentor-Protégé Joint Venture project need only have a minimum of \$2.5M in total value size of a single order or contract." The same page also notes, "The HUBZone, SDB, VOSB, SDVOSB, WOSB, or EDWOSB partner project, or Joint Venture project need only have a minimum of \$2M in total value size of a single order or contract." Does the first project submitted by a Protégé for a WOSB and 8a certified MPJV need to meet a minimum value size of \$2.5M as a JV or \$2M for a WOSB and 8a certified MPJV on single order or contract to be compliant?	The current RFP has been updated. Please propose in accordance with the current RFP.
7792	Per Section A.3.7(a) Proposal Volume, General Instructions, second para on Page 98: Failure to provide a signed SF1449 and acknowledgement of all subsequent solicitation amendments will result in the Offeror being eliminated from Competition. Was it the Government intention to use SF 1449 forms for each Amendment instead of SF 30 forms when the SF 30 is used for amendments of solicitations or modifications of contracts?  Will the Government Amend Each Amendment that issued a SF 1449 to provide/include a SF 30 or replace the SF 1449 with SF 30s?	The solicitation was updated in Amendment 11 to indicate "acknowledgement of all subsequent solicitation amendments" can be done via the SF 30 or via an affirmative statement within the General Instructions Cover Page.

7793	The Amendment 10 solicitation Category B, page 104, specifies, "Each Protégé or Mentor-Protégé Joint Venture project need only have a minimum of \$2.5M in total value size of a single order or contract." It further states, "The HUBZone, SDB, VOSB, SDVOSB, WOSB, or EDWOSB partner project, or Joint Venture project need only have a minimum of \$2M in total value size of a single order or contract." Can a Mentor company to a WOSB and 8a Mentor-Protégé Joint Venture submit the second required project with a minimum value of \$2M for a single order or contract and still be compliant?	The current RFP has been updated. Please propose in accordance with the current RFP.
7794	Solicitation Amendment 10 Category C, page 104, reads, "For Mentor-Protégé Joint Ventures, one of the REPs from different mandatory experience technical areas shall be submitted from the Protégé or Mentor-Protégé Joint Venture itself." Is it permissible for the second REP to be submitted by the mentor of a WOSB and 8a Mentor-Protégé Joint Venture?	For Mentor-Protégé Joint Ventures, A Mentor may provide Past Performance References and REPs in accordance with the RFP. Amendment 11 provides this clarification.
7796	According to Amendment 10 for Category C on page 104 the Government states, "For Mentor-Protégé Joint Ventures, one of the REPs from different mandatory experience technical areas shall be submitted from the Protégé or Mentor-Protégé Joint Venture itself." Is it permissible for the second REP to be submitted by a first-tier subcontractor to a WOSB and 8a certified MPJV?	The current RFP has been updated.
7798	Q&A Batch 6, #2574 says CPARS should not be submitted in relation to section A.3.7.2, #9. As this paragraph is still in the current Amendment 10, please confirm that other customer evaluations still need to be submitted if applicable, just not CPARS?	CPARS should not be submitted. The referenced "recent customer evaluations of previous performance" has been removed in Amendment 11.
7802	Can NASA clarify the reference to A.7-Communications in A.7 - Electronics processes (within Attachment A)? We are unable to find the reference.	The solicitation was updated in Amendment 11.
7804	Paragraph (a)(12) from the following excerpt does not appear to be a valid reference. Please provide an updated reference."The information shall match the past performance information with the relevant experience identified in paragraph (a)(12) of this section."	The solicitation was updated in Amendment 11.
7807	Please confirm the government will still use past performance questionnaires that were previously submitted by customers in accordance with the original RFP due date.	Yes.
7809	<p>There appears to be a contradiction in the Q&amp;A Batch 6 Question ID 3089 and Question ID 6664 and Amendment 10 regarding the number of REPs or Past Performances allowed from a Mentor in a Mentor-Protégé Joint Venture submission. We ask the Government clarify that Amendment 10 language is correct and to update Question ID 3089 accordingly.</p> <p>In Question ID 3089 the Government states "The mentor cannot submit REPs or Past Performance references". However, in Amendment 10 A.3.7.2(a) the RFP states: "For joint ventures, the Offerors shall provide past performance for the work done and qualifications held either individually by a partner to the joint venture, the work done by the joint venture itself, or any combination of both." Will the Government confirm that for REPs and Past Performances Offerors can provide qualifications held either individually by a partner to the joint venture, the work done by the joint venture itself, or any combination of both?</p> <p>To restrict mentors from submitting a REP or Past Performance would be a significant disruption to many JV responses requiring significant changes to Past Performance Questionnaires that have already been submitted. We suggest that NASA retain the language A.3.7.2.(a) and replicate throughout the Evaluation Criteria.</p>	For Mentor-Protégé Joint Ventures, A Mentor may provide Past Performance References and REPs in accordance with the RFP. Amendment 11 provides this clarification.
7812	Section A.3.7.1 regarding Relevant Experience Projects recency has been updated in Amendment 10 to "Offerors shall furnish relevant experience projects that are completed or ongoing with three (3) years of the proposal due date to be considered recent" from original "solicitation release". Similarly, A.3.7.2 Past Performance has been updated to "only contracts with performance within three years from the proposal due date will be evaluated" from "solicitation release". This is a significant change from every previous Amendment as well as Draft RFP releases and as a result many offerors who have already submitted Past Performance Questionnaires and will have to retract and re-submit PPQs for different references. Would the Government please keep the original requirement "three (3) years of solicitation release date" in order to avoid unnecessary changes to a large percentage of offerors and their clients.	Amendment 11 revised the recency date to 3 years from the original RFP release date.
7818	Because the task orders are awarded to the prime contractor and the first-tier subcontractor's NAICS code are not relevant to the contract award, is it still required for first-tier subcontractor to submit Exhibit 4? If yes, what is the government's reasoning for the requirement that a first-tier subcontractor submit Exhibit 4?	First-tier subcontractors are not required to submit Exhibit 4.
7822	Does the government require only the SF1449 to be submitted with the proposal? Or is the government requiring the SF1449 and the SF30s (amendments) to be submitted under Volume I - Offeror Volume? If the government requires multiple files for this part of the response, how should the Offeror compile those files - as a single, merged PDF file? As a PDF Portfolio? Or as separate files?	The solicitation was updated in Amendment 11 to indicate "acknowledgement of all subsequent solicitation amendments" can be done via the SF 30 or via an affirmative statement within the General Instructions Cover Page.

7823	<p>Information provided at the NASA SEWP VI Industry Day on 11/6/24 regarding the questionnaires was that the NASA PMO understood that the government customers asked to fill out the questionnaire may not submit the questionnaire back to NASA by the proposal submission due date and time and stated that NASA would reach out to the POC information provided, if necessary. However, the Amendment 10 RFP states on page 112 that "The Offeror is responsible for ensuring that the questionnaire is completed and submitted, via email to PastPerformance@sewp.nasa.gov no later than the closing date of this solicitation designated in Block 8 of the SF 1449."</p> <p>Will the government confirm which approach is correct and update the RFP as appropriate?</p>	The solicitation was updated in Amendment 11.
7826	To ensure offerors can provide the government with the most relevant project experience examples aligned with NASA's A.1.34 NAICS Codes Within Scope requirements, will the government please consider adding NAICS Code 541613: Marketing Consulting Services to the list of in-scope NAICS codes for Categories B and C?	The solicitation was updated in Amendment 11.
7829	Can the government please clarify how the Average Annual Value to Date will be verified during evaluation? Specifically, will FPDS cost report records be used to confirm that the correct formula has been applied when calculating "Average Annual Value to Date" based on the provided formula and example on page 108 of the RFP? If so, please note that the cost report records that will be accessed during evaluation may differ from the time of proposal preparation. Additionally, if the government plans to use Past Performance Questionnaires (PPQs) from customers to verify "expenditures incurred to date," the Average Annual Value could vary depending on when the customer completed and submitted the PPQs. Should offerors request updated PPQs from customers if new expenditures are processed prior to the proposal deadline?	NASA will validate that Past Performance data is accurate.
7831	For the Past Performance Matrix, the solicitation states that the information "shall match the past performance information with the relevant experience identified in paragraph (a)(12) of this section". We can not find paragraph (a)(12). Please provide the information referenced.	The solicitation was updated in Amendment 11.
7832	There are currently 97 files associated with this solicitation in SAM.gov. Could the government please update the Attachments page on the SEWP website or otherwise provide an updated list of all current solicitation files, Enclosures, Attachments, and Exhibits, etc. including their most recent release date?	No.
7833	As per Amendment 8 and 10, when an offeror is a joint venture (JV), and submitting past performance only from the protege or JV itself, should terminated contracts be listed for each JV member or for the Joint Venture itself? Specifically, should the JV list its own terminated contracts, or should each partner list their individual terminations, including those de-scoped due to performance or cost issues?	List any contracts terminated from the JV, Mentor, and Protégé.
7837	It appears that the 8(a) companies have the same requirements regarding JVs as Small Busn, yet SDOVSB, HubZone, etc. have less restrictive requirements. Please consider changing this so that 8(a)s have the same requirements, whether by themselves or in a JV, as SDVOSB, HubZone, etc.	The current RFP has been updated.
7838	For Volume III, Exhibit 5 is required to be submitted in Excel format, and it also needs to be signed. Could you please provide guidance on how the signature should be incorporated into this Excel-based deliverable, considering it must maintain working cell formulas?	The solicitation was updated in Amendment 11.
7841	Do we understand correctly that in an MPJV, the Mentor cannot provide any contracts towards the REPs or Past Performance? Or is it that they are allowed to provide contracts but in a limited number?	For Mentor-Protégé Joint Ventures, A Mentor may provide Past Performance References and REPs in accordance with the RFP. Amendment 11 provides this clarification.
7845	1. SF30 forms (amendments 1 through 10): Could the government please confirm that the offerors are required to fill out blocks 15A, 15B, and 15C only? Additionally, is each signed SF30 amendment document to be made into its own PDF and submitted within the zipped file of the proposal?	Yes to both questions. Note that the solicitation was updated in Amendment 11 to indicate "acknowledgement of all subsequent solicitation amendments" can be done via the SF 30 or via an affirmative statement within the General Instructions Cover Page.
7846	<p>Per Section A.3.7.1 Offer Volume, (c) Mandatory Experience/Offerings, For Category B and C, Pg 103.</p> <p>Requirement now states that relevant experience projects be completed or ongoing within three (3) years of the proposal due date. Previously the requirement was within three (3) years of the solicitation date (May 23, 2024). Would the Government consider changing this back to the solicitation date to maintain consistency with other sections of the RFP, proposals already written and avoid the impact of additional changes to solicitation due date?</p>	Amendment 11 revised the recency date to 3 years from the original RFP release date.
7847	<p>Per section A.3.7.2 Past Performance Volume, (a) Information to the Offerors, Pg 108</p> <p>Requirement now states that past performance references be completed or ongoing within three (3) years of the release date of the final SEWP VI RFP. Previously the requirement was within three (3) years of the solicitation date (May 23, 2024). Would the Government consider changing this back to the original solicitation date to maintain consistency with other sections of the RFP, proposals already written and avoid the impact of additional changes to the RFP?</p>	Amendment 11 revised the recency date to 3 years from the original RFP release date.

7853	As the current verbiage in Section “Category B” on pages 103-104, is not clear, will the Government please confirm that both WOSB and Mentor-Protégé partnerships have the minimum contract value requirements for reference contracts of \$2M for both instead of \$2M for one and \$4M for the other?	The current RFP has been updated to clarify the requirements. Please propose in accordance with the current RFP.
7854	As the current verbiage in Section “Category C” on pages 104-105 is not clear, will the Government please confirm that the minimum contract value requirements for reference contracts for socio-economic standard businesses, as well as for Joint Venture and Mentor-Protégé Agreements is \$1M for both as opposed to \$1M for one and \$2M for the other?	The current RFP has been updated to clarify the requirements. Please propose in accordance with the current RFP.
7855	Our question is similar to question number 7516. Please reference clause A.3.7.2, pages 106 – 108 and A.4.3 on page 117. In Amendment 10, the definition of “recency” for purposes of Past Performance was changed from “3 years from initial RFP release date” to “3 years from proposal due date.” This change will likely exclude many PPQs that have already been submitted to the SEWP team, which is inconsiderate of the government official who took the time to complete those PPQs and may cause administrative complexities for the SEWP VI evaluators. This change will also cause additional work for government contracting officers as additional PPQs may need to be completed. And of greatest concern is that this change sets a moving target for Past Performance “recency”, since the proposal due date may continue to change if impacted by a government shut down. For these reasons, we suggest that the government revert to the original Past Performance “recency” definition to 3 years from the initial proposal release date of May 23, 2024.	Amendment 11 revised the recency date to 3 years from the original RFP release date.
7858	The RFP Amendment 10 now states “Contracts that are completed or ongoing within three years of the proposal DUE date will be considered recent.” This is in contrast to what was released through Amendment 8, which stated “within three years of the solicitation RELEASE date.” This also goes against statements made at the Nov 6 Industry Day, where we were told that PPQs already Requested/submitted did not need to be redone. However, if within 3 years of DUE date is required, that will negate a lot of PPQs already submitted based on RFP RELEASE date.  We request that NASA please revise this back to the original language of withing 3 years of RELEASE date.	Amendment 11 revised the recency date to 3 years from the original RFP release date.
7862	RFP Section A.3.7.2(a) Page 105: “For joint ventures, the Offerors shall provide past performance for the work done and qualifications held either individually by a partner to the joint venture, the work done by the joint venture itself, or any combination of both.” Page 106: “For offerors submitting as Mentor-Protégé Joint Ventures, contracts may be submitted from the Protégé or the offering Mentor-Protégé Joint Venture itself.” Question: For small businesses proposing in Category C, please confirm a MP-JV offeror may submit a contract from either partner (i.e., Mentor or Protégé) so long as it is responsive to the content representative areas.	For Mentor-Protégé Joint Ventures, A Mentor may provide Past Performance References and REPs in accordance with the RFP. Amendment 11 provides this clarification.
7866	CAT A includes NAICS 334220 but not 561621. CAT C includes 561621. Recommend adding 561621 to CAT A. Reason is that CAT A Technical area 7A includes Security Cameras. A TO that is security cameras plus installation would likely be assigned NAICS 334220, with per SBA is the principal NAICS for Video Security Systems and CCTV. This would mean that CAT A contract holders could bid. However, if it was say 40% supplies and 60% services, which is common when there are option years for services, then it cannot be 334220 but must have a Services NAICS, most likely 561621 Security System Services. In that case, since 561621 is not included with CAT A, only CAT C could bid. Since CAT A includes supplies and related services, it makes sense to have 561621 in CAT A so that CAT A contract holders can bid on Security Camera systems even when they include security cameras but are over 50% services.	The solicitation was updated in Amendment 11.
7872	Amendment 10 Request for Proposal - We respectfully request the revised RFP be provided with all changes highlighted with track changes. The Amendment 10 CHANGES document doesn't clearly show what has changed.	No.
7873	RFQ, A.3.7.1, General InstructionsIf we use an REP from a first-tier subcontractor, must we include a Teaming Agreement?	Yes (original response revised).
7877	Potential Question to Gov RFQ, A.3.7.1, General InstructionsOn the SF 1449, Box 10 requests the NAICS code for our bid but also includes a field for the Size Standard. Could you please clarify whether we are required to provide only the NAICS code, or if the Size Standard field must also be completed?	The Offeror shall include in Block 17a of the SF1449 the NAICS Code the Offeror is proposing using for competition at the master contract level. Amendment 11 reflects this clarification.