

Comment Id	Original Comment	Published Response
1696	<p>page 109, "Offerors are advised that the matrix is a summary of the referenced contracts identified in paragraph (a)(12) above."</p> <p>There does not appear to be any requirement for responding to (a)(12) except for completing the matrix. Please explain what other requirements (specific information, format, page limitations) apply to this response beyond the summary matrix.</p>	<p>The matrix is a summary of the referenced contracts submitted for the past performance volume for a given scope category. The required matrix information includes a contract identifier, work performed, and whether the Offeror was a prime or subcontractor. The matrix should match the past performance information submitted pursuant to the instructions of paragraph (a)(1). There are no additional specific information, format, or page limitations mentioned beyond completing the matrix.</p>
1708	<p>Re: page 100's instruction to "address all the elements under FAR 9.104 ... that are not addressed in another proposal volume":</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Please provide guidance on what offerors need to do to demonstrate adequate financial resources per 9.104-1(a) and 9.104-3(a). 2. Please provide guidance on what offerors need to do to demonstrate compliance with the delivery or performance schedule per 9.104-1(b). 3. Please confirm offerors' Past Performance Volume meets the requirement to demonstrate they have a satisfactory performance record per 9.104-1(c) and 9.104-3(b). 4. Please provide guidance on what offerors need to do to demonstrate they have a satisfactory record of integrity and business ethics per 9.104-1(d). 5. Please confirm offerors' Management Approach (Subfactor B) demonstrates they meet the requirements in 9.104-1(e) and (f) and 9.104-3(a). 6. Please provide guidance on what offerors need to do to demonstrate compliance with the eligibility requirements in 9.104-1(g). 	<p>The wording with regard to 9.104 has been updated in Amendment 8.</p>
1785	<p>In the SEWP VI Industry Day Slide Deck (18OCT23; slide 21), the Mandatory level of relevant experience was: "3 REPS (from 3 of 10 Mandatory areas)" for Small Business in Category B, and "2 REPS (from 2 of 10 Mandatory areas)" for HUBZone, SDVOSB, and EDWOSBs in Category C. In the RFP (page 103), Category B REP requirements for small business are a "total of three (3) different REPs from different mandatory experience technical areas shall be submitted" while the HUBZone, VOSB, SDVOSB, WOSB, EDWOSB, 8a offerors require a "total of 2 different REPS for each of the mandatory experience technical areas." The language is neither consistent between the socioeconomic requirement (the latter requires it for EACH of the mandatory areas) nor is it consistent with the intent expressed at industry day. The same language is included in the Category C on page 104. Since we are a VOSB, is the requirement that we provide 2 (two) different REPS from 2 (two) of the 10 (ten) mandatory areas?</p>	<p>Yes. The Solicitation has been updated in an Amendment prior to Amendment 7 to read "A total of two (2) different REPs from different mandatory experience technical areas shall be submitted."</p>

1786	For section "(c) Independent Past Performance Information" can the government confirm that this is for informational purposes and that there is nothing additional required by the Offeror?	Yes.
1813	Attachment A- SEWP SOW A.1.1: Regarding the requirement to detail how the offeror will support the four Acquisition Objectives outlined in Attachment A- SEWP SOW A.1.1, Could the Government please provide insight and/or more information on what the NASA-specific scientific and engineering problems are that should be addressed with our hardware and software solutions and services?	Offerors should respond to the broad scope of requirements as described in Attachment A. SEWP Scope.
1831	The criteria for evaluators for moderate and low is the same on Exhibit 2: The Offeror's relevant past performance meets or slightly exceeds minimum acceptable standards; adequate results; reportable problems with identifiable, but not substantial, effects on overall performance. Please adjust so they are different.	The Solicitation has been updated to remove "Moderate Level of Confidence".
1847	incorrectly worded:"For HUBZone, VOSB, SDVOSB, WOSB, EDWOSB, 8a offerors (inclusive of first- tier subcontractors, if applicable): A total of 2 different REPs for each of the mandatory experience technical areas shall be submitted." Please change it to: "A total of two (2) different REPs from different mandatory experience technical areas shall be submitted."	The wording has been updated in an Amendment prior to Amendment 7.
1867	For companies with the capability to propose CLINs for all Technical Areas, should we submit CLINs for each Technical Area we can fulfill using Exhibit 3a, or should we limit our response to a total of 4 Technical Areas only?	The Government will only review and evaluate Exhibit 3a to ensure the requirements in A.3.7.1 OFFER VOLUME- CATEGORY INSTRUCTIONS; (b) Mandatory Experience/ Offerings are met in terms of the 4 required technical areas. Offerors may propose additional CLINs to be used in the initial load of the SEWP Database of Record post-award.
1896	If a company holds multiple social economic categories (e.g. SB, WOSB, SDVOSM) are separate proposals required for each social economic category? If so, can the proposal data be the same submission data (identical) for each category? Will individual contracts be awarded for each social economic category?	Only one proposal for each 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. 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 Contract Holder's contract will be identified for each NAICS Code and business size as reflected in Exhibit 4 for use at the Task Order.
1922	For category A it states you may propose any 4 of the mandatory technical areas, with a maximum of 4 LOAs. Please confirm we are to only submit 4 of the categories please area 9 even if we are able to respond to all technical areas.	The Government will only review and evaluate Exhibit 3a to ensure the requirements in A.3.7.1 OFFER VOLUME- CATEGORY INSTRUCTIONS; (b) Mandatory Experience/ Offerings are met in terms of the 4 required technical areas. Offerors may propose additional Technical Areas to be used in the initial load of the SEWP Database of Record post-award.
1954	For Category B, Large Business, is the Company restricted to compete only in the NAICS area(s) submitted in the REPs provided?	Post-award, Other than Small Businesses will be eligible to receive RFQs for which the Issuing Agency has not included a set-aside requirement.

1980	<p>RFP states that, "For Other than Small Businesses: A total of four (4) different REPs from different mandatory experience technical areas shall be submitted. Each Project must have had a minimum of \$30M in total value size of a single order or contract and must be described using the Exhibit 1 REP template.</p> <p>Can you confirm that a Large Business proposing in Category B need only submit 1 REP in 4 of the 10 scope areas for a total of 4 REPs, in order to be deemed acceptable?</p>	Yes.
1985	<p>Will you please clarify? We want to submit a proposal for 5 out of the 11 Technical Areas under Category C. Is only one separate proposal required for Category C, to include the 5 Technical Areas, and not a separate proposal for each Technical Area? Also, is there a special format requirement to list and separate the 5 Technical Areas within the proposal so that the reviewers will know that the submission is for 5 out of the 11 Technical Areas and not all of 11 of them?</p>	Offerors should only provide the number of required Relevant Experience Projects as stated in the RFP. For Category C small businesses, a maximum of three REPs should be submitted each REP must reference a different Technical area. Each REP is to be provided on a separate copy of Exhibit 1 with the attached response.
1986	<p>Can you help clarify if the cited number of REPs is required per category, or per content representative area</p>	The cited number of REPs are for each proposal. For example, for small businesses bidding in Category C, three REPs must be submitted with the Category C proposal.
1996	<p>Referencing pages 103-104 of the Final RFP: For Category B HUBZone, VOSB, SDVOSB, WOSB, EDWOSB, and 8a offerors, the RFP states: "A total of 2 different REPs for each of the mandatory experience technical areas shall be submitted. Each Project must have a minimum of \$4M in total value size of a single order or contract and must be described using the Exhibit 1 REP template." Does the RFP therefore require the Offeror to submit a total of 20 separate REPs indicating a total value of \$80M (2 separate REPs for each of the 10 Mandatory Experience Technical Areas)? Or does the RFP allow an Offeror to use a single REP in separate Mandatory Experience Technical Areas (i.e., a single REP that qualifies for both B2 IT Managed Services and B4 IT Service Management)?</p>	The Solicitation has been updated in an Amendment prior to Amendment 7 to read "A total of two (2) different REPs from different mandatory experience technical areas shall be submitted."
2004	<p>In section A.3.7.1(c) of the RFP titled Offeror NAICS Size Standard Crosswalk (Exhibit 4), the Government requires bidders to complete Exhibit 4 for each NAICS code represented. It then goes on to explain that: Exhibit 4 "is being collected to verify an Offeror's size standard and for the SEWP data repository. An Offeror will be grouped within a scope category based on the size standard associated with NAICS code identified on Exhibit 4." Does this mean that (for example) a bidder who bids in category A1 as unrestricted/large under NAICS 541519, will still be categorized as a small business in task orders issued under underlying Category A NAICS code(s) for which they qualify as small, as noted in the Government's Exhibit 4 and verified in SAM?</p>	Yes.

2006	<p>In section A.3.7.1(c) of the RFP titled Offeror NAICS Size Standard Crosswalk (Exhibit 4), the Government requires bidders to complete Exhibit 4 for each NAICS code represented. It then goes on to explain that: Exhibit 4 "is being collected to verify an Offeror's size standard and for the SEWP data repository. An Offeror will be grouped within a scope category based on the size standard associated with NAICS code identified on Exhibit 4." Does this mean that (for example) a bidder who bids in category A1 as unrestricted/large under NAICS 541519, will still be categorized as a small business in task orders issued under underlying Category A NAICS code(s) for which they qualify as small, as noted in the Government's Exhibit 4 and verified in SAM? Or in this situation, would the offeror be required to submit a second bid, against the Category to qualify to bid against A2 Small Business Set Aside Task Orders?</p>	<p>Yes, a bidder who bids in category A1 as unrestricted/large under NAICS 541519, will still be categorized as a small business in task orders issued under underlying Category A NAICS code(s) for which they qualify as small, as noted in the Government's Exhibit 4 and verified in SAM.</p>
2017	<p>Page 104 : The solicitation states, "For HUBZone, VOSB, SDVOSB, WOSB, EDWOSB, 8a offerors (inclusive of first-tier subcontractors, if applicable): A total of 2 different REPs for each of the mandatory experience technical areas shall be submitted."</p> <p>Could the government please clarify that this statement does not suggest offerors need to submit 2 projects for each of the 10 mandatory experience technical areas, resulting in a total of 20 different experience projects?</p>	<p>The Solicitation has been updated in an Amendment prior to Amendment 7 to read "A total of two (2) different REPs from different mandatory experience technical areas shall be submitted."</p>
2024	<p>Could the government please clarify the relationship between socioeconomic category awards (e.g., 8(a), HUBZone) and the Small Business and Unrestricted categories, given that there is only one solicitation per category and an offeror can only submit one prime proposal per category?</p> <p>Specifically:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. If a contractor is awarded a socioeconomic category contract, would the offeror gain access to small business task orders in the respective small business group in each category? 2. Are we correct to assume that for a small business to gain access to the unrestricted group, the offeror must meet the necessary Past Performance and Relevant Experience Project (REP) thresholds for the unrestricted group in each category (A & B)? <p>During the industry day in 2023, it was mentioned that if a Small Business grows out of the size standard, they will be grandfathered into the unrestricted group. Could the government please clarify this assumption?</p>	<p>1. Yes; 2. No.</p>

2056	In reference to Section A.3.7.1, page 103, The solicitation language says "Offerors shall furnish relevant experience projects that are completed or ongoing within three (3) years of the solicitation release date to be considered recent and be from a different requirement." Please confirm that "and be from a different requirement" means "and each REP must have a unique contract/task order number". If that is not the case, please explain what the language means. We have two consecutive contracts with the same client. The first was to enhance and expand an enterprise system. The second is to maintain that system and perform other tasks including refactoring other systems, security work, implementing innovations and innovative technologies across the enterprise, expanding containerization, etc.. The contracts have different contract numbers and represent different requirements. How can we sufficiently demonstrate this NASA for both to qualify as distinct REPs?	If the two REPs are associated with different contract numbers and the 3 pages attached to the two Exhibit 1 submissions describe different work being performed in each, then these would be 2 distinct REPs.
2081	Please confirm that "requirements" in the context of "...and ten requirements in a day for Category B and C" refers to "...Customer requests for (RFI's, RFQ's, etc.) task order proposals, GWAC contract administration, and task order administration".	"Requirements" refers to an expected volume of Request for quote submissions on a daily basis.
2109	There is a marked difference between the instructions for Volumes 1 and 2 versus Volume 3 with regard to the instructions for small businesses, ultimately impacting the evaluation of small businesses. It is clear in the Volume 1 and 2 instructions that the Government understands that small businesses require different consideration when it comes to expectations for capabilities and experience. That consideration is totally missing in Volume 3. (The word "small" does not appear at all in Section A.3.7.3 or A.4.4.) How are small business Primes expected to be competitive on Volume 3 and assessed as low risk, when they will all be "high risk" if they are being held to the same standard as large/other than small businesses?	Unlike Volumes I and II which provide minimum mandatory requirements, there are no minimum mandatory requirements in Volume III beyond responding to each section as instructed in the RFP. Volume III.
2110	Does a JV require a meaningful relationship letter if it is only using past performance from members of the JV?	No. (revised response.)
2115	The first paragraph states, "Category C has a threshold restriction of \$2 million per order (inclusive of options) for the 1st year of contract performance and \$10 million per order in the 2nd year of contract performance. Category C threshold restrictions are subject to removal beginning in the 3rd year of contract performance." Is there a reason behind these restrictions that NASA can share? Also, is the removal of restrictions in the third year on a company-by-company basis, or automatic for the contract overall?	The Category C dollar threshold restrictions are mandated as part of OMB'S GWAC Designation for SEWP VI. The removal of the restrictions will be for all Category C Contracts.
2132	If my company bid Category B as a Small business and was awarded a contract, does it have visibility to all task orders, including large business task orders, and can I bid for the large business task orders?	All Contract holders within that RFQ's category that meet the NAICS code and set-aside (or unrestricted) status and any other requirements of an Issuing Agency will be eligible to see the Issuing Agency's RFQ.

2136	Page 36 of Final RFP: Category C has a threshold restriction of \$2 million per order (inclusive of options) for the 1st year of contract performance and \$10 million per order in the 2nd year of contract performance. Category C threshold restrictions are subject to removal beginning in the 3rd year contract performance. Not sure this is clear to us. Can you please provide additional explanation?	If a Government customer has a Category C requirement above the restrictions (\$2 million in year 1 and \$10 million in year 2), they will be unable to utilize SEWP.
2155	Will the government confirm that the two Reps and past performance data submitted for SDVOSB can be used also for WOSB submission and that each has to be submitted separately.	The question is not relevant as an offeror can only submit one proposal per category as a Prime.
2231	RFP Paragraph A.4.4 (b) pp. 118-119. Mission Suitability Management Approach (Subfactor B) requires Offeror responses in the following four areas: Commitment to Supply Chain Management, Commitment to Sustainability, Commitment to Product and Services Diversity, and Program Management. What is the relative importance of these four areas within Mission Suitability Management Approach (Subfactor B)?	As stated in the RFP: "The multiple sections of each subfactor within Mission Suitability are not weighted or listed by importance."; i.e. All factors have the same importance."
2268	Section A.3.7.1 for Category A: "All Offerors shall complete Exhibit 3a- Category A Solutions Spreadsheet and propose technology solutions for any four (4) of the eight (8) Mandatory Technical Areas." Question: Are offerors restricted to proposing only 4 of the 8 technical areas in their proposal, or is 4 simply the minimum? Additionally, if offerors are only being asked to propose 4 areas, are companies that receive a SEWP VI award able to add the remaining technical areas to their contract?	The Government will only review and evaluate Exhibit 3a to ensure the requirements in A.3.7.1 OFFER VOLUME- CATEGORY INSTRUCTIONS; (b) Mandatory Experience/ Offerings are met in terms of the 4 required technical areas. Contract Holders will be able to update, delete and add to their offerings within the full scope of Category A post award.
2315	Please confirm whether offerors that are qualify for mutiple designations under HUBZone, WOSB, SDVOSB, 8a, etc can submit in multiple groups or if they need to "choose" a single group to pursue. If multiple groups are allowed, please clarify the mechanics for submitting all desired/qualified designations.	Offerors may only submit one proposal per category as a Prime

2339	<p>For a SB in Category C - It says we should submit - "A total of three (3) different REPs from different mandatory experience technical areas shall be submitted." What does this mean- We should submit 3 REP that cover all 10 areas or we can pick 3 sub areas from the below list.</p> <p>Category C- Mandatory Experience Sub-areas:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Network Services 2. Innovation Services 3. Information and Data Analytics Services (IDAs) 4. Application Services/Software Development 5. Cybersecurity Services 6. Cloud Services 7. Digital Multimedia and Technical Communications Services. 8. IT Operations and Maintenance / Help Desk/Call Center Support 9. Database Services 10. In-Scope Training 	<p>The Solicitation has been updated in an Amendment prior to Amendment 7 to clarify the number of REPs required depending on the Offeror's business size.</p>
2341	<p>For a SB with EDWOSB and 8(a) in Category C - It says we should submit - "A total of 2 different REPs from different mandatory experience technical areas shall be submitted." – so am I limited to submitting only 2 REP or I can submit more than 2 REPs?</p> <p>Do I need to cover all the 10 Category C Experience sub-areas in the 2 REPs?</p>	<p>EDWOSB Offerors in Category C can only provide 2 Relevant Experience Projects each of which cover a different Technical Area.</p>
2347	<p>We are a Small business. For Category C - We have a Project that was for implementing Cyber security for a government agency and the Period of performance was for a total of 10 months but the size of the project was more than \$5M. Can we use this as REP and also as a Past Performance as it qualifies for thresholds mentioned for both REP and the Past Performance?</p>	<p>The same contract can be used for an REP and as a past performance reference if that contract meets the requirements of each.</p>
2350	<p>Could you please clarify whether the past performance references are required to be spread across different technical areas, similar to the REP requirements? Or is it acceptable for an offeror to submit past performance references that are concentrated in one or a few technical areas, as long as they meet the relevancy/size criteria specified in the RFP?</p>	<p>The past performance references are required as a whole (i.e. one reference can relate to multiple different technical areas) C1527to show relevance to the required number of different content areas based on the relevancy/size criteria . For example the three past performance references for a small business must include relevancy to at least two different content areas. (revised response)</p>

2371	If a company qualifies in multiple SB categories (eg. SB, VOSB, SDVOSB, and WOSB) in Category C do we submit one (1) proposal with Exhibit 4 completed or four (4) separate proposals- one (1) for each qualifying SB category?	Only one proposal for each Category will be accepted per Prime Offeror. The Contract Holder's contract will be identified for each NAICs Code and business size as reflected in Exhibit 4 for use at the Task Order.
2373	Exhibit 3A Category A, Section Technical Area 1, Page 1: Is there a more favorable evaluation if an offeror is providing than the minimum requested number of CLINS or Providers in Exhibit 3(a)?	No.
2374	A.3.7.2(a) Information from the Offeror (page 105) states that Prime Offerors shall furnish the information requested below a minimum of one (1) but not more than three (3) of your most recent similar contracts that are completed or ongoing within three (3) years of the solicitation release date to be considered recent. Page 104 Category C for Hubzone, VOSB, SDVOSB, WOSB EDWOSB, 8a Offerors says that A Total of 2 different REPs from different mandatory experience technical areas shall be submitted. If submitting as Prime Offeror and one of the socio-economic categories, can "only" one(1) contract be used for Past Performance? Is a contract the same as a Relevant Experience Project? Which REP requirement is correct and should be used, the one on page 104 or page 105?	The same task may be used for an REP and a Past Performance, but there is no requirement to do so. There is no correlation between REPs and Past Performance references. The relevant experience wording in the Past Performance section does not relate to REPs.
2378	For Category C contracts, does the government have a \$2M threshold per taskorder award for the base year (1st year)? Why does the government have such restrictions for Category C task order? Explain why for the restriction.	Yes. The Category C dollar threshold restrictions are mandated as part of OMB'S GWAC Designation for SEWP VI.
2379	For Category C contracts, does the government have a \$10M threshold per taskorder award for the 1st Option Period 2nd year)? Why does the government have such restrictions for Category C task order?	Yes. The Category C dollar threshold restrictions are mandated as part of OMB'S GWAC Designation for SEWP VI.
2573	A.3.7.1 OFFER VOLUME, Pg. 104, states "A total of 2 different REPs from different mandatory experience technical areas shall be submitted." Confirming that for a WOSB it is required to submit two Relevant Experience Projects (REPs) from two different mandatory experience areas with a minimum of \$2M in total value.	Yes.
2608	Reference RFP Section A.1.42, page 71: Can a vertical on ramp occur for a Large Business awardee whose size standard qualifies for Small Business designation after the start of the period of performance?	If a Contract Holder has a NAICs code with a small business size standard, regardless of whether their Proposal level NAICs and business size is Other than small, then they will be eligible for small business set-aside requirements for that small business NAICs code. In this situation vertical on-ramping is not relevant.
2677	Section A.3.7.1 (c): Will the Government please confirm that the instructions regarding Exhibit 4 on page 105 stating that Offerors shall identify their size standard for each NAICS within the category for which they are proposing? It is unclear whether Offerors are to "propose" certain NAICS within a category.	Offerors should identify the NAICs code/size standards they are identified with in sam.gov.
2783	Can any of the submitted REPs be considered among the three past performances required?	The same contract can be used for an REP and as a past performance reference if that contract meets the requirements of each.

2788	If we show through REP and Past performance capabilities in 6 of the 10 technical Areas, can we bid on all 10 Technical Areas or only on those 6 technical areas we showed past performance / capabilities in the proposal?	Proposals are not bids on technical areas. Only the required number of Technical Areas for the Offeror's business size can be used for REPs and Past Performance to meet the mandatory requirements.
2789	In the industry Day you talked about "duplication or replica of another offeror". Can we not write to the same REP / past performance another Small Business submits with different content in the proposal? Or no REP / Past Performance / Contract can be duplicated? Define duplication of offer? Does that mean 3 words stated exactly?	Duplication refers to narrative parts of the proposal that are extensively duplicates of each other with no business connectivity between the two offerors.
2825	Is there a page limit for section (c) Independent Past Performance Information described on Page 110?	The offeror does not supply any independent past performance information. Independent Past performance refers to information obtained by the Government independent of the information in the Offeror's proposal.
2838	4) Is otherwise eligible for an award. What are the conditions under this otherwise eligibility?	There are no specific conditions. This is a general statement that there are no legal, financial, contractual or other factors affecting eligibility.
2900	The instructions indicate a past performance matrix should be included in the Past Performance Volume. Due to the 10 page limitation for 3 past performance references please clarify if the matrix may be excluded from page count.	Yes. The Past Performance Matrix described in Section A.3.7.2.(a)12 of the RFP is included in the 10-page limit for the Past Performance Volume. (revised response)
2902	The instructions state: "A total of four (4) different REPs from different mandatory experience technical areas shall be submitted." Please clarify if this means each REP should address one mandatory experience technical area that is unique from the technical area the other REPs address?	Yes.
2913	RFP states, "For a past performance submission to have its content rated "relevant" (Pertinent) it must meet the following criteria: Other Than Small Businesses- • In Category A, Other than Small Businesses shall provide past performance references showcasing at least 4 content representative areas." Please confirm that there is no advantage to covering more than four content representative areas across an offeror's past performance references. For example, would an offeror submitting three references covering twelve different areas receive the same relevance rating as an offeror submitting one reference demonstrating 4 different areas?	There is no advantage to exceeding the minimum requirement of 4 content areas.
2945	For joint ventures the Offerors shall provide the work done and qualifications held individually by each partner to the joint venture as well as any work done by the joint venture itself. Is this bullet requesting information in addition to the information requested elsewhere in this section, or is this bullet simply guidance?	The information being requested is a separate requirement.

2954	(3)Page 101 Category A May all 8 technical categories and labor be proposed? Or can only 4 be proposed?	The Government will only review and evaluate Exhibit 3a to ensure the requirements in A.3.7.1 OFFER VOLUME- CATEGORY INSTRUCTIONS; (b) Mandatory Experience/ Offerings are met in terms of the 4 required technical areas. Offerors may propose additional Technical Areas to be used in the initial load of the SEWP Database of Record post-award.
2958	Category B: The RFP states "For HUBZone, VOSB, SDVOSB, WOSB, EDWOSB, 8a offerors (inclusive of first- tier subcontractors, if applicable): A total of 2 different REPs for each of the mandatory experience technical areas shall be submitted." There are 11 technical areas in Category B. Is NASA looking for 22 different REPs in Category B small from HUBZone, VOSB, SDVOSB, WOSB, EDWOSB, and 8a offerors? Or can the government confirm that only a total of 2 REPs that show experience in 2 of the 11 technical areas are all that is needed?	The wording has been updated in an Amendment prior to Amendment 7 to clarify that only 2 REPs are required in total.
2971	For Category B and C, there is lot of overlap in the technical sub-areas mentioned. Even the text that is given in the solicitation is similar. How will the government evaluate those differently. Please provide more details on how will the government evaluate Category B writeup to get a high confidence vs how will the government evaluate Category C writeup to get a high confidence?	Each proposal in any category will be evaluated as indicated in A.4.4 Phase Three- Mission Suitability. As indicated in that section the evaluation criteria are the same for Category B and C proposals.

2975	<p>For HUBZone, VOSB, SDVOSB, WOSB, EDWOSB, 8a, offerors (inclusive of first- tier subcontractors, if applicable): A total of 2 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.</p> <p>Category C- Mandatory Experience Sub-areas:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Network Services 2. Innovation Services 3. Information and Data Analytics Services (IDAs) 4. Application Services/Software Development 5. Cybersecurity Services 6. Cloud Services 7. Digital Multimedia and Technical Communications Services. 8. IT Operations and Maintenance / Help Desk/Call Center Support 9. Database Services 10. In-Scope Training 	<p>1. 2 sub-areas need to be addressed in total. 2. Each of the 2 REPs must demonstrate experience in a different technical area; i.e. a total of two Technical Areas must be demonstrated using 2 different Relevant Experience Projects.</p>
3029	Following contract award, can an awardee use SEWP VI NAICS codes other than those used for its REPs or Past Performances?	Yes.
3071	Can I submit a proposal as 8(a), Then another as SDVOSB in the same category and use same experiences	No. Companies can only submit one proposal per category as a Prime.
3073	The referenced paragraph states that Offerors must generate adequate compliance with any special standards established for this acquisition under FAR 9.104-2. Please clarify the special standards established under FAR 9.104-2 as well as the documentation the Government requires in response to this requirement.	The wording with regard to 9.104 was updated in Amendment 8
3084	Do JVs require an MRCL letter?	No. (revised response.)
3108	Thresholds (\$2M per order for 1st year and \$10M for 2nd year) apply to Group C. What is the basis of these thresholds? Is the threshold related to Category B to maintain separation between large and small or is there another reason?	The Category C dollar threshold restrictions are mandated as part of OMB'S GWAC Designation for SEWP VI. There is no relation to any other part of the SEWP Contracts.
3109	Thresholds (\$2M per order for 1st year and \$10M for 2nd year) apply to Group C. What is the basis of these thresholds? Is the threshold related to Category B to maintain separation between large and small or is there another reason?	The Category C dollar threshold restrictions are mandated as part of OMB'S GWAC Designation for SEWP VI. There is no relation to any other part of the SEWP Contracts.

3114	Section V: Given we are submitting as an unpopulated joint venture, please confirm that we are to submit Representations and Certifications from each individual member in our response.	You are required to submit Representations and Certifications from each individual member of the unpopulated joint venture.
3116	We have a single award Blanket Purchase Agreement (BPA), where we are the sole awardee of a contract with a predetermined ceiling value and a period of performance of 5 years. Under that BPA, the Government issues Task Orders every year. This is effectively work similar to a contract with one Base period, and multiple option periods. However, the Government chose this construct to mitigate risk of annual budget uncertainties and to have the ability to make minor modification in the scope of the work. We believe that we should be able to aggregate the task orders under that single award BPA to count as the TCV where our company as the sole recipient, and the work is effectively continuation of the same tasks, and done for the same department, agency and office? Would this satisfy the requirement as long as the TCV is greater than \$30M?	Yes.
3117	We have a single award BPA where Govt. awards separate task orders for projects with distinctly different scope. Our awarding agency signs Inter Agency Agreements with other Federal agencies and brings works to our BPA. These tasks often are initially awarded for a year and are renewed every year, which effectively work as a base year plus option year construct. As these TAs have distinctly different scope of work, and different end customer, we believe it's reasonable to use these TAs (base + renewal) as individual contracts to meet the \$30 M value, based on the scope of work and end customer. Will the government agree to this interpretation?	Yes.
3121	[Final RFP, A.3.7.1, page 100] Will the government please clarify what documentation or evidence is required to "address all elements under FAR 9.104 to demonstrate responsibility?"	The wording with regard to 9.104 was updated in Amendment 8
3148	At what point does a SEWP Master Contract awardee size-out of a NAICS small business size standard (e.g., at the 5-Year SEWP Master Contract re-award point, if asked to re-certify at the Task Order level, at their SAM.gov annual recertification, whenever they exceed the size standard)?	Ordering CO has the responsibility to determine which predominant NAICS code applies to a task order solicitation, whether the task order is unrestricted or set-aside, including the type of socio-economic set-aside if applicable.
3160	Would the definition of "appropriate safeguards" be covered by the Attachment J (C-SCRM) of this solicitation and supplemental attestation form?	Appropriate safeguards are constantly emerging and are defined in various standards and guidelines including those listed in A.1.30 SUPPLY CHAIN RISK.
3168	Please clarify requirements for REPs described in RFP Page 104 (Paragraph title: "Category C. For HUBZone, VOSB, SDVOSB, WOSB, EDWOSB, 8a offerors"). "A total of 2 different REPs from different mandatory experience technical areas shall be submitted." So, if the offeror is addressing, say, all 10 mandatory experience subareas, is the Government looking for 20 "different" REPs or can the same two REPs potentially be used for each of the 10 mandatory subareas?	Offerors must only provide the required 2 REPs which should each address a different Technical Area.

3169	Please clarify. On RFP Page 109 (mid-page), it is stated that for Past Performance for HUBZone, SDVOSB, EDWOSB, and 8a in Category B and C shall provide relevant work in at least two content representative areas for content to be rated relevant. Must the content representative areas in this volume be limited to the same as those selected as Mandatory Technical Areas the offeror selects for the Offeror Volume (Volume I)? Alternatively, is the Government requiring addressing as many of the Content Relevant Areas identified in the RFP (potentially all 10 cited on RFP Pages 108-109 for Category C) without regard to which the Offeror has chosen for Volume I?	No, there is no correlation between REPs and Past Performance and therefore no requirements that content representative areas relate to the REPs in Volume I.
3173	Section A.3.7.1 Offer Volume page 100 the solicitation states "Provide information addressing all the elements under FAR 9.104 to demonstrate responsibility (address the elements under this section that are not addressed in another proposal volume)." Can the government clarify what type of documentation is required for the offeror to submit to demonstrate responsibility?	The wording with regard to 9.104 was updated in Amendment 8.
3174	Can REPs and Past Performances be from different contracts, or is it preferred and/or required that they be from the same contract?	There is no preference. The REP and past performance can be from the same or different contracts.
3186	Section A.3.7.1 Offer Volume page 104 the solicitation states "A total of 2 different REPs for each of the mandatory experience technical areas shall be submitted". This would be a total of 20 REPs. Can the Government confirm the offeror is required to submit 2 different REPs from different technical areas resulting in a total of 2 REPs submitted?	The Solicitation has been updated in an Amendment prior to Amendment 7 to read "A total of two (2) different REPs from different mandatory experience technical areas shall be submitted."
3193	RFP / A.3.7.1 (c) Offeror NAICS Size Standard Crosswalk (Exhibit 4) Please describe the graduation process as contractors become large under more and more of its Category sub-NAICS. Does it mean that contractors will no longer receive RFQs for small-business set-asides under that sub-NAICS, but will now receive them when that sub-NAICS is used for Unrestricted RFQs? Something else?	As contractors grow and exceed the size standards for a greater number of NAICS codes, they will no longer be eligible to compete for small business set-aside opportunities under those NAICS codes. Instead, they will be eligible to compete for opportunities that are designated as unrestricted, meaning those that are open to all businesses regardless of size.
3202	A.3.7.2 (a) Please clarify A.3.7.2 (a) numbers 1-12. Items 1-8 seem to clearly ask for these items to be addressed regarding each of the past performance examples we are to provide. Items 9-12 seem to reference the offeror as a whole. How should an offeror respond to items 9-12, with reference to the individual projects presented, or as the offeror as a whole?	Items 1-8 in A.3.7.2 (a) should be addressed regarding each of the past performance examples provided. Items 9-12 should be addressed with reference to the offeror as a whole, providing a comprehensive view of the offeror's overall past performance history and capabilities.
3213	A.3.6 (B): Volume II: Past Performance Volume, "Information from the Offeror(a)" has a page limitation of ten pages. Do the ten pages include the Past Performance Matrix?	The ten-page limitation includes the Past Performance Matrix.
3214	A.3.7.2(a)(12), Past Performance History: Can the government clarify what is meant by "The Offeror shall provide a description of its relevant past performance history in meeting the technical and management requirements identified below"?	The Offeror is required to provide a description of its relevant past performance history in meeting the technical and management requirements identified in the RFP.

3215	A.3.7.2(c): Can the government confirm that the Offeror does not need to submit any information for (c) Independent Past Performance Information?	Confirmed.
3220	Reference the final bullet in this section, "...Meaningful Relationship Commitment Letter clearly demonstrates that the resources (e.g., financial resources, overall oversight and management, or other resources) of the other companies will meaningfully affect the performance of the proposed contract." Can the Government clarify what specific criteria or information is required to be included in the Commitment Letter?	Please refer to A.3.7.1 Offer Volume point E which lists the information to be included in the letter.
3221	This requirement seems to require us to obtain some sort of certification or clean bill of health from the SBA. Is that the case? If so, is there a streamlined process by which the SBA can correctly evaluate potentially hundreds of SEWP Offerors and provide them with these certificates in time for SEWP bid submission?	The referenced section was removed in Amendment 8.
3225	RFP Ref: A.3.7.1 (b), Page 103, RFP Text- A REP provided by an Offeror shall meet the mandatory experience technical area for the category being proposed on Exhibit 1- Relevant Experience Project Table. The Offeror shall provide a REP from NASA contracts, other Government contracts, and/or commercial contracts. If the work was done as a subcontractor, then the size and work described as a sub-contractor must be only that work specifically defined in the subcontract. For joint ventures, the Offerors shall provide the work done and qualifications held individually by each partner to the joint venture as well as any work done by the joint venture itself. Offerors shall furnish relevant experience projects that are completed or ongoing within three (3) years of the solicitation release date to be considered recent and be from a different requirement. Only projects with NAICS codes listed as in-scope for SEWP VI are to be submitted. No additional information is requested in support of the Exhibit 1 REP template. Offerors shall only submit the total number of REPs as required for the proposed category and business size standard. Question: Can we use same projects as REPs and past relevant experience?	Yes.
3227	Page 104 Category C – REPs: RFP states: "For HUBZone, VOSB, SDVOSB, WOSB, EDWOSB, 8a, offerors (inclusive of first- tier subcontractors, if applicable): A total of 2 different REPs from different mandatory experience technical areas shall be submitted." Please confirm that a WOSB is required to submit two past performances that align with two distinct Category C - Mandatory Experience Sub-areas.	Yes.

3246	<p>In a sample of the SourceAmerica commitment letter dated June 4, 2024, it states "SourceAmerica and Prime Contractor agree that with respect to the NASA SEWP VI project:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SourceAmerica will provide the Prime Contractor with qualified AbilityOne NPA subcontractor(s) to satisfy the mandatory requirement under the NASA SEWP VI program that the Prime Contractor will utilize AbilityOne NPAs as Subcontractors for the Product Service Codes and NAICS Codes designated under NASA SEWP VI as a mandatory requirement to utilize AbilityOne non-profit organizations as Subcontractors." We understand the term 'qualified' NPA is defined by the AbilityOne Commission in Policy 51.402, titled: AbilityOne Program Qualification Requirements for Nonprofit Agencies and Associated Responsibilities of the Central Nonprofit Agencies." We understand this does equate to an NPAs ability to perform the work required of SEWP VI NAICS code services. Please clarify if 'qualified' means they meet the AbilityOne Commission standards identified by Policy 51.402. If not, please provide the meaning of qualified as stated in the SEWP VI requirement. 	SourceAmerica will provide Primes for their selection, qualified NPAs that are good standing with AbilityOne Program and have the capabilities to support NAICS codes identified for AbilityOne subcontracting.
3254	RFP Page 100 A.3.7.1, 10th Bullet: RFP states: "Provide information addressing all the elements under FAR 9.104 to demonstrate responsibility (address the elements under this section that are not addressed in another proposal volume)". Information that may not be addressed in other section is Financial Responsibility (FAR 9.104(a). Please clarify what offerors need to submit to prove financial responsibility?	The wording with regard to 9.104 was updated in Amendment 8
3259	Could the Government please confirm our understanding that each REP must cover at least one mandatory area? For example, could a large business submit a total of four REPs, each covering one mandatory area, and still pass Phase I?	Correct - a large business must provide 4 REPs. Each of the 4 REPs must cover a different technical area.
3264	The Government states, "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. More than one Offer, e.g., proposal, from a Corporate Structure may be submitted if an Offeror is NOT sharing proposal evaluation elements and/or committing resources from other entities by way of a Meaningful Relationship within a Corporate Structure." Could the Government please clarify what it means by, "committing resources from other entities by way of a Meaningful Relationship within a Corporate Structure." Could it please provide examples of what would be prohibited?	Committing resources from other entities by way of a Meaningful Relationship within a Corporate Structure means utilizing the resources (e.g., financial resources, overall oversight and management, or other resources) of the other companies to meaningfully affect the performance of the proposed contract.

3266	Can large businesses provide relevant experience projects and/or past performance in support of a small business bid if they are not bidding as a joint venture?	No.
3273	Which volume of the proposal do we use to provide our Reps and Certs? Are they included in Page Count?	Reps and Certs should be included in Volume I – Offer Volume. Title pages, tabs, and tables of contents are excluded from the page counts.
3279	Can we use a task order which was awarded as part of a single award IDIQ for REP submission?	Yes.
3280	Regarding Offerors who hold a NASA V GWAC contract for Category A, are individual purchase orders/contract numbers eligible for past performance since the overarching GWAC contract is not?	Yes.
3281	Can the mandatory mandatory technical areas be the same in different REP's or do they have to be different?	The mandatory technical areas must be different in different Relevant Experience Projects (REPs). For each category, the REPs must showcase the different mandatory experience technical areas.
3292	Should we complete the Reps & Certs? Which volume should we include the Reps & Certs in?	Reps and Certs should be included in Volume I – Offer Volume.
3293	Can the Past performance projects be from State and local and commercial?	Yes.
3296	Can the Content representative areas of the PP's be the same for all three PP's or do they have to be different?	For small businesses, the past performance references in total must showcase 2 different content representative areas. (revised response)
3304	General: Please clarify what the government considers "commercial contracts.". For example, if a company is subcontractor to a prime company on a government contract, is the work the subcontractor doing considered commercial since the subcontractor reports to the prime and not the government customer?	The government considers "commercial contracts" to be those that involve the acquisition of commercial products and commercial services as defined in FAR 2.101.
3306	Section A.3.7.1(a) ISO 9001/CMMI Certifications - If proposing as a JV, is it acceptable for at least one JV member to have the required ISO 9001 (all categories) and CMMI (Category B) certifications? Or must the certs be in the name of the JV itself?	As stated in the Solicitation: For Offerors proposing as Contractor Teaming Arrangements (CTA) or Joint Ventures (JV): Evidence shall be provided that the certification is in the name of the JV, prime contractor in the CTA, or in the name of one of the companies in the JV.
3308	Section A.3.7.1(b) Mandatory Experience - Can projects performed by individual members of a JV be used to meet the relevant experience requirements? Or must the experience be from the JV entity itself?	Offerors shall provide the work done and qualifications held individually by each partner to the joint venture, the work done by the joint venture itself, or any combination of both.
3315	On page 104 of the RFP, it states: "For HUBZone, VOSB, SDVOSB, WOSB, EDWOSB, 8a offerors (inclusive of first- tier subcontractors, if applicable): A total of 2 different REPs for each of the mandatory experience technical areas shall be submitted." Can you please confirm that this sentence should read "For HUBZone, VOSB, SDVOSB, WOSB, EDWOSB, 8a offerors (inclusive of first- tier subcontractors, if applicable): A total of 2 different REPs from different mandatory experience technical areas shall be submitted."?	See Comment 1837. The Solicitation has been updated in an Amendment prior to Amendment 7 to read "A total of two (2) different REPs from different mandatory experience technical areas shall be submitted."

3317	RFP states each volume should be submitted as a single PDF file. Are offerors expected to include supporting documentation? If so, should that documentation be included within the PDF or as standalone documents?	No supporting documentation shall be provided unless it fits within the 3 pager per REP limit.
3324	In Section A.3.7.1(b), for HUBZone, VOSB, SDVOSB, WOSB, EDWOSB, and 8(a) offerors pursuing Category B, the government states "a total of 2 different REPs for each of the mandatory experience technical areas shall be submitted." This differs from the Category C REP requirements for Small Disadvantaged Businesses, which state "a total of 2 different REPs from different mandatory experience technical areas shall be submitted." Can the government please confirm the Category B requirement should state "a total of 2 different REPs from different mandatory experience technical areas shall be submitted?"	The Solicitation has been updated in an Amendment prior to Amendment 7 to read "A total of two (2) different REPs from different mandatory experience technical areas shall be submitted."
3327	Regarding A.3.7.2 Past Performance Volume, please confirm item 9 "Recent customer evaluations of past performance including Award Fee Evaluation results, Fee Determination Official letters, Annual Performance Evaluation Forms, or any other written performance feedback" are to be part of the past performance writeup.	Yes.
3334	RFP Page 107: Please confirm the following calculation is correct when determining the Average Annual Value to Date. Total Contract Expenditures as of submission (July 11, 2024) divided by the total months the contract has been active. Using the example listed on page 107 of the RFP the total contract expenditures to date is \$43,500,000. Total duration is 2 years and 4 months which equals 28 months. Divide the total months by 12 and it equals 2.33 years. Divide 43,500,000 by 2.33 and it equals 18,669,528. Is this correct?	The Average Annual Value to Date is determined by dividing the Total Contract Expenditures as of the submission date by the total months the contract has been active, then converting the total months to years.
3370	"Under ""Instructions"" on page 1, the final sentence reads, ""...Sections 1-4 are to be completed by the Offeror and verified by the evaluator. Sections 5 and 6 are completed by the""". The sentence is missing information. Question: Will NASA please complete this sentence so the offeror can understand the requirement?"	"Sections 1-4 are to be completed by the Offeror and verified by the evaluator. Sections 5 and 6 are completed by the evaluator".
3375	Section A.3.7.1, Offer Volume, appears to require a complete REP form for each mandatory experience. It appears that the same information is required in A.3.7.2, Past Performance Volume. Please confirm that REP forms are to be submitted as part of the Offer Volume and not as part of the Past Performance Volume.	REPs are provided using Exhibit 1 in Volume I and are not related to information provided in Volume II.
3393	As an OEM, we have elected to sign Teaming Agreements with multiple VARs in order to provide the SEWPVI more aggressive pricing than their standard contract price. By executing these Teaming Agreements, does SEWPVI consider this a "Meaningful Relationship"? If so, that will result in higher prices on the SEWPVI contract from all VARs bidding this OEM.	No.
3404	May a font size smaller than 10pt be used for text in diagrams, schedules, charts, tables, artwork, and photographs, as long as it is legible?	No, text in diagrams, schedules, charts, tables, artwork, and photographs shall be no smaller than 10-point type Times New Roman font.

3405	May a font other than Times New Roman be used for text in diagrams, schedules, charts, tables, artwork, and photographs, as long as it is legible?	Yes as long as the font size is no smaller than 10-point type Times New Roman font.
3406	How many REPs are needed for each mandatory experience technical area in Category B and C?	Only one REP can be used for each of the required number of Technical Areas.
3408	Section states "Any proposal found to be a duplication or replica of another offeror (company) or have a section that is a duplication or replica of another offeror (company), that is not a part of a joint venture or contractor teaming arrangement, will lead to all identified offerors being ineligible for award and will not be evaluated by the Government." Question: Please confirm that this statement does not apply to the data found in Exhibit 3a- Category A Solutions Spreadsheet.	Confirmed.
3414	How does a JV ensure that past performances are credited to the JV? What direction to we provide customers on how to submit the PPQ to the SEWP Team for proper attachment to the JV proposal?	Offerors shall provide the work done and qualifications held individually by each partner to the joint venture, the work done by the joint venture itself, or any combination of both. The Offeror shall instruct each of its references to return the Past Performance Questionnaire directly to the Government Contracting Officer via email.
3422	Exhibit 3A Cat A Spreadsheet - please confirm that the solutions categories submitted to not map back to a specific past performance submitted.	Confirmed.
3425	In section A.3.7.2 (a) the requirement states "Prime Offerors shall furnish the information requested below a minimum of one (1) but no more than three (3) of your most recent similar contracts that are completed or ongoing within three (3) years of the solicitation release date to be considered recent," but further down in this same section the requirement for "other than small business in Category A" states "Offerors identified as an Other Than Small Business in Category A shall provide past performance references showcasing technology solutions for at least four (4) content representative areas for content to be rated relevant (pertinent)." Can the Government please provide clarity on the number of past performance references required?	Offerors shall provide a minimum of one (1) but no more than three (3) of the most recent similar contracts covering at least four (4) content representative areas.
3431	Please confirm that the Past Performance NAICS code needs to match the top level NAICS code for the proposal submission. For example: if all the past performances have an awarded NAICS of 541519, then the proposed NAICS code for the SEWP VI submission would be 541519.	Yes.

3438	FAR 52.219-28 has limited circumstances where an organization's size must be recertified (e.g. novation, merger/acquisition, or 5th contract year and annually thereafter). However, the language in A.1.49 gives precedence to what is contained in SAM, which must be updated annually. This essentially requires an annual recertification on the SEWP vehicle and may have the unintended consequence of organizations growing out of NAICS codes faster (and the government to not be able to maximize the small business status benefit of a large amount of small to mid-sized contractors.) Would the government please revise this section to only include the recertification requirements in FAR 52.219-28?	Contract Holders are required to re-represent their size standard in accordance with FAR 52.219-28. Ordering agencies may request a size-standard re-certification at the order level, at their discretion.
3439	A.1.49 gives latitude to task order contracting officers to request Offerors recertify their size at any time. Please confirm that if an Offeror is required to recertify at the task order level, it would not impact any other task order or the master contract size certification.	The size-standard re-certification at the order level is at the discretion of the ordering agencies.
3446	RFP states "Provide information addressing all the elements under FAR 9.104 to demonstrate responsibility (address the elements under this section that are not addressed in another proposal volume)." The FAR 9.104 asks for "(a) Have adequate financial resources to perform the contract, or the ability to obtain them (see 9.104-3(a));" Is the Government asking for the offer to submit financial records (i.e., income statements) or line of credit from a bank?	The wording with regard to 9.104 was updated in Amendment 8.
3452	A.3.7.1 second bullet point - The government requests the NAICS code used for competition and the relevant experience. Can the government please clarify what type of information is requested for relevant experience? Would the government like a table of references offered in the past performance volume? Or a brief narration of the references offered in the past performance volume? Or something else?	The government requests that the relevant experience information include a table of references offered in the past performance volume. The table should match the past performance information with the relevant experience identified in paragraph (a)(12) of the section. The matrix should include contract identifiers, work performed, and whether the Offeror was a prime or subcontractor.
3458	FAR 52.219-28 has limited circumstances where an organization's size must be recertified (e.g. novation, merger/acquisition, or 5th contract year and annually thereafter). However, the language in A.1.49 gives precedence to what is contained in SAM, which must be updated annually. This essentially requires an annual recertification on the SEWP vehicle and may have the unintended consequence of organizations growing out of NAICS codes faster (and the government to not be able to maximize the small business status benefit of a large amount of small to mid-sized contractors.) Would the government please revise this section to only include the recertification requirements in FAR 52.219-28?	Contract Holders are required to re-represent their size standard in accordance with FAR 52.219-28. Ordering agencies may request a size-standard re-certification at the order level, at their discretion.
3459	A.1.49 gives latitude to task order contracting officers to request Offerors recertify their size at any time. Please confirm that if an Offeror is required to recertify at the task order level, it would not impact any other task order or the master contract size certification.	The size-standard re-certification at the order level is at the discretion of the ordering agencies.

3471	A.1.49 states, "Upon identification of a contractor's change in the size standard the SEWP order request tool will be updated to reflect the size-standards listed in SAM.gov and a unilateral mod will be completed to update the contract accordingly." Does this mean that if you outgrow a small business size for a specific NAICS that you can remain on the contract for those NAICS you are still small within?	Yes, if a contractor outgrows a small business size for a specific NAICS code, they can remain on the contract for those NAICS codes where they are still classified as small and if in Category A or B, they will be eligible for unrestricted requirements.
3476	To address, FAR 9.104 - are offerors expected to provide financial information to prove financial responsibility? If so, where should we include in the proposal and is this excluded from page count?	Please refer to A.3.6 Proposal Preparation.
3481	In Section A.3.6(B)(7) The solicitation states that "any proposal found to be a duplication of replica of another offeror (company) or have a section that is a duplication or replica of another offeror (company), that is not part of a joint venture or contractor teaming arrangement, will lead to all identified offerors being ineligible for award and will not be evaluated by the Government." In a situation where a company (Company A) submits a proposal for Category C, and is a member of a Joint Venture that also submits a proposal for Category C, what sections of Volumes I, II & III need to be different in the Joint Venture's proposal than that submitted in Company A's proposal?	Offerors proposing as a prime and as part of a joint venture may submit the same management approach, certifications, references for past performance and mandatory experience.
3511	"The RFP incorporates FAR 52.207-6 SOLICITATION OF OFFERS FROM SMALL BUSINESS CONCERNS AND SMALL BUSINESS TEAMING ARRANGEMENTS OR JOINT VENTURES (MULTIPLE-AWARD CONTRACTS). (DEC 2022) indicating that only Small Business proposers can team at the IDIQ-level and that they are restricted to teaming with only other Small Business partners. Teaming at the Task Order-level does not appear to be defined in the Solicitation. Please provide information on the requirements for teaming at the Task Order level. For example, can either a Large or Small Contract Holder team with either a Large or Small partner who is not a Contract Holder on Task Orders released under SEWP VI? Does there need to be an arrangement between Primes and potential Teaming Partners at the time of IDIQ proposal submission or can Teaming Arrangements be made post-Contract Award to accommodate specific Task Orders as they are released?"	There are no requirements at the contract level for teaming at the order level. Teaming arrangements can be establish with companies regardless of business size and can be made post award to accommodate specific task orders as they are released."
3515	Please clarify if the \$2M/10M size threshold restriction in years 1&2 of contract performance is for the 1st and 2nd year of the contract, regardless of in which contract year the Offeror's performance begins. As this results in a disincentive for mature SBs who customarily perform on contracts 10x+ in size (as noted in our REPs and PPs), we ask NASA to strike this provision entirely or increase the threshold to \$10M in year 1 and \$20M in year 2, with no limit thereafter.	All Contracts will begin at the same time. The restrictions will be placed on all Category C contracts for years one and two of SEWP VI. The Category C dollar threshold restrictions are mandated as part of OMB'S GWAC Designation for SEWP VI.
3518	For the naming convention of the files, if the offeror is a JV and is submitting its partner ISO or CMMI certificates, do we name the file with both the JV and the partner company names or just the JV name?	The file should be named with the JV name.
3528	Section A.3.7.2(b) Prior Customer Evaluations (Page 110) - If Exhibit 2 Past Performance Questionnaires (PPQs) are not returned by the proposal due date, what recourse or alternative will offerors have to provide past performance information?	No action is required by the Offeror, if Exhibit 2 PPQs are not returned by the proposal due date. Offerors will not be disadvantaged if the Government customer fails to act as requested.

3549	A.3.5 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 (JV) or contractor team arrangement (CTA) in that same category." Can a company that is part of two joint ventures (JVs) submit a bid with each of their JVs for the same category (i.e. Category C)?	No.
3551	On page 100, is it permissible to acknowledge that we comply with FAR 9.104 or are we to address each bullet in that chapter of the FAR individually?	The wording with regard to 9.104 was updated in Amendment 8.
3570	If the minimum average annual cost/fee of \$2.5 Million is deemed relevant/pertinent for a past performance contract, recommend reducing REP minimum total value to \$12.5 Million (which is \$2.5 M average annual minimum for each of a typical 5-year contract).	The two requirements serve different purposes - one is to ensure a level of relevant experience, the other is to obtain past performance information.
3572	In reference to RFP A.3.7.1 on page 100, what (if any) documentation is required to demonstrate that a company is compliant with FAR 9.104?	The wording with regard to 9.104 was updated in Amendment 8.
3578	Could you please verify if the new version of SEWP will not include any pricing obligations for the award?	There are no pricing obligations for award.
3580	How many NAICS codes does an offeror need to select on Exhibit 4 to be satisfactory?	There is no minimum requirement. Exhibit 4 is only used post-award to determine the Task order requirements the Contract Holder is eligible based on the Issuing Agency' NAICS code and business size.
3583	Is there a benefit in the evaluation of proposal for an offeror to list all potential NAICS codes in Exhibit 4?	There is no minimum requirement. Exhibit 4 is only used post-award to determine the Task order requirements the Contract Holder is eligible based on the Issuing Agency' NAICS code and business size.
3605	In the last paragraph of page 117, it states "The Offeror's relevant past performance is pertinent to the acquisition" Does "pertinent to the acquisition" mean that the reference contract must have been awarded in the list of NAICS codes in the tables on pages 61-63 - or that the work being referenced in the contract would fall within the scope of the listed NAICS codes. This is a challenge when a contract has a variety of work, but by definition, can only be assigned a single NAICS code for award.	No. By following the instructions in terms of the NAICS code and content areas, the Offeror will demonstrate that the past performance is pertinent to the acquisition.
3619	A.3.3(d) states that "All Electronic files shall be uploaded as a single zip archive file less than 120MB." However, A.3.6(A)(3) states that "Electronic files...no larger than 120MB PER FILE." Please clarify if the limit is 120MB total (per ZIP) or 120MB per FILE.	The limit is 120MB per file. Each electronic file should be no larger than 120MB.
3626	Is it ok if there is a semi duplicate submission for single company and its JV that it is a participating member of?	Yes.
3645	Does the Government require PPQs for "Mandatory Experience" Volume 1 REPs for Category B, or only for the projects included as part of "Past Performance" Volume 2?	There is no relationship between REPs and Past Performance projects.
3650	The current SF1449 forms are blank. When will you be sending out the revised forms for the contractors to fill out?	The SF1449 forms have been corrected and updated at SAM.gov.
3654	What corporate paperwork, if any, is required from Joint Venture bidders?	Joint Venture bidders must provide evidence that the certification is in the name of the JV, prime contractor in the CTA, or in the name of one of the companies in the JV. Additionally, the JV must have a corresponding UEI Number in SAM.gov.

3664	RFP Evaluation Criteria Page 120 A.4.5: Please clarify how the Government would like Offerors to "affirmatively demonstrate compliance" with FAR 904-1.	The referenced section was removed in Amendment 8.
3679	<p>A.3.7.1 (b), page 103 AND A.3.7.2 (a), page 106. Volume I and Volume II dollar amount minimums for past performance projects for Category B Other Than Small Business are inconsistent and disproportionate.</p> <p>Volume I instructions in RFP Section A.3.7.1 (b) Category B - For Other than Small Businesses requires that Each Project must have had a minimum of \$30M in total value size of a single order or contract.</p> <p>However, Volume II instructions in RFP Section A.3.7.2 (a) For Other Than Small Businesses proposing in Category A & B state that the past performance provided shall be for similar scope efforts with a minimum average annual cost/fee incurred of \$2,500,000 (\$2.5 Million) for size to be rated relevant (pertinent).</p> <p>Assuming that most contracts are awarded for 5 years of performance, past performance project that qualifies for Volume II (annual cost \$2.5M) will not qualify for Volume I (\$30M in total value). For consistency of requirements across two volumes, we recommend that the Government changes Volume I minimum total value to \$12.5M or less.</p>	The solicitation will remain as stated.
3692	<p>A.3.7.2 (B), RFP Page 106; The offeror must provide past performance submissions as it relates to the NAICS code being used for competition. Does this mean that each of our Past Performance submissions must have used the same NAICS as the code being used for this competition on Category B?</p>	Each past performance submission must relate to the NAICS code selected upon proposal submission; i.e. being used for competition at the master contract level and recorded on the submitted SF 1449.

3695	<p>A.3.7.1 (B), RFP Page 103 and A.3.7.2(a) (B), RFP Pages 105-106" A.3.7.1: A Relevant Experience Project (REP) for mandatory experience is defined as a single contract or task order as either a prime or subcontractor per REP area. An REP must be based on a single specific contract or task order and not based on a single IDIQ contract. A REP provided by an Offeror shall meet the mandatory experience technical area for the category being proposed on Exhibit 1- Relevant Experience Project Table. The Offeror shall provide a REP from NASA contracts, other Government contracts, and/or commercial contracts. A total of four (4) different REPs from different mandatory experience technical areas shall be submitted. Each Project must have had a minimum of \$30M in total value size of a single order or contract and must be described using the Exhibit 1 REP template.</p> <p>A.3.7.2(a): Prime Offerors shall furnish the information requested below a minimum of one (1) but no more than three (3) of your most recent similar contracts that are completed or ongoing within three (3) years of the solicitation release date to be considered recent." Can the Offeror use different contract references for the REP requirements in the Offer Volume vs the PP requirements in the Past Performance Volume or does the Government intend for these contract references to be the same?</p>	The Offeror can use different contract references for the REP requirements in the Offer Volume vs the PP requirements in the Past Performance Volume.
3703	<p>The Final RFP refers to nine Category A Technical Areas in pp, 24-32 along with numbering those with a lowercase "a" after each of the nine (9); however, on page 108, under 12. Past Performance History, for Category A, eight Content Representative Areas are listed without a lowercase "a" after each number (to coincide) with the same in pages 24-32. Question: Assuming these are interchangeable terms and styles, does the Government prefer the nomenclature and numbering shown verbatim in Category A Content Representative Areas on page 108?</p>	The preference is for the Offeror to include the Category lettering (a, b, or c) related to that proposal's category.
3717	<p>RFP A.3.7.1 Offer Volume, "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 government can benefit from robust Contract Holder teams that span the technical areas. Will the Government please confirm that Offerors may propose subcontractors and provide CTAs for subcontractors even if they do not provide an REP or PPQ?</p>	Yes.
3719	<p>RFP A.3.7.1 Offer Volume, "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." May Contract Holders propose new subcontractors at the task order level?</p>	Yes.

3724	RFP A.4.5 Prospective Contractor Responsibility states "Per FAR 9.103(b), if the prospective contractor is a small business concern, responsibility will be determined in accordance with Subpart 19.6, Certificates of Competency and Determinations of Responsibility. If the prospective contractor is a Section 8(a) participant, see Subpart 19.8." If responsibility is determined using FAR 19.6 or 19.8, must the offeror also demonstrate adequate compliance with the general standards at FAR 9.104-1 and special standards under FAR 9.104-2?	The referenced section was removed in Amendment 8.
3726	RFP A.4.5 Prospective Contractor Responsibility states "Per FAR 9.103(b), if the prospective contractor is a small business concern, responsibility will be determined in accordance with Subpart 19.6, Certificates of Competency (COC) and Determinations of Responsibility. If the prospective contractor is a Section 8(a) participant, see Subpart 19.8." Per FARs 19.6 and 19.8, Certificates of Responsibility are obtained by the Contracting Officer and not the offeror. Will the government confirm that Offerors are not required to obtain a COC from the SBA?	Confirmed.
3740	Would the Government confirm that the only Offeror required fill-in clauses required to be returned in the Offer Volume are those found in Section V., sub-sections A.5.1, A.5.2, A.5.3, A.5.4, A.5.5, and A.5.6 that are not already included in the offeror's completed SAM.gov registration?	Confirmed.
3746	RFP Language (pp. 103-104): "For Small Businesses (including prime small business offerors and first tier Subcontractor, if applicable): A total of three (3) different REPs from different mandatory experience technical areas shall be submitted." "For HUBZone, VOSB, SDVOSB, WOSB, EDWOSB, 8a, offerors (inclusive of first- tier subcontractors, if applicable): A total of 2 different REPs from different mandatory experience technical areas shall be submitted." Question: Confirm the total number of REPs required for each socioeconomic category.	Small businesses other than HUBZone, VOSB, SDVOSB, WOSB, EDWOSB, 8a are required to provide 3 REPs. HUBZone, VOSB, SDVOSB, WOSB, EDWOSB, 8a offerors are required to provide 2 REPs.

3750	<p>A.3.7.1 OFFER VOLUME, (b) Mandatory Experience/ Offerings, For Category B and C:</p> <p>RFP Language (pp. 103-104): "For Small Businesses (including prime small business offerors and first tier Subcontractor, if applicable): A total of three (3) different REPs from different mandatory experience technical areas shall be submitted."</p> <p>"For HUBZone, VOSB, SDVOSB, WOSB, EDWOSB, 8a, offerors (inclusive of first- tier subcontractors, if applicable): A total of 2 different REPs from different mandatory experience technical areas shall be submitted."</p> <p>Question: Does NASA intend for the total number of REPs to reflect a mix of the Technical Areas under each Category, or must Offerors provide the total required REPs per each Technical Area (e.g. Category B: 2 REPs x 10 = 20 REPs)?</p>	<p>No. The total number of REPs required for small business offerors is three - each of which must be a different contract and represent a different technical area. The total number of REPs required for HUBZone, VOSB, SDVOSB, WOSB, EDWOSB, 8a, offerors is two - each of which must be a different contract and represent a different technical area.</p>
3753	<p>A.3.7.1 OFFER VOLUME, (b) Mandatory Experience/ Offerings, For Category B and C:</p> <p>RFP Language (pp. 103-104): "Category C - For HUBZone, VOSB, SDVOSB, WOSB, EDWOSB, 8a, offerors (inclusive of first- tier subcontractors, if applicable): A total of 2 different REPs from different mandatory experience technical areas shall be submitted."</p> <p>For Category C, confirm Offerors only need to submit 2 different REPs. Also, do these REPs need to cover ALL mandatory experience technical areas?</p>	<p>Yes HUBZone, VOSB, SDVOSB, WOSB, EDWOSB, 8a, offerors must only submit two REPs. Each REP must be relevant to one Technical area each for a total of 2 technical areas.</p>
3759	<p>Can work that was performed under a previous JV be used to demonstrate REP? Will any member be penalized if both JV members claim the full value on separate proposals.</p>	<p>The Government will 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.</p>
3763	<p>RFP Language (p. 115): "Offerors that do not receive a notification from the Government are to assume their proposal has proceeded to the next phase of the evaluation."</p> <p>Does NASA have a projected schedule for when Offerors should anticipate receiving the down-select notices for each Phase of the SEWP VI evaluation process? Will NASA provide updates for each Phase down-select on the NASA SEWP VI Website and/or SAM.gov?</p>	<p>The Government will notify each Offeror if they are no longer eligible for award along with providing a brief rationale statement upon completion of each phase of evaluation.</p>
3766	<p>Does a protégé JV member have to provide a past performance?</p>	<p>No.</p>

3767	<p>If there are any mandatory elements that an MPJV has to provide from the protégé specifically, this requirement should be less than the general requirement for other offerors (lower minimum value or fewer references). Please refer to 13 CFR 125.8(e), which outlines SBA's recognition of the significance of an MPJV and suggests special considerations for the protégé. It states 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. Additionally, please note that the RFP currently treats MPJVs no differently than a Prime/sub-CTA relationship, emphasizing the need for heightened consideration of Prime/sub relationships. I recommend referencing the decision from the POLARIS pre-award protest from VHC Partners LLC and SH SYNERGY for further insights.</p>	This was addressed with the updated wording in Amendment 8.
3769	For mandatory experience, can offerors use a particular single-award IDIQ to create multiple bundles?	Offerors may submit multiple tasks under a single award IDIQ as long as each task is a separate and distinct task from the others; e.g. has a separate task order number.
3770	If an offeror uses individual task orders under a single-award IDIQ for REPs, does that preclude them from using the same projects as a bundled past performance?	No.
3774	Please explain more clearly how to complete the crosswalk based on the category an offeror is bidding.	The Exhibit 4 NAICS code crosswalk should be filled in based on all NAICS codes and business sizes that the Offeror is registered for in sam.gov.
3776	RFP says two bids per category are allowed: One Prime and one CTA. What about two CTAs and 0 Primes?	Only one proposal per scope category will be accepted per offeror as a Prime. 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.
3780	Does "similarly situated" mean small business vs large for all NAICS in a category? or Does it just refer to the administrative NAICS? Or does a subcontractor have to be small AND have all the same designations as the Prime?	The term "similarly situated" refers to the administrative NAICS code. A subcontractor does not have to be small and have all the same designations as the Prime.
3784	Can work that was performed under a previous JV be used to demonstrate past performance? Will any member be penalized if both JV members claim the full value on separate proposals?	For joint ventures, the offerors shall provide the work done and qualifications held individually by each partner to the joint venture, the work done by the joint venture itself, or any combination of both.
3785	What is meant by "the NAICS code" in the requirement: "The offeror must provide relevant experience as it relates to the NAICS code being used for competition"	The NAICS code being used for competition is the NAICS code selected by the Offeror when submitting their proposal and as provided by the Offeror on their SF1449.
3788	Are IT service contracts between two companies considered commercial contracts?	Yes.
3790	Are IT subcontracts between two companies, where the end client is a government agency considered commercial contracts?	Yes.
3793	Are subcontracts used as past performance or REPs treated differently than commercial contracts?	No.

3796	Can past performance/REPs performed under a previous JV be referenced for REPs / past performance without written authorization from the JV managing partner? If this capability was replicated in REP or past performance, would it disqualify both members of the former JV in their separate bids?	For joint ventures, the Offerors shall provide the work done and qualifications held individually by each partner to the joint venture, the work done by the joint venture itself, or any combination of both.
3797	Why is NASA limiting the total contract value of task orders in the first two years of category C? This seemingly arbitrary limitation may disincentivize the contract utility and marketability of SEWP VI. \$2M in year one of SEWP is a relatively small amount over a typical five-year service contract, and while \$10M in year two of SEWP is more favorable, it still serves as an unnecessary restriction.	The Category C dollar threshold restrictions are mandated as part of OMB'S GWAC Designation for SEWP VI.
3805	A.3.7.1: Is the Meaningful Relationship Commitment Letter only required for Offeror's responding to Category B and C?	No. It is required in all 3 Categories if applicable to the Offeror's proposal.
3806	Exhibit 2 PPQ Section 1, H: Regarding "Competitive", we assume that if the PPQ is for a single award IDIQ, that was won competitively, the answer is "Yes" and if the PPQ is for a task order under a single award IDIQ, the answer is "no". Is that correct?	Correct.
3810	A.3.7.1(b) Technical Area Tabs: Is an Offeror required to propose only the minimum number of CLINS in four technical areas under Category A? Will Awardees be able to add additional products in all of the Category A technical areas post-award? Are we limited to only submitting for a maximum of 4 technical areas?	The Government will only review and evaluate Exhibit 3a to ensure the requirements in A.3.7.1 OFFER VOLUME- CATEGORY INSTRUCTIONS; (b) Mandatory Experience/ Offerings are met in terms of the 4 required technical areas. Offerors may propose additional Technical Areas to be used in the initial load of the SEWP Database of Record post-award.
3823	A.3.7.1(a) ISO Certification: Please confirm that a wholly owned subsidiary of the parent company which is the OEM/Provider may provide the ISO Certification of the parent company OEM/Provider to satisfy the requirement of A.3.7.1(a) when functions covered by the ISO certification are being performed by the parent company as shared services. Is a Meaningful Relationship Commitment Letter required to support this?	The statement is true. A Meaningful Relationship Commitment Letter is required.
3829	Do we need to provide 1-3 past performance per technical area? Or 1-3 overall based on our primary NAICS?	1-3 overall based on your primary NAICS.
3831	A.3.7.2 PAST PERFORMANCE VOLUME (b) PRIOR CUSTOMER EVALUATIONS (PAST PERFORMANCE QUESTIONNAIRES) pg 110 states we must send Exhibit 2 to clients for completion. QUESTION: From past experience we have learned that it is the policy of one of our clients which we want quote as past performance to never fill out and return an evaluation questionnaire even when encouraged to do so without disclosing any classified information. We will provide a writeup on that past performance, and will send the questionnaire and provide their contact information. If they do not respond, will that affect our past performance evaluation? In what way?	An Offeror shall not be rated favorably or unfavorably if the offeror does not have a record of "recent" and "relevant" past performance or if a record of past performance is unavailable. In such cases the offeror will receive a "Neutral" rating.

3834	If an Offeror submits three Past Performances in a Category C proposal, and sends three questionnaires to its Past Performance references, but one or two of the references are not returned to the Government either because it is too late, or because of an internal policy of not filling out reference questionnaires, does that mean the Offeror will receive an overall "neutral" rating instead of satisfactory rating, if at least one of the questionnaires is returned and all Past Performance evaluation factors on that one questionnaire are met (including recency, relevance, and customer satisfaction ?	An Offeror shall not be rated favorably or unfavorably if the offeror does not have a record of "recent" and "relevant" past performance or if a record of past performance is unavailable. In such cases the offeror will receive a "Neutral" rating.
3838	Can a company prime a category and also be a member of a joint venture (whether managing member or minority member) priming within the same category? If so, is there any restrictions or limitations on the projects that company can use? For example, can the company that is the prime use the same projects for their prime bid and also use the same projects for their Joint Venture prime bid?	Yes, a company can prime a category and also be a member of a joint venture priming within the same category. There are no proposal level restrictions; e.g. the same projects can be used.
3841	A.3.6(B)(2) RFP pg. 96: Would the Government consider Times New Roman 10 for tables?	The solicitation was updated in a previous amendment to allow for Times New Roman 10 for tables.
3842	Page 121, Section A.4.5 states: "Per FAR 9.103(b), if the prospective contractor is a small business concern, responsibility will be determined in accordance with Subpart 19.6, Certificates of Competency and Determinations of Responsibility." Considering that NASA is now requiring "determining whether prospective contractors and subcontractors are responsible" in the form of the SBA Certificates of Competency (COC) -an SBA process with a timeline (per their website) of eight (8) months -AND- given the number of potentially 100's of bidders... Would NASA consider removing this requirement -OR- move this requirement to a Post-Award/Condition of Performance???	The referenced section was removed in Amendment 8.
3844	This section refers to an Attachment H. Where is Attachment H located within the solicitation package?	The formal agreement with AbilityOne Non-Profit Agency (NPA)/Non-Profit Agencies NPAs will be incorporated into the contract as Attachment H post award.
3846	The instruction regarding respective documents is unclear. What is considered a respective document? Are we supposed to create a volume document (with TOCs, etc.) and then provide all exhibits, appendices, and annexes, etc. as separate documents? Outside of Exhibit, LOA, and PP (which we assume means past performance) is there anything else the Government considers a separate document?	The formal agreement with AbilityOne Non-Profit Agency (NPA)/Non-Profit Agencies NPAs will be incorporated into the contract as Attachment H.
3850	Does the Government anticipate that Volume III be submitted as two separate files?	Proposal Submission Table indicates that Volume III should be divided into two parts: Technical Approach (III-A) and Management Approach (III-B). Each part should be submitted as separate documents with file names indicating Volume III-A and Volume III-B.
3853	The RFP states: "In no event can an offeror compete as a prime and as part of more than one joint venture or teaming arrangement per category." May a company that is just a proposed subcontractor be a proposed subcontractor to more than one Offeror?	Yes.

3858	The RFP state: For HUBZone, VOSB, SDVOSB, WOSB, EDWOSB, 8a offerors (inclusive of first- tier subcontractors, if applicable): A total of 2 different REPs for each of the mandatory experience technical areas shall be submitted. This seems to be a typo considering the instructions for all other categories and set asides. Should this be "from different mandatory areas as opposed to all mandatory areas."?	The Solicitation has been updated in an Amendment prior to Amendment 7 to read "A total of two (2) different REPs from different mandatory experience technical areas shall be submitted."
3859	In Item 12, Performance History, this section requires that we must present references showcasing a certain number (based on Category and Business Size) of content areas. Do these numbers pertain to each past performance reference or to the collective number of past performance references in the past performance volume? For example, if I am proposing in Small Business in Category A, must each of the past performance references have at least 3 content representative areas or should my references collective (added up) present at least 3 content areas? Please clarify.	The numbers pertain to the collective number of past performance references in the past performance volume. For example, if proposing in Small Business in Category A, the references collectively should present at least 3 content areas.
3872	If an offeror intends to submit proposals for two or three categories and a contract can be used as past performance in two or three categories, can the offeror have the customer provide only one past performance questionnaire for a contract?	The numbers pertain to the collective number of past performance references in the past performance volume. For example, if proposing in Small Business in Category A, the references collectively should present at least 3 content areas.
3874	How are the following terms included in the Past Performance Questionnaire defined: Section 1.G, Total Contract Value; Section 6, What is the Contract Value; Section 6, Initial Value; Section 6, Current Value?	The numbers pertain to the collective number of past performance references in the past performance volume. For example, if proposing in Small Business in Category A, the references collectively should present at least 3 content areas.
3875	Section 6 requests that the estimated cost and fee be provided for Initial Value and Current Value. For Firm Fixed Price and Time & Material contracts, can the customer indicate "N/A" for the cost and fee fields?	For Firm Fixed Price and Time & Material contracts, the customer can indicate "N/A" for the cost and fee fields.
3879	1.On Page 104, "For HUBZone, VOSB, SDVOSB, WOSB, EDWOSB, 8a offerors (inclusive of first- tier subcontractors, if applicable): A total of 2 different REPs for each of the mandatory experience technical areas shall be submitted," yet on Slide 22 of the PowerPoint presentation from the SEWP PMO sponsored SEWP 6 conference call on Tuesday, June 4th, 2024 – the slide states: "HUBZone, VOSB, SDVOSB, WOSB, EDWOSB, 8a offerors: 2 REPs (from 2 of 10 Mandatory areas); \$4M Minimum." Can the Government confirm that for Category B, HUBZone, VOSB, SDVOSB, WOSB, EDWOSB, and 8a offerors only need to address 2 of the 10 Mandatory technical areas with each of their two REPS?	Yes.
3880	On Page 104, the RFP states: "A total of 2 different REPs from different mandatory experience technical areas shall be submitted..." Is there a minimum and/or maximum of different mandatory experience technical areas for Category C? Does a contractor gain an increased score during evaluation if they address more technical experience areas per Category?	For Category C, a total of 2 different REPs from different mandatory experience technical areas shall be submitted. Offerors shall not address more than the required number of technical areas.

3882	Are the representations and certifications required to be completed and submitted with the proposal?	Reps and Certs are to be completed, submitted and included with the SF 1449 in Volume 1.
3889	Are Reps and Certs to be included with the SF 1449 in Volume 1?	Reps and Certs are to be included with the SF 1449 in Volume 1.
3901	The table provided for page limits, lists for Volume III, each subfactor as a volume. Are these to be separate Volumes and files or just sub-volumes within Volume III?	These are to be separate volumes and files within Volume III. The Technical Approach (III-A) and Management Approach (III-B) should be submitted as separate documents.
3903	In Volume II, page 107, #11- Concerning Contracts Terminated. It is now grouped within the items to be provided for each Past Performance Project, rather than the company as a whole within the last three years. Could you please clarify this?	The information concerning contracts terminated should be provided for each Past Performance Project rather than for the company as a whole within the last three years.
3908	In Section A.3.7.2 (a) in Question #5, the government asks for "date of contract." Please advise on which date the government is asking for. Is it the date of contract award?	Yes.
3909	If our buyer or end-user agency has a regulation that prevents them from providing past performance information, how should we address this? Can we submit directly a completed copy of the past performance document to NASA SEWP ? In the past, we have faced issues where the agency did not send the past performance information due to rules and regulations. How should we handle this situation?	If an Offeror submits redacted documentation, the Offeror bears the risk that it may not be evaluated if the Government source selection team cannot sufficiently verify the information submitted. Offerors may mark pages containing sensitive or proprietary information with an appropriate legend in the header or footer.
3911	In Section A.3.7.2 (a) in Question #12, please confirm that the if government is asking for the past performance history of the specific past performance reference only or is the government asking for the relevant past performance of the company outside of that specific reference.	The government is asking for the past performance history of the specific past performance reference only.
3912	How should multiple products contract be utilized for Past performance, and what is the process for using it?	The government is asking for the past performance history of the specific past performance reference only.
3915	May a contractor use a Sub-Agency REP just like an Agency REP? For example, could a contractor use the US Air Force (Sub-Agency) which would fall under the Department of Defense (Agency)?	The process for providing past performance for credit card orders is the same as for other orders.
3919	Do the past performance for CAT A need to specifically support/align to the (4) selected OEMs for the catalog?	No.
3925	How should we proceed when submitting Category A sub prime (2-4) for a quantity of 40 line items, you are asking for correlated past performance for the category we are submitting. Does this mean we can only provide one past performance for each category, or can we use one past performance per manufacturer but include different line items from various manufacturers?	You can use one past performance per manufacturer but include different line items from various manufacturers. The total number of content representative areas for which the Offeror is proposing for a category does not need to be included in a single past performance reference.
3927	Do you need the copy of the contract's first page along with the past performance? If it is a credit card order, can we submit a copy of our quote submitted to the buyer instead?	Provide all necessary information to demonstrate past performance.
3930	May Offeror's include an acronyms list, outside of page count, for the Mission Suitability Volume?	Yes.

3934	P106 states "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 for the Offeror (including JVs) and no more than one (1) reference Contract for each first-tier subcontractor..." Please confirm that a JV with two first tier subcontractors can submit 5 projects (3 from JV and 1 each from first tier subs).	Joint Venture (JV) with two first-tier subcontractors can submit a total of 5 projects. This includes up to three (3) reference contracts for the Offeror (including JVs) and one (1) reference contract for each first-tier subcontractor.
3939	Question: Can the Government confirm that the cover page and indices can go in the front of each volume rather than being separate numbered sections within?	Yes.
3940	Question: Does the Government require a separate cover page and indices for Subfactor B: Management Approach within Volume III? Are Subfactors A (Technical) and B (Management) intended to be separate files?	Subfactors A and B must be separate files and so should each have a cover page and indices.
3953	Electronic file instructions specify each proposal volume (I, II, and III) is a single PDF; however, the Proposal Submission Table shows cover page and indices for both the Technical Approach and Management Approach within Volume III. Should the Technical and Management Approaches be submitted as two separate documents, with file names indicating Volume III-A and Volume III-B?	Technical and Management Approaches should be submitted as two separate documents within Volume III. The Proposal Submission Table specifies that the Technical Approach should be labeled as Volume III-A and the Management Approach should be labeled as Volume III-B.
3955	Can the Government please clarify this statement: In no event can an offeror compete as a prime and as part of more than one joint venture or teaming arrangement per category. Does it mean that an offeror that Primes Category A can only be on one JV or subcontracting teaming arrangement? The same would apply to Cat B and C, correct?	The Solicitation statement means that in a given category an offeror can only compete at most once as a Prime and once as a member of a JV.
3956	For the purposes of REPs, it is clear how work and contract value should be portioned if the Offeror performed the project as a subcontractor. Alternatively, if the Offeror was the prime contract holder but oversaw subcontractors performing some of the work, is the overall scope and total value of the contract considered experience of the prime contract holder?	If the Offeror was the prime contract holder but oversaw subcontractors performing some of the work, the overall scope and total value of the contract are considered the experience of the prime contract holder.
3960	Please confirm the Past Performance Matrix should summarize a maximum of 3 contracts, being the same 3 recent similar contracts described in response to items 1-9 in Volume II, Information from the Offeror.	Yes.
3961	Please confirm using past performance of a parent or affiliate company, with a MRCL, is allowable for all offerors and not limited only to Small Business offerors.	Yes.
3962	For #9 Recent customer evaluations, is the Government requiring that Offerors submit with Volume II all formal customer evaluation documents for each of the 3 past performance references the offeror provides?	We require that Offerors submit with Volume II all formal customer evaluation documents for each of the 3 past performance references the offeror provides.
3963	In response to #10 Small Business Subcontracting Plan history, if the Offeror's individual past performance references did not require small business subcontracting goals, is it acceptable to provide the SSR for the Offeror's overarching commercial subcontracting plan?	Yes.

3964	<p>RFP Section: V. FAR 52.212-3 OFFEROR REPRESENTATIONS AND CERTIFICATIONS—COMMERCIAL PRODUCTS AND COMMERCIAL SERVICES. (FEB 2024)- ALTERNATE I (FEB 2024)</p> <p>Question: Will the Government please specify where offerors shall include the Representations and Certifications documentation within the proposal file structure?</p>	<p>As noted in A.3.7.1(a) the Representations and Certifications documentation should be included in Volume I in the General Instructions section.</p>
3965	<p>Considering that there is no higher past performance confidence rating than satisfactory, is an Offeror evaluated more favorably if their past performance shows experience with more than the minimum of 4 content representative areas?</p>	No.
3974	<p>RFP Section: RFP A.4.5 Prospective Contractor Responsibility</p> <p>Question: Is documentation required for submission with the proposal to "affirmatively demonstrate adequate compliance with the general standards of prospective Contractor responsibility"? If so, what documentation is required?</p>	The wording with regard to 9.104 was updated in Amendment 8.
3976	<p>RFP Section: RFP A.4.5 Prospective Contractor Responsibility</p> <p>Question: In what section of the proposal response should information be included to "affirmatively demonstrate adequate compliance with the general standards of prospective Contractor responsibility"?</p>	The wording with regard to 9.104 was updated in Amendment 8.
3979	<p>RFP Section: A.2.1, List of Attachments, A.1.35</p> <p>H - AbilityOne Formal Agreement</p> <p>Question: The RFP requires that the contractor shall have formal agreements with upon award with the AbilityOne non-profit agencies. The list of attachments designates as Attachment H, a formal agreement with AbilityOne and designates it is to be submitted. Please clarify:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is H referring to the Letter of Commitment with AbilityOne or the formal agreement with the non-profit agency with whom the contractor will enter into a subcontract? 2. If H is referring to the formal agreements that a contractor is to enter into with the non-profit agencies, are the agreements to be submitted with the proposal or upon award of a SEWP VI contract? 3. If H is referring to the formal agreements between the offeror and the non-profit organization, is a teaming agreement acceptable to demonstrate the formal, written commitment of the offeror to the non0profit agency? 	<p>Attachment H refers to the formal agreement with the non-profit agency with whom the contractor will enter into a subcontract. These formal agreements are to be submitted upon award of a SEWP VI contract, not with the proposal. Additionally, a teaming agreement is acceptable to demonstrate the formal, written commitment of the offeror to the non-profit agency.</p>
3986	<p>RFP Section: PPQ Fee</p> <p>Question: Will NASA please define the term "Fee" as it refers to PPQ Section 6?</p>	<p>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.</p>
3987	<p>Is the NAICS "used for competition" the single NAICS code selected with submission of the proposal or all NAICS that are in scope for each Category?</p>	Yes.

3995	Will the government please clarify the basis of the threshold restrictions in the 1st and 2nd years for Category C? Will the government consider increasing or removing the threshold for both the years?	The Category C dollar threshold restrictions are mandated as part of OMB'S GWAC Designation for SEWP VI.
3997	For #4 Current contract expenditures to date: How would the Government calculate the average annual value to date for a firm-fixed price contract, using this example: An ongoing FFP task order has a designated period of performance of June 2022–June 2025 (a total of 3 years, with 2 years underway to date) and total contract value of \$6M. As of June 2024, the total \$6M has been exercised. Is this task order's average annual value to date considered to be \$3M (total exercised \$6M divided by 2 years, PoP to date), or is it considered \$2M (total of \$6M divided by 3 years, full PoP not yet completed)? Knowing how to calculate average annual value for FFP contracts with ongoing PoP is important to know whether these will or will not meet the \$2.5M threshold for SEWP VI past performance.	Please refer to the formula listed in A.3.7.2.
4002	Will the government clarify, and revise as needed, that the NAICS codes within the scope of the Solicitation as listed in Section A.1.34, (pages 61 & 62) can be utilized for the Past Performance Volume for Categories A, B, and C?	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 and listed in the Offeror's SF1449.
4012	1.Can Past Performances for Category A also be used for Category C?	Yes.
4013	Will the government announce when the down-select process has been completed so that if we do not receive a notification, we can safely assume that we are moving to the next phase of the evaluation?	Yes.
4014	For an unpopulated Joint Venture, is it sufficient to provide an AbilityOne Commitment letter in the name of one of the JV members?	An AbilityOne commitment letter provided in the name of one of the JV members is sufficient for an unpopulated Joint Venture.
4032	If a Joint Venture has no subcontracting plan history, is it acceptable to submit the latest ISR or SSR of one of the JV members?	Yes.
4036	(b) Mandatory Experience/ Offerings: The requirement indicates that each mandatory experience needs 2 REPs for small businesses in category C. Category C has 10 mandatory experience areas. You need to submit 2 different projects (REPs) for each of the ten mandatory experience technical areas listed. If you must propose for all ten areas, you would need 20 different REPs, (2 for each area). This seems to be excessive for small businesses.	The Solicitation has been updated in an Amendment prior to Amendment 7 to read "A total of two (2) different REPs from different mandatory experience technical areas shall be submitted."
4043	Section A.3.7.2(a) Are Prime Offer's allowed to use their own past performance that was done as a Tier 1 subcontractor or are we limited to only our prime Task Order contracts?	Prime Offerors are allowed to use their own past performance that was done as a Tier 1 subcontractor.

4045	<p>Reference Pages 94, 95, and 96 - (A) PROPOSAL FORMAT AND ORGANIZATION / (B) PROPOSAL CONTENT AND PAGE LIMITATIONS: Section A states that the Offerors shall submit proposal in three volumes as specified below: Volumes I, II, and III. Section B Proposal Submission Table identifies additional volume numbers in the Volume column: Volume I, II, III A, and III-B.</p> <p>Question: Will the Government confirm that Offerors are only to submit 3 volumes total; and that volumes III-A and III-B are to be included as 2 sections of volume III?</p>	Confirmed.
4050	In Section A.4.5 pg 121 is a contractor responsibility under FAR 9.103(b) for small business concerns obtaining a Certificate of Competency and Determinations of Responsibility?	No.
4053	As part of our proposal artifacts and submission, how are we to designate which socio-economic categories we are pursuing?	Offerors must complete Exhibit 4 reflecting their Size Standard(s) for each NAICS within the category in which they are proposing.
4059	As part of our proposal artifacts and submission, how are we to designate which socio-economic categories we are pursuing?	Offerors must complete Exhibit 4 reflecting their Size Standard(s) for each NAICS within the category in which they are proposing.
4063	<p>Reference Page 99 - A.3.7.1 OFFER VOLUME: lists the elements to be included in the Meaningful Relationship Commitment Letter.</p> <p>Question: If an Offeror typically describes its organizational structure including any affiliates, divisions, or subsidiaries within the body of its proposal cover letter and/or within the various proposal volumes that covers the necessary elements, will the Government confirm that this approach is acceptable instead of providing a separate Meaningful Relationship Commitment Letter?</p>	No. The Government requires a separate Meaningful Relationship Commitment Letter to be provided as specified in the RFP.
4064	Please confirm whether an Past Performance must be specifically designated in one of the NAICS listed in the associated Category tables provided in A.1.34, pp61-63.	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 and listed in the Offeror's SF1449 and not just any of the NAICS codes listed in the table.
4068	The RFP states "Subcontractors from Other Than Small Businesses that creates a CTA will not be evaluated." Please clarify. Does this mean, "Large contractors cannot be in a small business CTA." or something else?	The statement means that a CTA composed of a small business prime and a large business subcontractor will not be evaluated. Only CTAs composed entirely of small businesses will be evaluated.
4069	May large businesses subcontract to small business primes? If they subcontract to a small business prime are they precluded from proposing in the other than small business categories on their own?	Yes, large businesses may subcontract to small business primes. However, a large business cannot subcontract to a small business prime to be able to propose in the other than small business categories.
4071	Our company is an 8(a) company. We wish to partner with another company that is HUBZone. Can we cross team either with two prime sub relationships where we sub to each other or through a CTA where we utilize both socio-economic designations?	An 8(a) firm and a HUBZone firm can create a CTA and submit a proposal utilizing the 8(a) designation.
4091	For the past performance matrix, is there a limit to how many contracts may be listed?	Only three projects should be submitted and referenced in the Past Performance Matrix.
4093	Can JV members use work completed in another JV as their own relevant experience and past performance?	Yes, JV members can use work completed in another JV as their own relevant experience and past performance if the JV member's proposal demonstrates that the JV member's resources were used in the performance of the prior JV contract.

4094	Do JV members need written consent from the managing partner to use JV work as REPs/past performance? If the work is replicated and proven, does it still disqualify bidders?	Yes, JV members can use work completed in another JV as their own relevant experience and past performance if the JV member's proposal demonstrates that the JV member's resources were used in the performance of the prior JV contract.
4096	Is NASA allowing the bundling of task orders under a single-award IDIQ contract for REPs?	No.
4097	If individual task orders under a single-award IDIQ are used for REPs, does that prevent using the same projects as bundled past performance?	No.
4100	Is the assessment of past performance relevancy based on qualitative descriptions or quantitative metrics?	The assessment of past performance relevancy is based on both qualitative descriptions and quantitative metrics dependent on the information provided by the Offeror.
4104	A.3.5 Page 93 May an OTSB prime in CAT B also be a traditional subcontractor to a SB prime in Group B2?	Yes.
4105	A.3.5 Page 93 May a Prime OTSB in Group B1 also be a traditional subcontractor to multiple SB socio-economoc companies in CAT C?	Yes. As long as they are not utilized as a first-tier sub in multiple proposals.
4106	A.3.5 Page 93 May new JVs or CTAs be created for the SEWP VI solicitation or must they have existed with previous joint work prior to the SEWP VI solicitation?	Yes, if the Offeror can meet the RFP requirements.
4122	A.1.35 AbilityOne Subcontracting; p.64-Will the Government provide a template for Attachment H: AbilityOne Formal Agreement?	No.
4126	"An Offeror will be grouped within a scope category based on the size standard associated with NAICS code identified on Exhibit 4." How does an offeror "identify" or otherwise designate the NAICS code they wish to compete under for size determination?	The Offeror will identify the Proposal level NAICS code at the time of proposal submission and as the NAICS code on the submitted SF1449.
4129	The Solicitation states, "Any proposal found to be a duplication or replica of another offeror (company) or have a section that is a duplication or replica of another offeror (company), that is not a part of a joint venture or contractor teaming arrangement, will lead to all identified offerors being ineligible for award and will not be evaluated by the Government. Will the Government confirm that a "section" refers to an explicitly identified element in the Solicitation such as A.3.7.3.B. 4 (i) which indicates "This section shall include a discussion on the staff, resources and processes planned or in place to handle requirements that can be expected to be more than 100 requirements in a day for Category A and ten requirements in a day for Category B and C" versus "Sections" or some other definition?	A "section" refers to an explicitly identified element in the Solicitation such as A.3.7.3.B. 4 (i).

4131	<p>The Solicitation states, "Any proposal found to be a duplication or replica of another offeror (company) or have a section that is a duplication or replica of another offeror (company), that is not a part of a joint venture or contractor teaming arrangement, will lead to all identified offerors being ineligible for award and will not be evaluated by the Government. . . . Offerors proposing as a prime and as part of a joint venture may submit the same management approach, certifications, references for past performance and mandatory experience. In no event can an offeror compete as a prime and as part of more than one joint venture or teaming arrangement per category." Does "one joint venture" mean any type of joint venture and contractor teaming arrangement?</p>	<p>Subcontractor past performances can be considered both federal and commercial, depending on the nature of the contracts they have performed.</p>
4132	<p>Please confirm that inserted attachments like SF1449, certifications, etc. do not need to abide by the font size and font style limitations and do not need to have a page number, solicitation #, company name, etc. in the footers and headers. This would make it easier to insert these attachments which may have been scanned and want to use the full page to show the document rather than include it as an image within the document limitations.</p>	<p>Confirmed.</p>
4135	<p>Will the Government please clarify if "recent customer evaluations of past performance" in A.3.6(B) #9, page 107, also include CPARS?</p>	<p>Yes.</p>
4140	<p>In Section A.3.7.1 OFFER VOLUME, b - Mandatory Experience/ Offerings, Category B, For Small Businesses, it states that "A total of three (3) different REPs from different mandatory experience technical areas shall be submitted." Can the government clarify that each of the REPs only need to be relevant to one mandatory experience technical area? For example, REP 1 meets technical area 1, REP 2 meets technical area 2, etc.?</p>	<p>Yes.</p>
4147	<p>In Section A.3.7.1 OFFER VOLUME, b - Mandatory Experience/ Offerings, Category B, For HUBZone, VOSB, SDVOSB, WOSB, EDWOSB, 8a offerors, it states that "A total of 2 different REPs for each of the mandatory experience technical areas shall be submitted." As this is different from all the other threshold requirements, can the government confirm that it should read as "A total of 2 different REPs from different mandatory experience technical areas shall be submitted."?</p>	<p>The Solicitation has been updated in an Amendment prior to Amendment 7 to read "A total of two (2) different REPs from different mandatory experience technical areas shall be submitted."</p>
4205	<p>What products are addressed in the Non Manufacturing Waiver Bidder Decision</p> <p>Please provide description of Government Program Audits approach Without Sub Contract Management needs is it advisable to add our experience to the management volume</p>	<p>Class Waivers are issued for all contracts; Individual waivers are granted to a contract by SBA. In both cases the waivers are based on a NAICs code and scope of products that are covered. Offerors do not need to take any action. The non-manufacturer rule applies to any order that is for products not covered by the waivers as described in the solicitation. NASA will provide guidance to Industry and Government customers when SEWP VI commences. There is no specific Government Program Audit approach. The Offeror should determine the information they will provide within the Management Approach Volume.</p>

4207	<p>Page 103 first paragraph: REP "Offerors shall only submit the total number of REPs as required for the proposed category and business size standard."</p> <p>Pg 104 states for Category C "A total of three (3) different REPS from different mandatory experience technical areas shall be submitted."</p> <p>Additionally pg 105, A.3.7.2 (a) States "Prime Offerors shall furnish the information requested below a minimum of one (1) but no more than three (3) of your most recent similar contracts...". The guidance on page 102/104 and that on pg 105 appears to be conflicting. Additionally at Industry Day your speaker stated that Past Performance and REPs are not the same.</p> <p>Please clarify.</p>	<p>The reference to page 104 is in regard to the Relevant Experience Project requirement. The reference to page 104 is in regard to the Past Performance requirements. These two requirements are not related. For REPs, "A total of three (3) different REPS from different mandatory experience technical areas shall be submitted." Separately, For Past performance, "Prime Offerors shall furnish the information requested below a minimum of one (1) but no more than three (3) of your most recent similar contracts...".</p>
4208	<p>Exhibit 4 and Pg 105 (c): "An Offeror will be grouped within a scope category based on the size standard associated with NAICS code identified on Exhibit 4." Is this crosswalk going to determine which socio-categories the offeror is eligible for award? In other words, do we submit one proposal and the one is applied to any socio category for which the offeror is eligible?</p>	<p>The Exhibit 4 crosswalk is only utilized post-award in order to identify what NAICS codes and business sizes a Contract Holder is eligible for at the task order level.</p>
4211	<p>A.3.7.1 This section states: Information from first- tier subcontractors, affiliates, and predecessor companies will be taken into consideration for only small businesses in accordance with 13 CFR 125.2(g) when the Small Business prime offeror does not independently demonstrate capabilities and/ or past performance necessary for award" Please confirm that a small business proposing in Category A can utilize past performance from a subcontractor.</p>	<p>Yes.</p>
4212	<p>A.3.7.2 Section states: Subcontractor past performance information will only be evaluated for small business prime offerors. Is the included for offers in Category A?</p>	<p>Yes.</p>
4216	<p>Should each individual REP showcase a minimum 4 mandatory areas, or can they have a minimum of 1 mandatory area and the overall offeror's 3 REP cover 4 mandatory areas?</p>	<p>Each REP should address only one technical area. For small businesses, the required 3 REPs should reference 3 technical areas - a different technical area for each REP.</p>
4217	<p>Mandatory Experience/ Offerings: The instructions state "For HUBZone, VOSB, SDVOSB, WOSB, EDWOSB, 8a offerors (inclusive of first- tier subcontractors, if applicable): A total of 2 different REPs for each of the mandatory experience technical areas shall be submitted." Can you elaborate on "each of the mandatory experience technical areas"? Does this mean that each REP has to cover all the 10 sub-areas or only one sub-area out of 10 sub-areas within Category B to be considered as relevant REP?</p>	<p>The Solicitation has been updated in an Amendment prior to Amendment 7 to read "A total of two (2) different REPs from different mandatory experience technical areas shall be submitted."</p>
4218	<p>Do REPs in phase 1 and past performance in phase 2 need to match? Or can they be different contracts?</p>	<p>No, they do not need to match. Yes, they can be different contracts.</p>
4219	<p>Can a vendor submit more than one proposal for same category under different socio-economic set-asides? For example, if a vendor wants to submit 2 proposals for Category B under the two different set-asides such as one proposal for 8(a) set-aside and another proposal for HUBZone set-aside, is that permissible?</p>	<p>No.</p>

4220	If a vendor wants to submit more than one proposal for same category (e.g. Category B) under different socio-economic set-asides such as HUBZone and 8(a), can they submit the same REPs and Past Performance References for two different proposals under different set-asides?	Offerors can only submit one proposal in a category as a Prime.
4221	We are bidding on SEWP VI as a Large business. If the prime contract is in the name of a joint venture where our company, a small business, is the lead partner performing all the work, should we represent our experience as that of a prime contractor or as a subcontractor?	If the prime contract is in the name of a joint venture where a small business is the lead partner performing all the work, the experience should be represented as that of a prime contractor.
4230	Does a vendor need to submit separate attachments for SF 1449, REP or do these have to include in a single document?	A vendor needs to submit separate attachments for SF 1449, REP, and other documents. These do not have to be included in a single document.
4231	In RFP section A.3.7.1, What does the "resource" signifies in the following text: 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, which will be treated as contractual promises and will be incorporated as an attachment to the resulting master contract.	In RFP section A.3.7.1, the term "resource" signifies the resources from a Parent Company, Affiliate, Division, and/or Subsidiary within a corporate structure that are being shared for evaluation purposes. This requires a Meaningful Relationship Commitment Letter.
4232	How many awards are there for a particular small business set-aside?	There is no set limit on the number of awards.
4234	Please confirm that if bidding Category B as a small business JV, only ONE of the two companies are required to have the CMMI and ISO certification. For example, if Company A of the JV has the ISO certification (but not CMMI) and Company B of the JV has the CMMI certification (but not ISO), this is considered acceptable to pass that criteria.	Yes.
4235	In section A.3.5, the solicitation states that, "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." IT services companies that qualify as small businesses rarely provide breadth and depth across all of the Technical Areas included within Category B and Category C. Teaming is critical for Small Business Offerors to provide the breadth needed to be a successful SEWP VI contract holder and provide access to IT service providers across all Technical Areas. Limiting qualified service providers to a single CTA position within a Category greatly limits prospective small business Offerors ability to build a high performing teams. Will the government allow companies to serve as a CTA subcontractor to multiple Prime Offerors within a Category - so long as those Prime Offerors are bidding with different Socio-economic designations. For example, can CompanyXYZ bid in Category C as a Subcontractor under PrimeOfferor123 that is an SDVOSB and also PrimeOfferor456 that is a Hubzone Company?	No. The Solicitation stated instructions remain as stated.
4239	For Category C, when two small businesses form a CTA, are they both considered Prime for purposes of submitting past performance and Mission Suitability?	Yes.

4240	A.3.6.(B).(2): Will the Government confirm that templates, forms and excel exhibits provided by the Government and already formatted using different fonts and font sizes are exempt from the formatting instructions identified in Section A.3.6.(B).(2)?	Yes.
4253	<p>Page 106 doc RFP A.3.7.2(a) 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) references contracts for the Offeror (including JVs) and no more than one (1) reference Contract for each first-tier subcontractor. Please confirm that a Small Business can submit four (4) contract references. Or please confirm that of the three (3) references, only one can be from a first-tier subcontractor.</p> <p>If the SB can submit four (4) reference contracts, that is in conflict with A.3.7.2(a) Information From the Offeror - "Prime Offerors shall furnish the information requested below a minimum of one (1) but no more than three (3) of your most recent similar contracts that are.</p> <p>Please provide clarification. Does the "not more than three (3) references" apply to OTSB?</p>	A Small Business can submit a maximum of three (3) references, with only one from a first-tier subcontractor. Yes "not more than three (3) references" apply to OTSB.
4258	Section A.3.6.(A) states: "Each proposal volume shall be submitted in a single searchable Adobe Portable Document Format (PDF) file (compatible with ADOBE Reader version DC or 2017), with appropriate bookmarks to at least the section header." Please confirm that a linked/clickable Table of Contents is sufficient as "bookmarks".	Yes.
4267	Category C threshold restrictions are subject to removal in the 3rd year - what is this about, why, etc	The Category C dollar threshold restrictions are mandated as part of OMB'S GWAC Designation for SEWP VI.
4276	According to Section A.3.5 of the RFP, a SB may submit a proposal in a category as a prime contractor once, and may also submit one additional proposal in the same category as part of a Contractor Team Arrangement (CTA). However, there are no limitations on the number of times a first-tier subcontractor under a CTA 9.601(2) can support different prime contractors, including the option to reuse a REP. Is this your interpretation?	There are no limitations on the number of times a first-tier subcontractor under a CTA can support different prime contractors, including the option to reuse a REP.
4277	NAICS Once we choose a competing NAICS, does that mean that all REPs and PPR have to be from the same single competing NAICS?	No for REPs: Amendment 8 removed the NAICS code wording with regard to REPs. For Past Performance, the NAICS code of the references must relate to the same single competing NAICS code. Amendment 8 clarified that if a NAICS code of a referenced contract or award, does not exist or match the NAICS code being used for competition then the Offeror should describe how the work relates to the NAICS code being used for competition. (revised response).
4284	In Volume I, Offerors are required to address all elements under FAR 9.104 to demonstrate responsibility. How does the Government want Offerors to demonstrate that we meet FAR 9.104-1(a), which states: "Have adequate financial resources to perform the contract, or the ability to obtain them"?	Offerors should provide evidence of their financial resources or the ability to obtain them. This can include financial statements, lines of credit, or other financial instruments that demonstrate the offeror's financial stability and capability to perform the contract.

4332	A past performance reference could be used by multiple offerors both within a Category (Prime contract and member of a JV) and across Categories (Used as a reference in Category B and Category C). We would prefer to not have a customer complete multiple Past Performance Questionnaires for the same contract. Can a single PPQ be provided for multiple uses of the project reference and if so how should we identify the PPQ that will be provided to NASA by the customer so that NASA can evaluate the PPQ against each proposal?	Yes, a single Past Performance Questionnaire (PPQ) can be provided for multiple uses of the project reference. You should clearly identify the PPQ that will be provided to NASA by the customer and indicate how it should be evaluated against each proposal.
4333	Within the "(a) INFORMATION FROM THE OFFEROR" the RFP requires a minimum of one (1) but no more than three (3) projects. If an Offeror submits only 1 project that satisfies the required number of content representative areas how will the government evaluate Volume II compared to an Offeror who submits more than 1 project? In other words, will a submission of multiple projects that satisfy the required number of content representative areas be evaluated differently than a submission of only 1 project?	The Government will evaluate each submission based on the relevance and quality of the past performance. Submitting multiple projects that satisfy the required number of content representative areas may provide a broader demonstration of capabilities, but a single well-documented project that meets all requirements will also be considered.
4353	A.4.5 Prospective Contractor Responsibility: Please clarify what information (or documentation) the offerors are to submit with their proposal relating to this section.	The wording with regard to 9.104 was updated in Amendment 8.
4418	Will the offeror be rated at a lower level of confidence if they submit just one past performance rather than three past performances?	No.
4440	Will the government authorize the rights to receive payment to an Authorized Reseller participating on an awarded contract?	Yes, the Government will authorize the rights to receive payment to an Authorized Reseller participating on an awarded contract, as specified in the contract terms and conditions.
4454	Reference RFP Section A.3.7.1.: The requirements from this RFP Section include addressing "all the elements under FAR 9.104". Please confirm the scope of this requirement and whether this includes addressing all subsections under FAR 9.104 (i.e. 9.104-1 through 9.104-7).	The wording with regard to 9.104 was updated in Amendment 8.
4456	Reference RFP Section A.3.7.1. To the extent that offerors are required to address FAR 9.104-2, please confirm that NASA has not included any "Special Standards" within the RFP that need to be addressed in proposals.	Yes, NASA confirms that no "Special Standards" have been included within the RFP that need to be addressed in proposal.
4457	Reference RFP Section A.3.7.1. To the extent that offerors are required to address FAR 9.104-2, please confirm that NASA has not included any "Special Standards" within the RFP that need to be addressed in proposals. Reference RFP Section A.3.7.1. The application of responsibility standards at FAR 9.104-3(d)(2) includes in part that a small business that has not agreed to comply with the limitations on subcontracting may be considered nonresponsive. For any Other Than Small Business offeror, please confirm that a response indicating that this is "Not Applicable" will suffice. For a Small Business offeror, please confirm that a statement indicating agreement to comply with FAR 52.219-14, Limitations on Subcontracting, will suffice.	The wording with regard to 9.104 was updated in Amendment 8.
4470	Please confirm the language should say 2 different REPs from "different" mandatory experience technical areas rather than "for each"?	The Solicitation has been updated in an Amendment prior to Amendment 7 to read "A total of two (2) different REPs from different mandatory experience technical areas shall be submitted."

4497	In section A.4.5 Perspective Contractor Responsibility, can you please confirm that there is no contractor deliverable due with the proposal for small businesses that is associated with "Contractor Responsibility"?	The wording with regard to 9.104 was updated in Amendment 8.
4520	Would the Government clarify the artifacts required to meet FAR 9.104?	The wording with regard to 9.104 was updated in Amendment 8.
4558	The instructions specify each proposal volume shall be submitted as a single searchable adobe portable document (PDF) but the example provided for respective volume and respective document instructions show multiple files within one volume. Can you confirm if all files should be consolidated into one file, and then zipped?	The solicitation has been amended to clarify the documentation instructions.
4560	Will the agency allow an offeror to participate in multiple teams or joint ventures that are submitting proposals under the solicitation?	Yes, the agency allows an offeror to participate in multiple teams or joint ventures that are submitting proposals under the solicitation, provided that the offeror complies with the requirements and restrictions specified in the solicitation.
4584	Please confirm. The language for Category B, HUBZone, VOSB, SDVOSB, WOSB, EDWOSB, 8(a) offers should state: "A total of 2 different REPs from DIFFERENT mandatory experience technical areas shall be submitted." Currently it states "A total of 2 different REPs for each of the mandatory experience technical areas should be submitted."	The Solicitation has been updated in an Amendment prior to Amendment 7 to read "A total of two (2) different REPs from different mandatory experience technical areas shall be submitted."
4594	Will there be a different set of evaluators for Category A, B, and C?	The Government does not disclose the names of the evaluators used for evaluation of proposals.
4617	The RFP has different requirements for unrestricted offerors vs. small business offerors. The RFP defines NAICS codes per Category (541519e for Category A, and 541512 for Category B and C). Additionally, in the SEWP VI proposal submission portal, there is a drop-down menu to select a NAICS code. Is an offeror's size status determined against the NAICS code selected by the offeror in the submission portal? Or is an offeror's size determined by the NAICS code assigned to each Category by the RFP (e.g. 541512 for Category B)?	For the purposes of the RFP proposal process, the offeror's size status is determined against the NAICS code selected by the offeror in the submission portal.
4618	A.3.7.1 says "The offeror must provide relevant experience as it relates to the NAICS code being used for competition." and A.3.7.2 says "The offeror must provide past performance submissions as it relates to the NAICS code being used for competition." Is the "NAICS code being used for competition" the same as the NAICS code assigned to each Category by the RFP (e.g. 541512 for Category B)?	"NAICS code being used for competition" refers to the NAICS code selected when uploading the proposal by the Offeror and provided in the Offerors SF1449.
4651	A.3.6 (a) (2), pg94 - Section A.3.6 (a) (2) of the RFP states, "All pages of Volumes I, II, and III shall be numbered and identified with the offeror's name, RFP number, and date." Can you please clarify whether the volume title page needs to be numbered?	The volume title page does not need to be numbered.
4656	Is the independent past performance information excluded from Volume II page count?	The offeror does not supply any independent past performance information. Independent Past performance refers to information obtained by the Government independent of the information in the Offeror's proposal.

4673	<p>The RFP states that, "Any proposal found to be a duplication or replica of another offeror (company) or have a section that is a duplication or replica of another offeror (company), that is not a part of a joint venture or contractor teaming arrangement, will lead to all identified offerors being ineligible for award and will not be evaluated by the Government."</p> <p>Bidders will have teamed and cross teamed with each other over the years, and will have seen and worked toward contracts with similar language in both the proposals as awarded, and the original PWS.</p> <p>Would the Government please clarify how they will determine if a Section is considered to be a "duplication" or "replica?"</p> <p>What is the appeal process if a company believes it has been erroneously eliminated?</p>	<p>The Government will compare the proposals for narrative parts of the proposal that are extensively duplicates of each other with no business connectivity between the two offerors. The Offeror should consult the appropriate FAR sections for appeal processes.</p>
4681	<p>If are a subcontractor on the Recent, Similar Past Performance contract, is it acceptable to submit a contractual and technical person from the Prime Organization?</p>	Yes.
4691	<p>A.3.7.1 Offer Volume instructions on page 100 require that the offeror "Provide information addressing all the elements under FAR 9.104 to demonstrate responsibility..." Does the Government require supporting artifacts (financial statements, lease copies, etc.), or will a summary narrative of relevant information pertinent to FAR 9.104 suffice?</p>	The wording with regard to 9.104 was updated in Amendment 8.
4693	<p>A.1.34 pg.61 - Please confirm that the Category A Past Performance references can align to any of the NAICS codes listed in the Category A NAICS table on page 61 of the RFP?</p>	The NAICS code used for the Past Performance reference is required to relate to the NAICS code used to compete as noted on the SF1449.
4717	<p>In reference to Section A.3.7.1(b), Is an Offeror only eligible for TOs under the categories they claim in their past performance (4 at minimum), or will all Offerors that receive an award be eligible for all categories?</p>	All Contract holders within that RFQ's Category (i.e. Category A, B or C) that meet the NAICS code and set-aside (or unrestricted) status and any other requirements of an Issuing Agency will be eligible to see and respond to the Issuing Agency's RFQ.
4725	<p>Will the government allow customers to submit prior versions of the PPQ form, assuming there will be updates to Exhibit 2 with future amendment(s)?</p>	Yes.
4733	<p>If an offeror is using the same contract in past performance for both Category B and C, can the Government confirm that only one Exhibit 2 form must be returned by the customer, rather than a form filled out with relevant information in B and a separate form filled out with relevant information for C?</p>	Exhibit 2 must be separately submitted with each Offeror's proposal.
4736	<p>Solicitation Document - pg 95, In the naming convention it is mentioned that the documents within the folder are to be labeled as shown below:</p> <p>GetItDone_Category#_Exhibit#</p> <p>GetItDone_Category#_LOA#</p> <p>However, below that it is mentioned that each volume shall be submitted in a single searchable pdf file. Request the Agency to kindly clarify on this.</p>	The solicitation has been amended to clarify the documentation instructions.
4741	<p>Can the Government please clarify if NASA SEWP intends to exercise the \$100M sole-source limit for DoD and \$25M limit for civilian agencies for Alaskan Native and tribally owned firms?</p>	No.

4763	If an offeror provides a screenshot of a website within their proposal response to management or technical that is meant to be representative, does the font within the screenshot need to be 10pt TNR or can it be smaller and a different font type?	No.
4767	Please confirm that Small Business Subcontracting Plan history is excluded from the page limitations in Vol II.	Yes.
4769	Category B, Page 104, For HUBZone, VOSB, SDVOSB, WOSB, EDWOSB, 8a offerors, the Government states "A total of 2 different REPs for each of the mandatory experience technical areas shall be submitted." while in other size categories state "different REPs FROM DIFFERENT" rather than "For each." Can the Government please reconcile this language with other size standards?	The Solicitation has been updated in an Amendment prior to Amendment 7 to read "A total of two (2) different REPs from different mandatory experience technical areas shall be submitted."
4792	The Government states that, "Each proposal volume shall be submitted in a single searchable Adobe PDF file". However, above, the Government gives the naming convention for separate files within the folder structure. Can the Government please clarify what requested information is to be collected in a single searchable PDF file and what information is to be provided as separate PDF files within the appropriate folder structure?	The solicitation has been amended to clarify the documentation instructions.
4809	In the interest of supporting small businesses per the SBA Mentor Protege Joint Venture (MPJV) program, will the Government exclude bidders who are members of MPJVs from the restriction limiting one JV submission per category?	No.
4812	Are "active" cross-references (table/figure references in the text with live links to the table/figure caption) allowed?	Yes, as long as all links are internal to the proposal documents.
4813	Regarding the limitation on subcontracting, "In no event can an offeror compete as a prime and as part of more than one joint venture or teaming arrangement per category." Since Category B includes two groups, one that is for large businesses and one that is for small businesses, will the Government allow bidders to submit with two MPJVs within the same category but different groups?	No. The document specifies that 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.
4839	The examples shown indicate that each Volume should be a folder with a series of files including exhibits, letters of authorization, etc. Rather than a single file per volume, which is what is stated in the sentence below the folder example "Each proposal volume shall be submitted in a single searchable Adobe Portable Document Format (PDF) file" Can you clarify if you want a single file, or a series of documents within a Volume folder (where all folders are zipped together into a single file)?	The solicitation has been amended to clarify the documentation instructions.
4853	If an Offeror is submitting as both a prime and subcontractor, can the Government clarify whether it can submit the same REPs and/or Past Performances in both bids as the Government states, "Any proposal found to be a duplication or replica of another offeror (company) or have a section that is a duplication or replica of another offeror (company), that is not a part of a joint venture or contractor teaming arrangement, will lead to all identified offerors being ineligible for award and will not be evaluated by the Government," since a prime/sub relationship does not constitute a JV or a CTA.	Yes, an Offeror can submit the same REPs and/or Past Performances in both bids if they are submitting as both a prime and subcontractor.

4887	Can you confirm that for the purposes of this solicitation, a "CTA" can be both a Prime/Subcontractor Teaming Arrangement as well as the type of arrangement where each CTA member has equal standing and acts as a prime contractor, with the ability to interact directly with government?	Yes, for the purposes of this solicitation, a "CTA" can be both a Prime/Subcontractor Teaming Arrangement as well as the type of arrangement where each CTA member has equal standing and acts as a prime contractor, with the ability to interact directly with the government.
4892	At the top of page 104 of the RFP, in the paragraph detailing requirements for Small Business socio-economic category offerors, it states "A total of 2 different REPs for each of the mandatory experience technical areas shall be submitted." This reads as if an offeror must have 2 different projects that cover all 10 of the mandatory experience areas, essentially, 20 projects. We are assuming this is a typo as on page 103 for standard small business it reads "A total of three (3) different REPs from different mandatory experience technical areas shall be submitted." Can you please confirm the language on page 104 mentioned above is incorrect and should instead read "A total of two (2) different REPs from different mandatory experience technical areas shall be submitted."	The Solicitation has been updated in an Amendment prior to Amendment 7 to read "A total of two (2) different REPs from different mandatory experience technical areas shall be submitted."
4893	Reference SEWP VI RFP; pages 92, 94; A.3.5 and A.3.6; Could the Government please clarify whether the 120 MB limit applies to the single ZIP file (as specified on page 92), or if it applies to individual files within the ZIP file (as specified on page 94)?	The 120 MB limit applies to the single ZIP file that contains all the proposal volumes. All files required for a single proposal must be submitted in one ZIP file, which should be less than 120 MB.
4895	Reference SEWP VI RFP; pages 94-95; A.3.6; There are conflicting instructions regarding the number of files for each volume and file names for them. On page 95, the RFP specifies, "...submitted as part of a single PDF file." But the file name instructions above that specify a folder for each volume and file names for Exhibits, LOA, and PP documents. Could the Government please clarify the files it expects and requires for each volume, or if one single file for each volume is required?	The solicitation has been amended to clarify the documentation instructions.
4913	In section A.3.5 of the RFP, 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 (JV) or contractor team arrangement (CTA) in that same category." Please confirm that a business may bid as a member of SBA mentor-protégé approved JV (Company X) under Category B, Group B1 (Unrestricted) and also be a member of a different SBA mentor-protégé approved JV (Company Y) bidding under Category B, Group B2 (Small Business Set Aside) as well?	No. An Offeror can only 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.
4933	Are separate REP references required for each task area, or can one reference cover multiple areas?	Each REP should reference a single technical area.
4952	Is there a cap on the number of subcategories that can be bid on within each category as a small business?	Subcategories are not bid on. The Technical Areas are responded to in order to meet the minimum requirements of Section A.3.7.1 OFFER VOLUME (b)Mandatory Experience/ Offerings.

4954	Per A.3.7.1: "An Offeror will be grouped within a scope category based on the size standard associated with NAICS code identified on Exhibit 4." Also, per Attachment C, "NAICS Codes automatically flow down from the basic contracts and populate the Federal Procurement Data System regardless of the NAICS Code assigned at the delivery order level." How are these groupings used in bidding and are there limits based on NAICS on how we can bid (as long as we qualify under the size standard)?	All Contract holders within that RFQ's Category (i.e. Category A, B or C) that meet the NAICS code and set-aside (or unrestricted) status and any other requirements of an Issuing Agency will be eligible to see and respond to the Issuing Agency's RFQ.
4963	Page 106 states that "The offeror shall provide the following information on all past/current contract references that meet the above criteria for the prime offeror." The solicitation then lists 12 numbered items to respond to for each "contract reference." Item 11 is a listing of "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)." Will the Government please confirm that this should be a separate response from items 1-10 that are specific to individual contracts? Will the Government please confirm that this is excluded from the 10-page limit as "Termination/Descope information"?	Yes, the Government confirms that the information on contracts terminated (partial or complete) within the past three years should be a separate response from items 1-10 and is excluded from the 10-page limit as "Termination/Descope information".
4966	Offerors are required to provide a "summary of relevant past performance information in matrix form." Will the Government please exclude the matrix from the 10-page limit for the Past Performance Volume?	No. The Past Performance Matrix described in Section A.3.7.2.(a)12 of the RFP is included in the 10-page limit for the Past Performance Volume. (revised response)
4984	In the section titles "Independent Past Performance Information" the Offeror is allowed to provide "relevant information provided by the Offeror, including past performance information for JV partners, teammates, and first-tier subcontractor(s), and may consider independently obtained information from Government sources (e.g., Contractor Performance Assessment Reporting System (CPARS)), and non-Government sources, in assessing Past Performance." Will the Government please confirm that Independent Past Performance Information is excluded from page count as identified on page 96 labeled "Customer Evaluations"?	Independent past performance is obtained by the Government independent of the Offeror's proposal and is not included in the page count.
4994	Can we use the REPs and PPs for multiple categories provided they fulfill average annual value and performance period parameters?	Yes.
5003	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.	No.
5011	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?	Yes, you can use the same projects for REPs and PPs if you submit proposals for multiple teaming arrangements.

5017	FAR 9-104 provides a framework of information required to demonstrate responsibility. However, no specific documentation is listed as acceptable as proof for evaluation. Are offerors allowed to provide documentation or attestation statements to address the specific elements of FAR 9-104, or are there specific documents required to meet the requirements? If specific documents are required, please provide.	The wording with regard to 9.104 was updated in Amendment 8.
5021	Can we submit a total of 2 REPs as an 8a covering all the 10 service areas? Is there a minimum number of service areas we must write up in the 3-page limit? Is it a minimum of 2 service areas as defined for Past performances?	Each REP must address a different Technical Area and should only address one Technical Area. An 8a must submit 2 REPs each covering one of the 10 service areas. The two areas must be different.
5022	Will the Government please clarify if offerors are limited to only TWO bids per Category? For example, Once as a Prime and 2nd time as a JV member. Will Government please clarify if offerors are we allowed to be a first tier sub contractor for 3rd submission after having submitted as a Prime and a JV? Please advise.	Yes, Offerors are limited to only TWO bids per Category: once as a Prime and a second time as a JV member. There is no restriction to a company being a first tier sub contractor on multiple submissions.
5028	With consideration of the April 21, 2023 decision by GAO regarding Section 876 of the 2018 Defense Authorization and GWAC solicitations that do not consider price or do not have price as an evaluation factor in the RFP, can you clarify how the Government intends to meet the requirements for pricing at the ID/IQ and task order level?	This is not applicable to NASA solicitations.
5040	Once awarded a contract, are we limited to only bidding on task orders under the NAICs code we submitted under at the time of proposal? If not, please explain the reasoning behind having the offeror select which NAICs code it will submit a proposal under when submitting and what this is intended to accomplish.	All Contract holders within that RFQ's Category (i.e. Category A, B or C) that meet the NAICs code and set-aside (or unrestricted) status and any other requirements of an Issuing Agency will be eligible to see and respond to the Issuing Agency's RFQ.
5048	Is the Meaningful Relationship Commitment Letter required for an Offeror sharing resources with a Parent Company or only if there are two Offerors responding to this solicitation that are sharing resources of the same Parent Company?	The Meaningful Relationship Commitment Letter is required for an Offeror sharing resources with a Parent Company, Affiliate, Division, and/or Subsidiary within a corporate structure for evaluation purposes.
5057	Will there be another round of onboarding for SEWP Categories B and C in the future? If so, when do we expect this to take place?	On-ramping is discretionary and will be determined by NASA based on program needs. There are no specific indicators about when or how often it might happen.
5070	1.If the bidder is using past performance that was performed as a member of a joint venture but is bidding as a prime contractor (that is NOT a joint venture) on NASA SEWP VI, should the PPQ be signed by the COR of the overall contractor or by the Managing Partner of the JV that had privity of contract with the Federal Government?	The PPQ should be signed by the COR of the overall contractor who had privity of contract with the Federal Government.
5073	For Category A RFQs, will customers be able to limit competition/visibility to only HUBZone businesses when posting their RFQ, similar to how SEWP V CHOP is set up now?	Yes.
5085	4. Page 97 – Proposal Content and Page Limitations – the instructions specify that “Offerors proposing as a prime and as part of a joint venture may submit the same management approach, certifications, references for past performance and mandatory experience”. Can the government clarify if this still holds true if the offeror proposes as a Prime for Category B and as part of a JV for Category C? Or is this only true when proposing within the same category?	Yes, this still holds true if the offeror proposes as a Prime for Category B and as part of a JV for Category C.

5086	If using past performance from a JV, and the bidder (not a JV) is bidding as a prime on NASA SEWP VI, do we list the TCV as the value of the total contract, or just the amount performed by our company on behalf of the JV?	You should list the amount performed by your company on behalf of the JV, not the total contract value (TCV).
5088	For Category A, "the past performance provided shall be for similar scope efforts with a minimum average annual cost/fee incurred of \$2,500,000 (\$2.5 Million) for size to be rated relevant (pertinent)." Since many Category A reference contracts may be stand-alone awards for hardware, which tend to be one-time deliveries and not multi-year contracts, please confirm that the "average annual cost/fee" would simply be calculated as the standalone total value of the reference contract, and would therefore be rated relevant for the minimum value requirement.	The "average annual cost/fee" would be calculated as the standalone total value of the reference contract divided by the number of years of performance. If the total value meets or exceeds the minimum annual value requirement, it would be rated relevant.
5127	We are experienced technologists with successful value-add deployments and award-winning past performance in several industries as WOSB To survive, we restructured during the Pandemic and are still recovering revenue due to the extremely long government sale cycles and delays. We have maintained our reseller partnerships, etc and even responded to the SEWP RFI. We were eagerly awaiting the SEWP VI Final RFP drop, but do not meet the 2-year revenue threshold. Can a Letter of Intent from our financial institution be used to show financial capability that meets the threshold in lieu of the revenue threshold?	No.
5136	The extended and delayed procurement cycles have impacted many small businesses. Can the the past performance period be extended to 5-7 years?	No.
5149	Page 71 A.1.42 On-Ramp Activity. What are the details around on-ramping? When will it be done? Currently states discretionary, but are there any indicators about when or how often it might happen? Is there a process to let contracting know that there are interested contractors to on-Ramp? Will the requirements be the same as the solicitation?	On-ramping is discretionary and will be determined by NASA based on program needs and announced via sam.gov. There are no specific indicators about when or how often it might happen. On-ramping decisions are based on NASA's internal analysis and metrics through the life of the contract and not interested companies. The requirements for on-ramping will be the same as the solicitation.
5153	Page 106 A3.7.2 Past Performance Volume, for Categories B and C, does the past performance have to be aligned with the two required relevant experience projects? If so, does this push the actual past performance requirement to be higher to align with the requirement for relevant experience?	No.
5172	A.3.7.1OFFER VOLUME Pg100. / Provide information addressing all the elements under FAR 9.104 to demonstrate responsibility (address the elements under this section that are not addressed in another proposal volume). QUESTION: CAN THE GOVERNMENT PLEASE ADDRESS WHAT TYPE OF INFORMATION THEY REQUIRE HERE?	The wording with regard to 9.104 was updated in Amendment 8.
5185	The past performance information sheet requires the person filling it out to substantiate anything other than 5. This could limit ability to get a form filled out by your prime if using a contract where a sub. Would the gov consider easing this requirement to only negative scores?	No.

5218	"On Exhibit 2, Section 1, F. Period of Performance (including options) - is the "To: ___" date intended to reflect the end date only of exercised contract options, or should it show the end date of the last unexercised contract option?"	The "To: ___" date should reflect the end date of the last unexercised contract option.
5219	"On Exhibit 2, Section 1, F. Period of Performance (including options) - is the "From: _" date intended to reflect the end date only of exercised contract options, or should it show the end date of the last unexercised contract option?"	The "From: _" date should reflect the start date of the contract.
5227	For REP's for Category c: For Small Businesses (inclusive of first- tier subcontractors, if applicable): A total of three (3) 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. Would the government consider reducing the total value required for small businesses?	No.
5228	Volume 1 – Offer Volume: Category B: For HUBZone, VOSB, SDVOSB, WOSB, EDWOSB, 8a offerors. The solicitation states "A total of 2 different REPs for each of the mandatory experience technical areas shall be submitted." Does this mean that we need REPs to cover all 10 Mandatory Experience Technical Areas identified in Category B?	No. The Solicitation has been updated in an Amendment prior to Amendment 7 to read "A total of two (2) different REPs from different mandatory experience technical areas shall be submitted."
5230	Volume 1 – Offer Volume: Category C: For Small Business offerors. The solicitation states "A total of 3 different REPs from different mandatory experience technical areas shall be submitted." Does this mean that we only need REPs to cover 3 Mandatory Experience Technical Areas identified in Category C?	Yes.
5231	Volume 1 – Offer Volume: Category B: For HUBZone, VOSB, SDVOSB, WOSB, EDWOSB, 8a offerors. The solicitation states "A total of 2 different REPs from different mandatory experience technical areas shall be submitted." Does this mean that we only need REPs to cover 2 out of the 10 Mandatory Experience Technical Areas identified in Category C?	Yes.
5246	For REP's for Category c: For Small Businesses (inclusive of first- tier subcontractors, if applicable): A total of three (3) 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. As a small business, we are working to provide both REP and PPR references for Category B. We have performance that meets the annual value requirement for PP but does not meet the total contract value for the REP. Would this be acceptable to use? IF so, would the government consider an REP that is under the total value size but meets all other requirements as a PASS? If not, would that mean they would automatically get a FAIL is the total contract value isn't met?	The stated dollar values must be met for the provided REPs, Failure to meet the requirements of Phase I will result in disqualification of the proposal.

5267	<p>Page 104 : The solicitation states, "For HUBZone, VOSB, SDVOSB, WOSB, EDWOSB, 8a offerors (inclusive of first-tier subcontractors, if applicable): A total of 2 different REPs for each of the mandatory experience technical areas shall be submitted."</p> <p>Could the government please clarify that this statement does not suggest offerors need to submit 2 projects, with each project covering all 10 mandatory experience technical areas, but instead is asking for 2 projects that collectively cover all of the mandatory experience technical areas?</p>	The Solicitation has been updated in an Amendment prior to Amendment 7 to read "A total of two (2) different REPs from different mandatory experience technical areas shall be submitted."
5273	<p>The RFP states:</p> <p>"For Other than Small Businesses: A total of four (4) different REPs from different mandatory experience technical areas shall be submitted."</p> <p>"For Small Businesses: A total of three (3) different REPs from different mandatory experience technical areas shall be submitted."</p> <p>"For HUBZone, VOSB, SDVOSB, WOSB, EDWOSB, 8a offerors: A total of 2 different REPs for each of the mandatory experience technical areas shall be submitted."</p> <p>Question: Will the Government please clarify, that for HUBZone offerors, they are to submit a total of 2 REPs, and NOT 2 REPs for each mandatory experience technical areas (which would be a total of 20 REPs)? Would the Government update this question to say "for different mandatory experience technical areas" versus for "each"? All other categories says from different experience areas rather than for each.</p>	The Solicitation has been updated in an Amendment prior to Amendment 7 to read "A total of two (2) different REPs from different mandatory experience technical areas shall be submitted."
5274	RFP Reference A.4.1 and A.4.3: Please confirm there is no relation between how Relevant Experience Projects (Volume I) are evaluated in connection with how Past Performance references (Volume II) are evaluated.	Each Volume is evaluated separately as described in A.4.2- Phase One-Offer Volume (Certifications, Mandatory Experience/ Offerings, and NAICS Crosswalk) and A.4.3 Phase Two-Past Performance.
5293	The RFP states "The Offeror shall provide a REP from NASA contracts, other Government contracts, and/or commercial contracts." It also states: "Only projects with NAICS codes listed as in-scope for SEWP VI are to be submitted." Commercial projects do not have a NAICS code. Please add "if applicable" to the statement. Please clarify how the government will evaluate commercial contracts referenced in both Volume I and Volume II.	Amendment 8 removed the NAICS code wording with regard to REPs. Amendment 8 clarified that if a NAICS code of a referenced contract or award, does not exist or match the NAICS code being used for competition then the Offeror should describe how the work relates to the NAICS code being used for competition.
5295	Does the "NAICS code being used for competition" refer to the NAICS referenced in the SOW (NAICS 541512 for Categories B&C) or may relevant experience from any in-scope NAICS be used?	The "NAICS code being used for competition" refers to the NAICS code selected by the Offeror upon proposal submission which must match the one entered by the Offeror into the SF 1449.
5310	For offerors submitting under a JV or CTA, section A.3.7.1, fifth bullet, requires that "all of the proposal submission documents are in the name of the existing Joint Venture or prime." Does this restriction extend to documentation that is required to be provided by JV members/CTA subcontractors?	No, this restriction does not extend to documentation that is required to be provided by JV members/CTA subcontractors. The documentation should be provided in the name of the JV or prime contractor as specified .
5321	The solicitation language of "in no event can an offeror compete as a prime and as part of more than one joint venture or teaming arrangement per category" is ambiguous. Does this limitation apply to subcontractors that are not offerors?	No.

5322	Can the Government please clarify what is the font requirement for individual contract reference responses to the numbered items 1-12 of A.3.7.2 PAST PERFORMANCE VOLUME?	The proposal font requirement is: not smaller than 12-point type Times New Roman font exclusive of headers, footers, and any graphic captions. Text in Diagrams, schedules, charts, tables, artwork, and photographs shall be no smaller than 10-point type Times New Roman font.
5336	As a Joint Venture (JV) major Partner, we are performing on a contract. Please confirm that we can use this contract / project as one of the past performance contracts.	Yes, as a Joint Venture (JV) major Partner, you can use the contract/project as one of the past performance contracts.
5346	"An REP provided by an Offeror shall meet the mandatory experience technical area for the category being proposed..." How will the Government be verifying that a REP "meets" the technical area?	The Offeror must provide sufficient detail in Exhibit 1 to demonstrate the REP meets the technical area.
5348	We supported the same agency or customer as Prime contractor twice – we were awarded the follow-on contract. Each contract has two different contract / project numbers and two different periods of performance. Both are within the 3-year period from the solicitation release date. Are we allowed to submit these as two separate past performance Projects?	Yes, you are allowed to submit these as two separate past performance projects since they have different contract/project numbers and periods of performance.
5349	The evaluation of REPs as currently stated cannot be adequate given the current instructions for REPs. Would the Government please consider implementing one or more of the following options to make evaluations of REP relevance more accurate and verifiable? - Require inclusion of contract documentation, such as a statement of work, with tags or highlights showing the relevant portion of work - Require verification of relevance through a Project Verification Form signed by a POC with knowledge of the contract's execution (KO, COR, etc.) in a manner similar to verification of relevance for past performance references (as in Exhibit 2, Section 4) - Provide more detail and additional instructions as to how offerors are to demonstrate relevance when completing REP forms	The Offeror may supply whatever information they feel appropriate within the limit of 3 pages per REP.
5359	Does the requirement for "each proposal volume" to be submitted in a "single PDF file" mean that the proposal submission zip file contains three folders that each contain one PDF file and that all attachments to each volume are to be converted to PDF and included inline with each volume?	No. The solicitation has been amended to clarify the documentation instructions.
5366	As a Joint Venture (JV) major Partner, we are performing on a contract. Please confirm that we can use this contract / project as Relevant Experience project (REP) or contract.	Yes, as a Joint Venture (JV) major Partner, you can use the contract/project as a Relevant Experience project (REP) or contract.
5375	When addressing the "elements under FAR 9.104 to demonstrate responsibility", how are offerors to show they "have adequate financial resources to perform the contract, or the ability to obtain them" (FAR 9.104(a))?	The wording with regard to 9.104 was updated in Amendment 8.

5398	In SEWP V delivery orders were routed to pools of contract holders based on their Group and Business Designation. A small business set aside Delivery Order was routed to a pool of contract holders that were in the correct group with the correct small business designation. This allowed the individual contract holders to determine if they could respond as a small business based on the Delivery Order NAICS and any necessary NMR waivers. How will these pools be decided on SEWP VI? Based on Proposal submission (Category A, Group A2), Technical Area Exhibit 3a NAICS, or Exhibit 4 NAICS?	Offerors will be eligible for requirements at the Task Order level based on matching the NAICS and size requirement of the Issuing Agency.
5402	If a contractor's proposal submission selects Category A Group A2, but they are deemed to be a large business or other than small, will the proposal be accepted and they will be moved into the Category A Group A1 or will the proposal be deemed non-compliant and discarded?	If an offeror indicates they are small under their Proposal level NAICS code and submits their requirements based on the Small Business requirements and it is determined they are a Large business under that NAICS code, their proposal will be non-compliant.
5420	For OTSB, does the requirement to cover four content representative areas with a maximum of three past performance references require that at least one reference cover multiple areas?	Yes.
5447	Section A.1.42; page 71; The government defines Lateral/vertical on-ramp as "the reassignment of a contract holder from one group to another within a scope category because of change in size standard." Does this include when a Category C contract holder exceeds the size standard (upon rerepresentation event) and would like to "on-ramp" to Category B? If NO, will NASA consider a Lateral process from Cat C to Cat B?	No, the lateral on-ramp is only in reference to Category C contract holders. A Category B on-ramp process is a separate process as defined in A.1.42 ON RAMP ACTIVITY.
5454	The PPQ instructions state that section 6 is to be completed by the customer. Since the Offeror may be sending the PPQ to the customer before completing the rest of the proposal, it is possible that the customer may provide a different figure for total contract expenditures and average annual value, due to including or not including expenditures past a certain date, depending on when the form is completed. Section A.3.7.2 requires offerors to identify "the date in which the expenditures have been incurred through", but the PPQ form does not. Would the Government please provide a place on the form for the customer to provide this date, to ensure any discrepancy between Volume II and the PPQ is not an issue?	It is recommended to include a note in the PPQ form requesting the customer to provide the date through which the expenditures have been incurred. This will help ensure consistency between Volume II and the PPQ.
5455	If an Offeror sends a PPQ to its Government customer in a timely manner but the customer does not submit the PPQ to the Government on time, Offerors will be disadvantaged by the actions of the Government. Instead of requiring PPQs to be received by the Government by the solicitation deadline, could offerors instead provide proof that PPQs for Federal Government references were sent to the Government POC two weeks before the solicitation deadline?	NASA may follow-up with customers for any questionnaires that are not returned by the due date, are incomplete or unclear.

5460	For subcontracts, commercial contracts, and contracts performed for a non-federal government entity, or other references where no NAICS code has been assigned, may offerors list the NAICS code that most closely matches the services performed?	Yes.
5474	In this section, it indicates that Offerors identified as an Other Than Small Businesses in Category B shall provide past performance references showcasing relevant work in at least four (4) content representative areas for content to be rated relevant (Pertinent). If the response to question above indicating that four Relevant Experience Project (REP) must address a minimal number of Category B- Mandatory Experience Technical Areas, must the past performance examples reflect the same number Category B- Mandatory Experience Technical Areas identified in the four Relevant Experience Project (REP)?	No. There is no relationship between the Relevant Experience Projects and the Past Performance references.
5506	Please explain how Offerors should address all the elements under FAR 9.104 to demonstrate responsibility. What specific items is the Government looking for in our response?	The wording with regard to 9.104 was updated in Amendment 8.
5510	Section A.3.7.1(b); page 103; The government states..."For joint ventures, the Offerors shall provide the work done and qualifications held individually by each partner to the joint venture as well as any work done by the joint venture itself." For a JV project in which the SEWP prime offeror is the lead member of the JV entity, please confirm the Total Contract Value and Average Annual Cost values are based on the entire JV project, inclusive of all JV members costs and expenditures. We contend this is similar to a prime project with subcontractors in which the TCV and Average Annual Cost is inclusive of subcontractor costs and expenditures.	Yes, the Total Contract Value and Average Annual Cost values for a JV project are based on the entire JV project, inclusive of all JV members' costs and expenditures.
5512	Please clarify the statement from the RFP that states "The offeror must provide past performance submissions as it relates to the NAICS code being used for competition". Does that mean that Offerors must show HOW the cited past performance is similar to one/more of the SEWP VI in-scope NAICS?	Yes, Offerors must show how the cited past performance is similar to one or more of the SEWP VI in-scope NAICS codes.
5521	Does certifying that our SAM.gov information is up-to-date satisfy the requirement to address all the elements under FAR 9.104?	The wording with regard to 9.104 was updated in Amendment 8.
5522	Past Performance Matrix- "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 project."; Is the Past Performance Matrix a requirement to be included with the Past Performance narrative or the Relevant Experience Project narrative? Would the Government clarify where this Matrix is expected to be included in proposals?	The matrix should be included with the Past Performance narrative.
5533	For mentor-protégé joint venture offerors, will the government please clarify what information for Relevant Experience Projects (REPs) and/or past performances, if any, must be submitted from the joint venture protégé in particular?	For mentor-protégé joint venture offerors, the Government requires the work done and qualifications held individually by each partner to the joint venture, the work done by the joint venture itself, or any combination of both.

5543	Section A.3.6 (B). Page 96 – Proposal Content and Page Limitations - the table indicates asterisks (*) under the Mission Suitability Volume for Category A – IT Solutions, Category B – IT Enterprise-Wide Solutions, and Category C – IT Services. Can the government please explain the significance of the asterisk in this table for these documents?	The asterisks were removed in Amendment 8
5546	On page 104 of RFP doc for Category B for HUBZone, VOSB, SDVOSB, WOSB, EDWOSB, 8a offerors - it states total of 2 different REPs for each of the tech areas with each must have minimum of \$4m in total contract. For Category C for HUBZone, VOSB, SDVOSB, WOSB, EDWOSB, 8a offerors - it states total of 2 different from different tech area with each must have a minimum of \$2m in total contract. Can the Govt pls change the wording to reflect "from different" versus "for each"?	The Solicitation has been updated in an Amendment prior to Amendment 7 to read "A total of two (2) different REPs from different mandatory experience technical areas shall be submitted."
5549	RFP A.3.7.2(a); For Volume II Past Performance, are past performance reference contracts required to be under the NAICS codes listed as in-scope for SEWP similar to the REP requirements?	The Offeror's past performance must be based on the NAICS code and associated business size the Offeror has identified for the Proposal submission for the given category.
5555	For the Past Performance Volume (A.3.7.2(a)), is Past Performance Matrix excluded from the page count?	No.
5558	Could you please explain the new requirement for Category C? Category C now has a threshold restriction of \$2 million per order (inclusive of options) for the 1st year of contract performance and \$10 million per order in the 2nd year of contract performance. Category C threshold restrictions are subject to removal beginning in the 3rd year of contract performance. Is this restriction for total contract value, e.g., if the contract has base year plus 4 option years, is the \$2 million only subject to the base year? Therefore, the total contract value could be \$2M base year plus \$2M for each option year for a total of \$10M. \$2M inclusive of option years is really quite limiting for small business. Also, most companies submitting relevant experience for Category C have already demonstrated that they have surpassed this low dollar threshold and this may hurt small business by not allowing them to participate in all contracts. We recommend that this new stipulation be removed (or at least revise the dollar amount so it is not so restrictive). Thanks for your consideration.	The Category C dollar threshold restrictions are mandated as part of OMB'S GWAC Designation for SEWP VI.
5563	Please confirm the table of contents for Vol I-III does not count against page count.	Yes.
5565	A.3.6.B; The Proposal Submission Table in Section A.3.6.B references a cover page and indices for Volumes II and III. Please define what indices are required since this is the only time a cover page is mentioned in the RFP instructions.	There is no requirement for a specific cover page and/or index. The Offeror determines whether to include them and what information they contain. Note that indexes and cover pages are not to be evaluated.
5571	Please confirm offerors can submit a Cover Page for Volumes I and II, in addition to Volume III, that is excluded from page count.	Yes.
5581	Is a separate Cover Page required for the Technical Approach Volume III-A and Management Approach Volume III-B? Or can offerors provide one Cover Page for Volume III?	Separate cover pages should be provided.

5598	The past performance document "Exhibit 2-PastPerfQues-SEWP VI.pdf" has all three category A, B and C. This will create lot of confusions for the evaluator. Is it possible to break this document into three documents related to each category? This will help us a lot, since we are going only for Category A and our customer are getting confused with questions related to B and C.	Exhibit 2 has been updated to clarify information concerning the 3 Categories.
5601	On page 100, it states to provide information addressing all elements under FAR 9.104 to demonstrate responsibility. Does this apply only to joint ventures?	No. This applies to all Offerors.
5604	Is there a limit on the number of first tier subcontractors or general subcontractors the offeror can propose?	No.
5605	"Contractors that are members of a joint venture/contract teaming arrangement and have a standalone award in a given category as a prime are prohibited from competing at the order level as both a prime offeror and as part of a joint venture/contract teaming arrangement." Please confirm that if we are awarded a Prime contract as a single Small Business entity and awarded a Prime contract through our Mentor/Protege JV that we must decide which entity to use when submitting for an individual Task Order proposal (cannot submit a Task Order proposal through both).	Yes.
5606	RFP, A.3.7.1 OFFER VOLUME, 4th bullet on page 98 – "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" - Are there any consequences / lowered ratings for disclosing the use of consultants, generative artificial intelligence, and/or subcontractors in the proposal preparation and their availability for the subsequent performance of the contract?	No.
5610	For Volume II Past Performance, are past performance reference contracts required to be under the NAICS codes listed as in-scope for SEWP similar to the REP requirements?	Each past performance submission must relate to the NAICS code selected upon proposal submission; i.e. being used for competition at the master contract level and recorded on the submitted SF 1449.
5617	The Proposal Submission Table in Section A.3.6.B references a cover page and indices for Volumes II and III. Please define what indices are required since this is the only time a cover page is mentioned in the RFP instructions.	The use of indices is at the Offeror's discretion and not a requirement.
5627	On page 93, can Company A submit a proposal under Category A and then form a CTA with Company B (with Company B acting as Prime) to submit under Category C, with some sharing of resources in this CTA?	Yes.
5630	Can a CTA created as Company A (SB) Prime + Company B (other than small) submit a proposal under Category C?	Yes.
5643	RFP A.3.7.2 states: "The offeror must provide past performance submissions as it relates to the NAICS code being used for competition." Please change "being used for competition" to say "listed as in-scope for SEWP VI" and confirm the NAICS requirement for A.3.7.2 means NAICS code on contract reference must match a NAICS code listed to the corresponding category in SEWP VI RFP A.1.34.	The Government will not change "being used for competition" to say "listed as in-scope for SEWP VI". The NAICS requirement for A.3.7.2 does not mean the NAICS code on the contract reference must match a NAICS code listed to the corresponding category in SEWP VI. It refers to the NAICS code that the Offeror used to be classified into the given category.

5645	<p>The current recency requirement of 3 years for prior experience and past performance experience is too restrictive and limiting to competition given the impact that COVID 19 had upon small business Government contractors throughout the past three years. We respectfully request the Government to extend the recency requirements for prior experience and past performance experience to 5 years. Extending the prior experience and past performance recency requirements to 5 years would benefit the Government by increasing competition with qualified and proven vendors. This would also benefit small businesses by alleviating pandemic impacts through increased opportunity to participate and compete in Government procurements such as this one.</p>	The solicitation will remain as stated.
5658	Will the Government confirm that each Volume should be submitted as 1 pdf file with bookmarks for each required element (including the excel spreadsheets)?	No. The solicitation has been amended to clarify the documentation instructions.
5660	<p>RFP. Page 104 - For category B – the RFP states - “For HUBZone, VOSB, SDVOSB, WOSB, EDWOSB, 8a offerors (inclusive of first- tier subcontractors, if applicable): A total of 2 different REPs for each of the 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” Is this a Typo since this would suggest submission of 20 REP’s if the requirement is to submit 2 different REPs for each of the mandatory experience areas. Please clarify.</p>	The Solicitation has been updated in an Amendment prior to Amendment 7 to read "A total of two (2) different REPs from different mandatory experience technical areas shall be submitted."
5673	<p>A.3.7.1 OFFER VOLUME, (b) Mandatory Experience/ Offerings (Page 101 – 105).</p> <p>General Clarification for Offerors regarding any constraints on Relevant Experience Project (REP) for mandatory experience.</p> <p>Please confirm that REPs are not subject to the “completed or ongoing within three (3) years of the solicitation” requirement. If so, we recommend that this requirement be extended to five (5) years as this has been a standard for other IDIQs and the significant delay in the release of the solicitation is resulting in challenges with the number of Offeror available qualified projects.</p>	As stated in the solicitation: " Offerors shall furnish relevant experience projects that are completed or ongoing within three (3) years of the solicitation release date to be considered recent."
5677	<p>A.3.7.2 PAST PERFORMANCE VOLUME (Page 105)</p> <p>General Clarification for Offerors regarding the requirement for past performance to be “completed or ongoing within three (3) years of the solicitation”</p> <p>We recommend that the government extend this requirement to five (5) years as this has been a standard for other GWACs/IDIQs and the significant delay in the release of the solicitation is resulting in challenges with the number of Offeror available qualified projects.</p>	The solicitation will remain as stated.

5683	<p>A.3.7.2.(b) Prior Customer Evaluations (Past Performance Questionnaires):</p> <p>(PP 110, first Paragraph).</p> <p>The offeror shall provide the questionnaire provided as Exhibit 2 to this RFP for each of the above references to establish a record of past performance. ... "Only one questionnaire is required per past performance reference."</p> <p>If proposing in more than one category, may the offeror use the same questionnaire across each category?</p>	Yes.
5684	What if the customer doesn't return the past performance questionnaire on time - how will that affect the past performance evaluation?	NASA may follow-up with customers for any questionnaires that are not returned by the due date, are incomplete or unclear.
5690	<p>Statement: This section shall include a discussion on the staff, resources and processes planned or in place to handle requirements that can be expected to be more than 100 requirements in a day for Category A and ten requirements in a day for Category B and C.</p> <p>Question: Does this imply that offerors must acknowledge each opportunity posted within each awarded Category, and indicate that we will be bidding or not bidding?</p>	No.
5694	For Categories B2 & C1 - Will all entities that receive an award, regardless of socio-economic category status, be put in the same group? Reason is because SB need 3 REPs; socio-economic eligible firms only need 2. We plan on having a company respond as an 8a offeror with 2 projects, but they could also qualify as a SB and provide 3 REPs. Just checking if there is a difference and I don't want to short ourselves of not proposing on something we qualify for. The recent GSA OASIS+ GWAC has separate areas for Total Small Business (TSB) and the socio-economic categories, and offerors could submit and receive an award in each it qualifies for.	Entities that receive an award will be placed in the same Category in which they proposed (Category A, B or C). All Contract holders within that RFQ's Category (i.e. Category A, B or C) that meet the NAICs code and set-aside (or unrestricted) status and any other requirements of an Issuing Agency will be eligible to see and respond to the Issuing Agency's RFQ.
5705	Please confirm that a SEWP V single-award Agency Catalog qualifies as a single contract.	A SEWP V single award agency catalog does not qualify as a single award contract.
5709	Should offerors have to provide this experience in the Offer Volume or in the Past Performance volume?	The reference is unclear and therefore cannot be responded to.
5710	<p>Statement: From Slide 30 of the SEWP VI Industry Presentation on June 4 - Only One (1) proposal per category submission; not one proposal that can be used for submitting in all category</p> <p>Question: Can offerors use the same Past Performance project for both Categories B and C? If yes, how should offerors reference this if they are responding to both Categories B and C?</p>	Yes. Each proposal is separately submitted, so the Offeror must ensure the information is provided in both proposals
5715	In the proposal submission table, is the Proposal Submission Table an exhaustive list of the files to be included with the response?	No.

5716	In the proposal submission table, for Volume III (Mission Sustainability Volume), please confirm that "Technical Approach Volume III-A" and "Management Approach Volume III-B" should be subfolders within the Volume III folder.	Yes.
5720	Section A.3.6, Section (B) PROPOSAL CONTENT AND PAGE LIMITATIONS includes a Proposal Submission Table that outlines the proposal components and page limitations for each Volume and section of the proposal submission. This table includes components of proposal submissions across Categories A, B, and C, and for Small Business and Other Than Small Businesses. Not all elements are applicable to all Categories or Size Standards. Will the government provide a unique Proposal Submission Table for EACH category and size standard?	Where a listed Tab, or Volume is not applicable to the Category for that Offeror's proposal, the Offeror should ignore that item.
5726	Section A.3.7.1 requires that Offerors "Identify and consultants, generative artificial intelligence, and/or subcontractors used in writing this proposal..." How should this information be submitted to the Government? What proposal section and format should be used for this submission. Is there a page limitation for this information?	The information can be provided as part of the cover letter and should be brief and succinct.
5729	Section A.3.7.1 requires that Offerors "Identify and consultants, generative artificial intelligence, and/or subcontractors used in writing this proposal..." Are Offerors required to disclose the use of generative artificial intelligence for the development and refinement of graphics?	Yes.
5730	Please verify that offerors are not restricted to submitting only 50 CLINs.	Yes, the offeror can propose more than the minimum number of CLINs. However, CLINs will not be reviewed or evaluated and will only be utilized to establish the initial Contract Database of Record upon Contract award.
5738	For Past Performance Questionnaires being submitted for the same project as a Prime and a member of a Joint Venture, can the same document with both Category B and Category C be filled in for the response?	Yes.
5742	Paragraph one states, "Only one proposal per group for each 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. 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." Please clarify that an MPA JV can submit a proposal in Category B as a small business and that the mentor in that MPA JV can submit a proposal in a large business JV in Category B (in the large business category). In other words, we interpret scope category to mean for example, Category B small business and Category B large business are different scope categories. Our rationale is that JVs are completely separate entities with no direct association to each other.	The meaning of scope categories is the three categories: Category A, Category B and Category C.

5744	In section A.3.5, the solicitation states that, "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." IT services companies that qualify as small businesses rarely provide breadth and depth across all of the Technical Areas included within Category B and Category C. Teaming is critical for Small Business Offerors to provide the breadth needed to be a successful SEWP VI contract holder and provide access to IT service providers across all Technical Areas. Limiting qualified service providers to a single CTA position within a Category greatly limits prospective small business Offerors ability to build a high performing teams. Will the government allow companies to serve as a CTA subcontractor to multiple Prime Offerors within a Category to provide breath and depth across all Technical Areas?	No.
5750	Background: On April 21, 2023, the United States Court of Federal Claims protest decision regarding SH Synergy, LLC and VCH Partners, LLC v. U.S., Case Nos. 22-1466 and 22-1468, for Polaris GWAC Program Small Business Pool under Solicitation No. 47QTCB22R0001 stated that GSA's decision not evaluate price at the IDIQ level under the Polaris Solicitations violates federal procurement statute 41 USC § 3306(c) which requires agencies to "include cost or price to the Federal Government as an evaluation factor that must be considered in the evaluation of proposals" except "If an executive agency issues a solicitation for one or more contracts for services to be acquired on an hourly rate basis ... the contracting officer need not consider price as an evaluation factor for contract award." Question: Upon review of the Final RFP, it appears that the Government improperly excluded Price as an Evaluation Factor at the IDIQ Level as there is no Price Volume included in the RFP. Based on the above referenced cases, can the Government clarify if an Offeror should submit a Price Volume and if so, provide instructions for what is required (Price Narrative, Labor Categories, Page Limitations, Volume Number, how Prime Offerors versus Joint Venture Offerors shall submit, etc.)?	The stated ruling is not applicable to NASA.
5755	A line in RFP Section A.3.7.2 states that the offeror "must provide past performance submissions as it relates to the NAICS code being used for competition." Can the Government please clarify and confirm whether this provision requires offeror's past performance contract example to be awarded under the in scope NAICS Codes cited in RFP Section A.1.34?	No. "The NAICS code being used for competition" refers to the NAICS code entered on the Offerors SF1449 and selected at the time of the proposal upload.
5758	Please confirm the Meaningful Relationship Commitment Letters should be included as separate files and not appendices within this file.	Yes.
5763	Will the Government please clarify their definition of "consultants" when referencing the need for identification in this volume?	Consultants are businesses entities or individuals who the Offeror consulted with in preparing the proposal.

5771	A.3.7.2 states, "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 (Five Hundred Thousand) for size to be rated relevant (pertinent)." Section A.1.2 GSFC 52.211-91 SCOPE OF WORK (FEB 2016) states, "Category C has a threshold restriction of \$2 million per order (inclusive of options) for the 1st year of contract performance and \$10 million per order in the 2nd year of contract performance." Assuming a standard five-year service task order, the \$500,000 average annual value totals more than the Category C year one maximum of \$2 million. Would the government consider lowering the average annual value to align to the \$2 million year one task order maximum (\$400,000 annual value)?	No. The solicitation will remain as stated.
5774	The RFP states, "A contractor can compete for a SEWP VI contract using any of the eligible in-scope NAICS for the category in which they are competing and are not beholden to using NAICS 541512- Computer Systems Design Services. The use of NAICS Code 541512- Computer Systems Design Services in Category B and C or NAICS 541519 footnote 18- IT Value Added Reseller in Category A are for administrative purposes only." If my company is small under NAICS 325910 (750 employees) but considered large under NAICS 541519e (150 employees), should I follow the small business proposal instructions/minimum requirements or do I have to meet the minimum proposal requirements of a large business for Category A?	The Offeror should follow the size standard based on the NAICS code and business size selected during proposal submission and entered in the SF 1449.
5786	· Is the assessment of past performance relevancy based on qualitative descriptions or quantitative metrics?	The assessment of past performance relevancy is based on both qualitative descriptions and quantitative metrics dependent on the information provided by the Offeror.
5787	Prime Offerors shall furnish the information requested below a minimum of one (1) but no more than three (3) of your most recent similar contracts that are completed or ongoing within three (3) years of the solicitation release date to be considered recent. 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). Will the Government please confirm that the Offeror may provide past performance information for contracts that have been performed for at least six months?	Yes.
5788	"The RFP states: ""Subcontractors from Other Than Small Businesses that creates a CTA will not be evaluated."" What does this mean?"	The referenced wording has been removed from the solicitation.

5789	<p>"The RFP states: The ""...format for each proposal volume shall parallel, to the greatest extent possible, the format of the evaluation factors and subfactors contained in this solicitation.""</p> <p>As the RFP only cites subfactors, what are the ""factors""?"</p>	An example of a factor is Mission Suitability.
5791	<p>"The RFP states: The ""...format for each proposal volume shall parallel, to the greatest extent possible, the format of the evaluation factors and subfactors contained in this solicitation.""</p> <p>As the RFP only cites subfactors, what are the ""factors""?"</p>	An example of a factor is Mission Suitability.
5801	<p>When completing the information tab on this exhibit 3a, under business size: If the Offeror qualifies as a small business for some of the NAICS codes and a large business under others on the Exhibit 4 crosswalk, is the Offeror's business size considered small for its proposal submission and evaluated as such? Or is this size standard based only on the RFP Category NAICS of 541519e (footnote 18) on page 24 of the RFP?</p>	The business size is based on the NAICS code and business size selected by the Offeror upon proposal submission and entered into their SF1449.
5805	<p>If Offerors qualify as a small business under some NAICS codes and a large business under others, is the Offeror's business size considered small for its proposal submission and evaluated as such?</p>	The NAICS code and associated business size utilized by the Offeror for their proposal submission will be the size designation for the entirety of the proposal.
5816	<p>As there are multiple NAICS codes under each category for submission, and we are required during submission to select the applicable NAICS; considering the possibility to submit under multiple NAICS codes exists, can we submit under multiple, or do we choose one overarching NAICS? If multiple, do we need to have a different proposal volume for each NAICS as we do for each category?</p>	A company can only submit one proposal per category as a Prime.
5817	<p>A.3.5 does not address all scenarios that may be applicable within a Category and Group. For example, can a large business offeror who is a member of a small business (e.g., Mentor Protégé) Joint Venture proposing in Category C in Group C1 - Small Business Set Aside also propose as a first tier subcontractor/CTA to another Small Business Offeror proposing within Category C, Group C-1?</p>	There are no requirements in regard to indices. The information provided is at the discretion of the Offeror. Indices are used to improve readability and are not themselves evaluated.
5838	<p>A.3.7.1(b) Letter of Authorization (Pg 101) and Enclosure 1 SEWP VI Providers - Were the vendors listed on Enclosure 1 SEWP VI Providers vetted by the Government? At least one vendor has declined to issue LOAs to companies other than current partners, potentially limiting competition.</p>	No.
5843	<p>Section # A.3.7.1 (b) Pge # 103 Que: For Categories B and C can we use the same set of Projects as REPs and Past performances?</p>	Yes.
5847	<p>In bullet 2 of A.3.7.1 should the phrase "the NAICS code being used for competition" be replaced with "an in-scope NAICS listed in A.1.34"? Otherwise, how is a NAICS code for competition determined?</p>	No.

5853	<p>RFP / A.3.7.1 (c) Offeror NAICS Size Standard Crosswalk (Exhibit 4)</p> <p>SEWP V was based on a very stable NAICS / Size Standard combination (541519 / 150 employees) for contractors that enabled contractors to bid as a small and deliver throughout the POP of the contract as a small. This ensured that contractors could put processes and systems in place to be successful on the contract. With the inclusion of dollar-value sub-NAICS on SEWP VI, contractors have the potential of speeding through those size standards before they become truly proficient at handling those commodities. How does the SEWP PMO foresee reducing the risk of creating a churn of new contractors at those lower size standard sub-NAICS?</p>	<p>Contract Holders will continue to have the in scope NAICS codes and business sizes available for which they qualify as small businesses whether or not they become OTSB in certain NAICS codes.</p>
5856	<p>RFP A.1.42: This section states "NASA reserves the right to conduct on-ramp activity as needed". Does Government have any notional "on ramp" schedule in mind?</p>	No.
5859	<p>Is the protégé in an MPJV also obligated to provide past performance separately from the JV?</p>	No.
5861	<p>RFP A.3.7.1 Page 103 - Please confirm if a large business can utilize the Relevant Experience Projects (REPs) from its parent company, provided that the evidence is submitted through a Meaningful Relationship Commitment Letter.</p>	Yes.
5870	<p>General - Will the Government consider lowering the large business estimated/actual value threshold from \$30M per project to \$10M per project for the Relevant Experience Projects required for Volume I, to better facilitate participation from smaller-sized large businesses in this procurement?</p>	No.
5874	<p>(c) Exhibit 4</p> <p>When bidding Category A Small Business, please clarify what happens under the following scenarios:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •You are large under some sub-NAICS at the time of submission. What happens to those NAICS at award? Do you receive Unrestricted RFQs for those NAICS or not? •You are small under some sub-NAICS at the time of submission but while the proposals are being evaluated you become a large under them. What happens to those NAICS at award? Do you receive Unrestricted RFQs for those NAICS or not? •You are small under some sub-NAICS at the time of award but during the POP of the Master Contract you become a large under them. What happens to those NAICS during the remainder of the POP? Do you receive Unrestricted RFQs for those NAICS from that point on or not? •If the answer to any of the questions above is that you would not receive Unrestricted RFQs after you become a large under certain NAICS, will there be a process to do so? What is it? Does it have to be done at the time of submission? 	<p>All Contract holders within that RFQ's Category (i.e. Category A, B or C) that meet the NAICS code and set-aside (or unrestricted) status and any other requirements of an Issuing Agency will be eligible to see and respond to the Issuing Agency's RFQ.</p>

5886	While we understand the government's desire to ensure past performance relates to the requirements of SEWP, the method by which that will be determined in the review process is not clear. Request the government provide the process metrics it will use to determine of past performance relevancy.	The Government will evaluate past performance relevancy based on the type and complexity of services or work in comparison to the requirements of the solicitation. The evaluation will consider customer satisfaction, contract data, and other performance factors such as technical, schedule, cost, and management requirements.
5895	Could Government please confirm that each Contractor will choose its own NAICS code?	Yes.
5905	Is it the Government's intent to organize Past Performance requirements that are excluded from the page count to be structured within the means of an Appendix?	No.
5910	Could the Government clarify the requirement "as it relates to the NAICS code being used for competition", given the NAICS Crosswalk that offerors are required to submit? Are Offerors allowed to use orders off any NAICS on the Crosswalk?	As stated in the RFP: "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". Therefore, Offerors are not allowed to use orders off any NAICS on the Crosswalk.
5934	For Category B and C, will the Government please confirm that REPs can include single specific task orders issued under a single-award IDIQ?	Yes.
5939	If an Offeror is bidding as a Small Business Prime and a separate bid as a Mentor/Protege JV, can we use the same REPs for both submissions? Can we use an REP performed through our JV on the Small Business Prime submission?	Yes.
5944	This information looks very similar to the information in the Past Performance Questionnaire. Is "Information from the Offeror" intended as a separate submitted document from the Past Performance Questionnaire?	The Rep information in Volume I is separate from the information provided for Past performance in Volume II.
5945	Solicitation section A.3.7.2(b) states "The questionnaire respondent shall be a representative from the technical customer and/or responsible Contracting Officer with direct knowledge of your firm's performance." If the person with direct knowledge of our firm's performance is no longer at the agency and due to personnel turnover no current employees are familiar, can we have the respondent most familiar with our work submit the PPQ?	Yes.
5946	May the Offeror submit individual Task Orders performed under a single-award IDIQ as past performance references? The Government states that a single-award IDIQ can be submitted at the contract level as a single past performance reference, and we want to ensure this is not mandated for all single-award IDIQs.	Yes.

5949	<p>REFERENCE TEXT: "Subcontractors may submit their required proposal information separately using the instructions in this provision. The Offeror shall ensure subcontractor submissions are made no later than the date and time specified for proposal submission and comply with all solicitation instructions."</p> <p>QUESTION: What, if any, proposal information may be submitted separately by subcontractors? If there is proposal information that may be submitted by subcontractors, is the SEWP VI RFP Application configured to accommodate proposal information being submitted separately by subcontractors?</p>	The Solicitation has been updated to remove the reference to subcontractor submissions.
5954	<p>REFERENCE TEXT: "Only one proposal per group for each 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."</p> <p>QUESTION: Is this prohibition applicable at the Category-level or is it applicable at the "Group" level within each Category?</p>	The prohibition is at the Category level.
5955	A.3.7.3 MISSION SUITABILITY VOLUME, (b), (2) Commitment to Sustainability: Is this required for Small Business offerors?	Yes.
5959	RFP Section A.3.7.1(b): If the same contract cannot be utilized for both the Relevant Experience Project (REP) and Past Performance requirements, please explain the rationale for this as many Small Businesses may not have enough qualified contracts/projects to meet the requirements otherwise?	The same contract can be used for REPs and PPs.
5960	Does NASA limit the total contract value of task orders in Category C's first two years? This could disincentivize SEWP VI's utility and marketability.	The Category C dollar threshold restrictions are mandated as part of OMB'S GWAC Designation for SEWP VI.
5963	The RFP states that "The offeror must provide past performance submissions as it relates to the NAICS code being used for competition." Can the Government please confirm that "the NAICS code being used for competition" means the Past Performance examples must be contracts under the in scope NAICS codes cited in RFP Section I.A.1.34?	No. "The NAICS code being used for competition" refers to the NAICS code entered on the Offerors SF1449 and selected at the time of the proposal upload.
5973	The RFP states two bids per category (one prime, one CTA). What about two CTAs and no prime bids?	No. Only one CTA proposal is allowed.
5974	<p>REFERENCE TEXT: General</p> <p>QUESTION: Please confirm that companies without an ISO 9001:2015 and/or CMMI certification are eligible to participate in the NASA SEWP VI GWAC procurement as a first-tier subcontractor.</p>	Yes.
5976	Can the same joint venture (JV) act as a bidder on Category B small or Category C and a subcontractor with another team within the same category?	Yes.

5979	<p>REFERENCE TEXT: "A total of 2 different REPs for each of the mandatory experience technical areas shall be submitted."</p> <p>QUESTION: Please confirm that the referenced text is intended to read "A total of two (2) different REPs from different mandatory experience technical areas shall be submitted."</p>	The Solicitation has been updated in an Amendment prior to Amendment 7 to read "A total of two (2) different REPs from different mandatory experience technical areas shall be submitted."
5981	<p>REFERENCE TEXT: "The offeror must provide past performance submissions as it relates to the NAICS code being used for competition."</p> <p>QUESTION: Must offerors provide past performance submissions as it relates to the two (2) NAICS Codes that are being used for competition purposes or must offerors provide past performance submissions as it relates to any of the in-scope NAICS Codes cited at RFP Section A.1.34?</p>	Each past performance submission must relate to the NAICS code selected upon proposal submission; i.e. being used for competition at the master contract level and recorded on the submitted SF 1449.
5985	<p>REFERNECE TEXT: General</p> <p>QUESTION: Please clarify which, if any, of the proposal or post award submissions/certifications also need to be submitted by first tier subcontractors (ie. Climate Change Risk Management Plan, SCRM Plan, Diversity, Equity, Inclusion, and Accessibility Plan, etc.), and which only need to be submitted by the Prime offeror.</p>	Unless otherwise stated in the Solicitation, there is no requirement for first tier subcontractors to submit documentation.
5997	Could you please clarify how the proposals will be evaluated (manually or using any software)?	The Government will utilize software and manual tools and processes.
6010	It states, 'Each volume of the proposal shall specify the evaluation criteria being addressed and contain a table of contents aligned with the RFP evaluation criteria. This table of contents is excluded from the page limitations contained in paragraph (b)(1) below.' Does this mean we need to include two tables of contents? If yes, will both be counted against the page limit?	Two table of contents should be provided and are excluded from the page count.
6018	Can we use an in-progress contract as past performance or REP?	Yes.
6020	It states, 'An Offeror may submit a single award IDIQ/BPA at the contract/agreement level as a single past performance reference. However, Offerors are not permitted to submit a multiple award or GWAC as an individual past performance reference.' Does this mean only awarded TOs or contracts can be used as past performance, not the contract vehicle itself?	Yes.
6047	Section A. 3.6 Proposal Preparation - general instructions, part (A), states "Each proposal volume shall be submitted in a SINGLE searchable adobe portable document file..." however the example shows multiple files that would support a single volume submission. Does the government expect submission of only three (3) files, one file for volume I inclusive of all required attachments, one file for volume II inclusive of all required attachments, and one file for volume III inclusive of all required attachments?	The solicitation has been amended to clarify the documentation instructions.
6059	Could Government clarify the requirement that "each volume of the proposal shall specify the evaluation criterion being addressed" if the Technical Approach and Management Approach are to be two documents in the Mission Suitability Volume?	Yes. This refers to the requirement that the Technical and Management Approach responses be provided as two documents.

6062	Section A.3.7.2 Past Performance (b) pg. 109 requires at least four content representative areas for content to be rated relevant. Can the Offeror use all three past performance references to cover the required four or must each past performance cover four representative areas?	The Offeror should use all three past performance references to cover the required four content areas.
6064	Would Government clarify whether the Technical Approach and Management approach are preferred to be two distinct documents in the Mission Suitability Volumes folder?	They should be two documents.
6068	Do we have to submit the PAST PERFORMANCES as per the relevant NAICS codes	The NAICS code used for the Past Performance reference is required to relate to the NAICS code used to compete as noted on the SF1449.
6074	In regards to Categories B & C, the RFP states: "For Small Businesses (including prime small business offerors and first tier Subcontractor, if applicable): A total of three (3) different REPs from different mandatory experience technical areas shall be submitted" - Is the government just asking for three total REPS for three total areas (one mandatory technical area each) or can each REP demonstrate relevance to multiple technical areas for each Category?	The requirement is for three total REPS for three total areas (one mandatory technical area each).
6084	The RFP states that: "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." - In this case, it is possible that if a company participates in one bid as a prime contractor and in another as a subcontractor, the same REP or Past Performance can be used for both bids without affecting the proposal evaluation or being considered as a duplication or replica of another proposal, thus not being grounds for disqualification?	Proposals from related companies, whether as subcontractors, CTAs, mentor protégés, etc. are not considered duplicative.
6108	Is the NAICS codes crosswalk evaluated for each subcontractor or globally for the prime?	No. the crosswalk is only used post award for establishing the NAICS codes and business sizes a contract holder is eligible for at the task order level.
6120	Our company is a Small Business (SB), HUBZone, and WOSB proposing in Category C. If we have to submit a different proposal for SB, HUBZone, and WOSB, may we use the same REPs for each proposal, or must they all be different?	Companies can only submit one proposal for Category C as a Prime.
6132	(pg 98) A.3.7.1 OFFER VOLUME, Offeror's subcontracting plan - Please confirm that for other than small business, we are required to submit our Commercial Subcontracting Plan as described in A.1.32 SMALL BUSINESS SUBCONTRACTING PLAN AND REPORTS.	The solicitation has been updated to allow for submission of either a commercial or individual subcontracting plan.
6147	(pg 109) relevant past performance information matrix - Can the government please confirm that the past performance matrix is excluded from page count under Past Performance Volume II Section (a).	No. The matrix is included in the page count.
6150	SECTION TITLE: RFP A.3.7.1(c) QUESTION: This section states that a contractor can compete for a SEWP VI contract using any of the eligible in-scope NAICS for the category in which they are competing. Does it mean we can use NAICS code 541512 for category A?	Yes.

6154	The final RFP cover letter states: "The anticipated contract award date is October 2024, with a May 1, 2025, contract effective date. Place of performance will be determined at the order level." However, the Government presented a slide at the June 4, 2024 Virtual Webinar that showed "May 1, 2025: Award." When will the contract be awarded, and what is the contract effective date?	The Government will provide information on sam.gov on the SEWP VI timeline as it is determined.
6163	Does the Government intend for Offerors to cover the required number of Content Representative Areas (i.e., Category B, Small Business, 3 content representative areas) per past performance reference or in the aggregate of the references?	The requirement is to show relevance in the content areas in total of all past performance projects included in response.
6165	Could an offeror use a collection of task orders as a single Phase I REP if they can demonstrate that the Task Orders were option years on the same project? For example, if the offeror was awarded a single-award IDIQ and the customer issued a new task order each year to support the same agency and provide the same work rather than being awarded a single five year award, could offerors use this experience as a single REP?	Yes.
6167	A Small Business is currently working with the SBA for an 8a Cert and WOSB Cert, can we select these options if we do not have the awarded certification at the time of submission? or do we have to have the Cert awarded at the time of submission?	The cert must be awarded at the time of submission.
6173	Attachment G refers to the DEIA as TBS (To Be Submitted) for Categories B and C. Is the plan submission applicable to the team members/ subcontractor companies or only the prime contractors?	Attachment G is a post-award document that is applicable to the Contract Holder.
6176	The Government states, "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. More than one Offer, e.g., proposal, from a Corporate Structure may be submitted if an Offeror is NOT sharing proposal evaluation elements and/or committing resources from other entities by way of a Meaningful Relationship within a Corporate Structure." Does this mean that a mentor could support multiple JV bids as long as they provide different evaluation elements?	No.
6177	Can large businesses provide relevant experience projects and/or past performance in support of a small business bid if they are not bidding as a joint venture?	No.
6196	Can we can bid as prime on one category and form JV in the same category at same time?	Yes.
6197	Can we use a task order which was awarded as part of a single award IDIQ for REP submission?	Yes.

6203	RFP states that - Category B: For HUBZone, VOSB, SDVOSB, WOSB, EDWOSB, 8a offerors: A total of 2 different REPs for each of the mandatory experience technical areas shall be submitted. We assume this is a typo and only two REP's covering two mandatory experience technical areas shall be submitted. Please confirm	The Solicitation has been updated in an Amendment prior to Amendment 7 to read "A total of two (2) different REPs from different mandatory experience technical areas shall be submitted."
6207	Can the Past performance projects be the same as the REP's?	Yes.
6209	Can the Content representative areas of the PP's be the same for all three PP's or do they have to be different?	The content representative areas of the PPs can be the same for all three PPs as long as the required number of different content areas is met; e.g. a small business could cover the same 2 content areas in all three references, or cover one content area in one, a second content area in another and both content areas in a third; or any combination that meets the requirement. (revised response)
6213	Can we do Subcontracting with any Large Business on any of the Three Categories?	Yes.
6214	Can the Past performance projects be from State and local and commercial?	Yes.
6220	Does "indices" refer to table of contents, or does it mean something else?	The offeror can include a separate index or simply utilize a table of contents.
6231	<p>This question pertains to the submission of Relevant Experience projects and the government's definition of "duplication or replica".</p> <p>Consider this scenario: Offer is a subcontractor on Contract ABC and includes Contract ABC as a Relevant Experience Project. The Prime Contractor on Contract ABC also submits the same Contract ABC as a Relevant Experience Project in their SEWP Proposal.</p> <p>Given this scenario, are both our company and our Prime Contractor allowed to cite the same project as a Relevant Experience Project without it being considered a duplication or replica?</p> <p>If citing the same project does raise concerns of duplication or replica, what steps can we take to ensure that our submission is not deemed as such?</p>	REPs and Past Performance Questionnaires are not subject to the duplication section.
6245	For State / local/ Commercial Contracts, we don't have the contract number. Will Government except the REP without Contract number? What can we put instead?	The offeror should put the identifier that was used to identify and track the contract/order as the Contract Number.

6330	Referring to the Section: "A total of three (3) different REPs from different mandatory experience technical areas shall be submitted." As Small Business we plan to bid on Category C, Do we need to provide total three (3) different REPs for all the ten (10) Category C- Mandatory Experience Sub areas or we need to provide Three(3) different REPs for each of the ten (10) areas as below: - Network Services; Innovation Services; Information and Data Analytics Services (IDAs); Application Services/Software Development; Cybersecurity Services; Cloud Services; Digital Multimedia and Technical Communications Services; IT Operations and Maintenance / Help Desk/Call Center Support; Database Services; 10. In-Scope Training.	No. A total of three REPs should be submitted. Each of the three submitted REPs must demonstrate experience in one Technical Area and for each, the Technical Area must be different; i.e. 3 total Technical Areas represented in 3 REPs.
6332	Referring to section "A total of three (3) different REPs from different mandatory experience technical areas shall be submitted." We plan to bid as Small Business to bid on Category B, Do we need to provide total three (3) different REPs for all the ten (10) Category C- Mandatory Experience Sub areas or we need to provide Three(3) different REPs for each of the ten (10) areas as below: - Enterprise- Wide Net; IT Managed Services; Enterprise- Wide Innovation Services; IT Service Management; Enterprise Service Program Integration; Enterprise-Wide Information and Data Analytics Services (IDAs); Enterprise-Wide Application Services/Software Development; Enterprise-Wide Cybersecurity Services; Enterprise-Wide Cloud Services; Enterprise-Wide Digital Multimedia and Technical Communications Services	No. A total of three REPs should be submitted. Each of the three submitted REPs must demonstrate experience in one Technical Area and for each, the Technical Area must be different; i.e. 3 total Technical Areas represented in 3 REPs.
6336	Referring to the Section: "A total of three (3) different REPs from different mandatory experience technical areas shall be submitted." as Small Business we plan to bid on Category C, Do we need to showcase the three REPs wherein we have experience related all the ten (10) technical sub areas such as- Network Services; Innovation Services; Information and Data Analytics Services (IDAs); Application Services/Software Development; Cybersecurity Services; Cloud Services; Digital Multimedia and Technical Communications Services; IT Operations and Maintenance / Help Desk/Call Center Support; Database Services; 10. In-Scope Training.	No. A total of three REPs should be submitted. Each of the three submitted REPs must demonstrate experience in one Technical Area and for each, the Technical Area must be different; i.e. 3 total Technical Areas represented in 3 REPs.
6337	Referring to section "A total of three (3) different REPs from different mandatory experience technical areas shall be submitted." We plan to bid as Small Business to bid on Category B, Do we need to showcase the three REPs wherein we have experience related all the ten (10) technical sub areas such as- as below: - Enterprise- Wide Net; IT Managed Services; Enterprise-Wide Innovation Services; IT Service Management; Enterprise Service Program Integration; Enterprise-Wide Information and Data Analytics Services (IDAs); Enterprise-Wide Application Services/Software Development; Enterprise-Wide Cybersecurity Services; Enterprise-Wide Cloud Services; Enterprise-Wide Digital Multimedia and Technical Communications Services	No. A total of three REPs should be submitted. Each of the three submitted REPs must demonstrate experience in one Technical Area and for each, the Technical Area must be different; i.e. 3 total Technical Areas represented in 3 REPs.
6353	Is it required that the NAICS code used for the submitted Past Performance reference match the NAICS code for the proposed category?	The NAICS code used for the Past Performance reference is required to relate to the NAICS code used to compete as noted on the SF1449.

6371	A.3.7 Proposal Volume. The offeror must provide relevant experience as it relates to the NAICS code being used for competition. Please define what is meant by the "NAICS code being used for competition".	The "NAICS code being used for competition" refers to the NAICS code the offeror is using to compete under for the SEWP VI master contract as identified in the Offeror's SF1449 and during the upload of their proposal.
6377	Is any one technical area ranked higher than another?	No.
6397	The procedure for determining whether the prospective contractors and the subcontractors are responsible are set forth in FAR subpart 9.1 and NASA FAR Subpart 1809.1. Failure by the offeror to affirmatively demonstrate adequate compliance with the general standards of the prospective contractor responsibility at FAR 9.104-1, and any special standards established for this acquisition under FAR 9.104-2, will result in a determination of non-responsibility. Does the Contractor have to comply with the above mentioned FAR Standards? DO we need to provide acknowledgement and should it be updated on our Sam.gov account?	The referenced wording was removed in Amendment 8.
6399	Is the Mandatory Experience Exhibit to be a separate PDF file or included in Volume I?	The Mandatory Experience Exhibit should be included in Volume I of the proposal.
6402	The RFP states: "(3) Title pages, tabs, and tables of contents are excluded from the page counts specified in paragraph (1) of this provision (as well as other documents specified in table (b)(1) above)." Please confirm that a cover page is acceptable and is excluded from page counts.	Yes.
6406	If an offeror submits two separate proposals, one for themselves and one as a CTA, can the REPs and Past performances be used on both proposals?	Yes.
6411	Please confirm that a cover letter is permitted and excluded from volume page counts. If permitted, with which volume should the cover letter be submitted?	A cover page is permitted for each Volume and should be placed in the volume(s) in which it is intended.
6413	Are you wanting the full Reps and Certs completed or will Paragraph B - None suffice?	The RFP requires the completion of the full Representations and Certifications as part of the proposal submission. This includes all necessary fill-ins and acknowledgments as specified in the solicitation
6414	Do all companies seeking SEWP 6 approval require a commitment letter from Ability One, even if they're not registered under any of the NAICS codes with the asterisk?	The AbilityOne Commitment Letter is required if applicable. This means that if the offeror plans to subcontract with qualified nonprofit agencies for SEWP opportunities within identified NAICS Codes, the AbilityOne Commitment Letter must be included. If the offeror is not registered under any of the NAICS codes with the asterisk and does not plan to subcontract with AbilityOne agencies, the letter will not be required.
6429	Of the 8 Mandatory Technical Areas are any evaluated higher than another. Example; A LOA covering IT Computer Systems would rate higher than a LOA covering Imaging Equipment.	No. Exhibit 3a is only evaluated to ensure the Offeror has met the requirements in Section A.3.7.1(b) Mandatory Experience/ Offerings Category A.

6430	For REPs related to Category B (Other than Small Businesses), we have the following question: Given that commercial purchases are not executed in the same way that federal contracts and federal task orders are executed, can the government confirm that a set of commercial purchases for the same effort conducted under a single Master Services Agreement be considered the same as the purchase under "one contract"?	The RFP allows for the submission of a single award IDIQ/BPA at the contract/agreement level as a single past performance reference. However, multiple award or GWACs are not permitted as individual past performance references. Therefore, a set of commercial purchases conducted under a single Master Services Agreement can be considered the same as the purchase under "one contract" as long as it meets the criteria specified in the RFP.
6433	Per instructions it states 4 proposed minimum Technical areas. Can more than 4 be proposed?	The Government will only review and evaluate Exhibit 3a to ensure the requirements in A.3.7.1 OFFER VOLUME- CATEGORY INSTRUCTIONS; (b) Mandatory Experience/ Offerings are met in terms of the 4 required technical areas. Offerors may propose additional Technical Areas to be used in the initial load of the SEWP Database of Record post-award.
6434	Should Exhibit 3a (and 3b, 3c) be included within the Vol 1 PDF or as a separate attachment under the Volume 1 folder?	Yes.
6440	Can category C have Subcontractors? If yes, do the subcontractors need to submit past performances, relevant experiences, and past performance questionnaires?	Category C have Subcontractors. Subcontractors do not need to submit past performances, relevant experiences, and past performance questionnaires.
6451	Is this question on each of the individual Past Performances referenced or in general?	The evaluation of past performance will be based on the individual contract references provided by the offeror.
6487	An Offeror shall not be rated favorably or unfavorably if the offeror does not have a record of "recent" and "relevant" past performance or if a record of past performance is unavailable. In such cases the offeror will receive a "Neutral" rating. However, an offeror with favorable, recent, and relevant past performance that meets the average value as specified in A.3.7.2 may be considered more favorably than an offeror with no relevant past performance information. This statement is in conflict with A.4.1.2) Phase 2, please clarify. Request clarification of evaluation process for past performance. Are there any limits to the number of SEWP VI awards? Is the Government planning to award a specific number of contracts?	The RFP states that an offeror without a record of recent and relevant past performance will receive a "Neutral" rating and will not be rated favorably or unfavorably. However, offerors with favorable, recent, and relevant past performance that meets the average value specified in A.3.7.2 may be considered more favorably. This is consistent with the evaluation process outlined in A.4.1 Phase 2, where past performance is evaluated based on recency, relevance, and the overall confidence rating assigned to the offeror's past performance. The Government does not specify a limit to the number of SEWP VI awards and intends to award contracts to all qualifying offerors that meet the criteria.
6493	Section A.3.7.2 Past Performance Volume Section (a) Information from the Offeror P. 105 Past Performance for projects that have been under contract for six month from date of SEWP solicitation or SEWP proposal date?	The RFP specifies that 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. Only contracts with performance within three years from the solicitation release date will be evaluated.
6496	Exhibit 4 Crosswalk: Can you please clarify which NAICS codes are "in-scope" for each Category? Are they the NAICS codes located in Exhibit 4 NAICS Crosswalk?	Yes. They are the NAICS codes in Exhibit 4.
6499	Page 104 of RFP, Category C: For HUBZone, VOSB, SDVOSB, WOSB, EDWOSB, 8a, offerors: Can you please clarify the number of REPs to be submitted by 8 (a) companies? Do we submit a total of 2 REPs for mandatory areas in Category C?	Yes.
6527	Can an offeror use a combination of STNs that fall under one agency catalog to show total amounts needed for Cat B and Cat C?	No, an Offeror cannot combine orders from one agency catalog in SEWP V to meet the minimum requirements for REPs and Past Performance in Category B or C. Offerors should ensure that their submissions meet the requirements specified for each category.

6528	RFP, page 107, Does cost report mean fpdfs report?	The term "cost report" in the RFP refers to the financial reporting of expenditures incurred under a contract.
6529	Could the government clarify if information on the Relevant Experience Project (REP) form, including project descriptions and past performance details from a first-tier subcontractor, when used in another prime offeror's proposal, is exempt from the duplication requirements?	Yes.
6559	RFP Page 95, Explain what is meant by "appropriate bookmark similar to headings in a document"? How is this added in electronic format?	The RFP requires that electronic submissions be organized with appropriate bookmarks similar to headings in a document. This means that the PDF files should include bookmarks that correspond to the main sections and subsections of the document, making it easier for reviewers to navigate through the proposal.
6560	How does NASA plan to accommodate the evaluation of Mentor-Protege Joint Ventures in order to comply with 13 CFR § 125.8(e) which prohibits Government Agencies from evaluating Proteges by the same standard they evaluate "other offerors generally." Reference 4/21/2023 where the United States Court of Federal Claims issued a decision in the matter of SH Synergy, LLC and VCH Partners, LLC v. The United States; a pre-award bid protest of GSA POLARIS.	Evaluation procedures are addressed in Section A.4, Source Selection and Phased Evaluation, and will follow all applicable FAR and NFS guidelines.
6579	NASA's intent to enforce a threshold restriction under Category C seems to be in direct conflict of NASA FAR Supplement (NFS) Subpart 1819.201 in which NASA is committed to providing to SBs, VOSBs, SDVOSBs, HUBZone, SDBs, and EWOSBs, WOSBs concerns maximum practicable opportunities to participate in Agency acquisitions at the Prime Contract level.	The Category C dollar threshold restrictions are mandated as part of OMB'S GWAC Designation for SEWP VI.

6583	<p>REFERENCE: "Any proposal found to be a duplication or replica of another offeror (company) or have a section that is a duplication or replica of another offeror (company), that is not a part of a joint venture or contractor teaming arrangement, will lead to all identified offerors being ineligible for award."</p> <p>As a small business, we routinely engage consultants to assist in the development and description of management approaches, processes, and procedures we have adopted for corporate use and included in proposals. SEWP VI's ban on duplication of proposal text places offerors such as us in an untenable position due to the description of certain of our management related policies and procedures being in the hands of potential, unknown to us, SEWP VI offerors. As a small business, the ban on duplication of proposal text and the potential that another offeror will re-use text previously written by proposal consultants for multiple companies' other prior proposals will cause an undue financial burden by requiring us to disregard prior investments and allocate funds and resources to re-write descriptions and re-create graphics from scratch of our management-related approaches, processes, and procedures for proposal requirements such as GWAC, task order, quality, and risk management. This same potential for disqualification also exists for us and many other offerors who have teamed with other companies over the years and jointly developed and shared descriptions of approaches for standard management-related proposal requirements.</p> <p>Please consider removing the ban on duplication of proposal text to enable offerors to use their standard proposal language and graphics without fear that another offeror may have, and could use, the same language and graphics for portions of their SEWP VI proposal, thus causing their proposals to not be evaluated through no fault of their own.</p>	The Solicitation will remain as stated.
6608	<p>Suggest that NASA define the circumstances under which a "meaningful relationship" exists within a corporate structure, such as the following:</p> <p>"For the purposes of SEWP VI, a "meaningful relationship" exists within a corporate structure when at least one of the following conditions exists: An entity is a wholly owned subsidiary of a parent organization; An entity is a parent of a wholly owned subsidiary; An entity operates under a single internal operational unit; Operating structure between the entities includes internal organizational reporting lines and management chains for "lines of business" that operate across the formal corporate subsidiaries."</p>	The Solicitation will remain as stated.
6611	<p>"There shall be an LOA for each different designated provider for a maximum of four (4) LOAs." - Can an offeror only sell 4 product lines?</p>	No. The LOAs are in reference to the 4 designated providers. Offerors are also required to provide a minimum of 4 other alternate providers and may submit as many as they want to include.

6624	<p>"A total of 2 different REPs for each of the mandatory experience technical areas shall be submitted." - There are 10 mandatory experience technical areas listed for Category B for HUBzone, VOSB, SDVOSB, WOSB, EDWOSB, 8a so does that mean a total of 20 REPs with a total minimum value of \$80M need to be submitted? Should this be worded like Category A and C: "A total of 2 different REPs from different mandatory experience technical areas shall be submitted..."</p>	<p>The Solicitation has been updated in an Amendment prior to Amendment 7 to read "A total of two (2) different REPs from different mandatory experience technical areas shall be submitted."</p>
6627	<p>Ref RFP A.3.7.2 states: "The offeror must provide past performance submissions as it relates to the NAICS code being used for competition." Can the Past Performance Volume consist of past performance examples from contracts with other in-scope NAICS beyond the single NAICS being used for competition, to provide further experience examples in the required content representative areas?</p>	No.
6633	<p>To encourage increased Small Business competition, with the procurement office consider decreasing the REP total value requirements under category b and c?</p>	No.
6634	<p>Section I, Page 64: The RFP refers to Attachment H in reference to AbilityOne subcontractors, however this attachment is not among the solicitation documents. Recommendation: Please provide Attachment H or direct the offeror to its location.</p> <p>Section III, Page 101: If a provider (OEM) is also an affiliate, is a Letter of Authorization (LOA) and/or Meaningful Relationship Commitment Letter required? Recommendation: We suggest that if the OEM is an affiliate, neither letter should be required.</p> <p>Section III, Page 101: If a provider (OEM) can meet the requirements of minimum distinct and relevant CLINs for the primary technical area (1,000) and the other three non-primary proposed technical areas (100) does the provider require a designated provider from Enclosure 1? Recommendation: We suggest the RFP be amended such that if a provider (OEM) can provide at least 1,000 distinct and relevant CLINS for the primary areas and at least 100 for the other three non-primary technical areas, then a designated provider not be required.</p> <p>RFP Section A.3.7.1(b), pages 101 & 151: RFP Enclosure 1 "List of Providers to be used by Offeror as Designated Providers as explained in Section A.3.7.1. (b) Mandatory Experience""Category A: All Offerors shall complete Exhibit 3a- Category A Solutions Spreadsheet and propose technology solutions for any four (4) of the eight (8) Mandatory Technical Areas below and technical Area 9:" Question / Recommendation: In Exhibit+3a-+Category+A+ Solutions+</p>	<p>With regards to Attachment H: The AbilityOne Formal Agreement is Attachment H. Attachment H is to be provided post award by the contractor in coordination with Source America/National Industries for the Blind. Reference Solicitation A.1.35 AbilityOne Subcontracting for guidance. Attachment I- Commercial Small Business Subcontracting Plan (Other than Small Businesses) is to be provided by the contractor and what is provided will be incorporated into the contract as Attachment I. For guidance on Attachment I- Commercial Small Business Subcontracting Plan (Other than Small Businesses) reference FAR 52.219-9(g). In terms of the LOA, the solicitation will remain as stated. An LOA is required for the four designated providers. The designated provider requirements will remain as stated in the solicitation. The list of 1000 distinct and relevant CLINs from the designated provider only pertains to the designated provider for which we present the LOA and have designated as the primary provider.</p>

6637	An Unrestricted MAC with Small Business Set-Asides in addition to the threshold restriction imposed in Category C, will result in thriving and growing SBs to have dormancy in contract years for 1-2 and year 3 they may size out if unable to recertify at the Task Order level.	The RFP outlines that Category C has a threshold restriction of \$2 million per order (inclusive of options) for the 1st year of contract performance and \$10 million per order in the 2nd year of contract performance. Category C threshold restrictions are subject to removal beginning in the 3rd year of contract performance. These threshold restrictions are subject to removal beginning in the 3rd year of contract performance. This structure is designed to provide opportunities for small businesses to grow and compete effectively in the initial years while allowing for greater flexibility and scalability in subsequent years.
6648	Should the reference to "Exhibit 1- REP Template" be changed to "Exhibit 1 Relevant Experience Project Table"	Yes, the reference to "Exhibit 1- REP Template" is the same as "Exhibit 1 - Relevant Experience Project Table".
6663	AbilityOne seems to be backed up with access to vendors. Could the Government consider extending this due date by two months?	No.
6683	Please clarify if offerors should submit a subcontractor management approach as part of the management approach section?	Yes, if applicable.
6692	For Category B, For HUBZone, VOSB, SDVOSB, WOSB, EDWOSB, and 8(a) offeror, the requirement states that the offeror is to submit a total of 2 different REPs for "each" of the mandatory experience technical areas (of which there are 10). Stating one is to submit 2 REPs for "each" of the 10 technical areas means the requirement total is 20 REPS. Is the language meant to be the same instruction as for Category C HUBZone, VOSB, etc., in which the language reads "a total of 2 different REPs from "different" mandatory experience technical areas shall be submitted" Suggest changing the language for Category B from "each" to "different" to clarify this requirement.	The Solicitation has been updated in an Amendment prior to Amendment 7 to read "A total of two (2) different REPs from different mandatory experience technical areas shall be submitted."
6694	Reference RFP A.1.35 AbilityOne SUBCONTRACTING (pages 63-64) and A.3.7.1 OFFER VOLUME (page 98). In the best interest of encouraging technically qualified small businesses (SBs) to participate in SEWP VI, please remove the burden (cost, proposal, and contractual deliverable) requirement for SBs to provide a Subcontracting Plan and an AbilityOne Commitment Letter with their proposals. (The burden of SB participation and the laudable non-profit participation of AbilityOne should be borne by Large Businesses exclusively.)	The solicitation will remain as stated.
6702	In Category B, the minimum requirements say, "For HUBZone, VOSB, SDVOSB, WOSB, EDWOSB, 8a offerors (inclusive of first- tier subcontractors, if applicable): A total of 2 different REPs for each of the mandatory experience technical areas shall be submitted." The literal interpretation of this requirement would result in providing 20 REPs. This seems like a typo and should mirror the language of Category C requirement, which says, "For HUBZone, VOSB, SDVOSB, WOSB, EDWOSB, 8a, offerors (inclusive of first- tier subcontractors, if applicable): A total of 2 different REPs from different mandatory experience technical areas shall be submitted." Please confirm.	The Solicitation has been updated in an Amendment prior to Amendment 7 to read "A total of two (2) different REPs from different mandatory experience technical areas shall be submitted."

6704	<p>"All electronic submissions shall be searchable and not contain scanned documents, except those documents that must be provided in their native format (e.g., signature pages, prior award fee letters for past performance, DCAA/DCMA approval letters, as applicable).."</p> <p>Question: Would the Government please clarify?</p>	Proposals should be in readable PDF format unless they are in an original format that cannot be converted into a readable format.
6718	<p>Can you please clarify the requirement for "minimum average annual cost/fee incurred"? Specifically, how many years of reaching the "minimum average annual cost/fee incurred" threshold is required? Is that year measured in calendar years, i.e. "1/1/21 - 12/31/21" or is it measured in contract years, i.e. \$x million in annual cost/fee was incurred from day 1 of the contract award to day 365 of the PoP? How many years of meeting the threshold requirements for "minimum average annual cost/fee incurred" are required to qualify?</p>	Section A.3.7.2 states that offerors must provide at least one, but no more than three, of their most recent similar contracts, completed or ongoing, within three years of the solicitation release date. It also states that only contracts with performance within three years of the solicitation release date will be evaluated—no additional time requirements.
6742	Please clarify if offerors should submit a subcontractor management approach as part of the management approach section?	Yes, if applicable.
6751	Regarding JVs, is the Government viewing JVs in the same manner as CTA, thus requiring associated JV Agreements/documentation?	Yes, the Government views Joint Ventures (JVs) in a similar manner as Contractor Team Arrangements (CTAs).
6766	<p>Respectfully suggest that NASA use the following criteria and formula for calculating Average Annual Value:</p> <p>Criteria for determining Average Annual Value (AAV):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> > For COMPLETED PROJECTS, average annual value is determined by the TOTAL FUNDED DOLLARS (i.e., total obligated value). Completed projects with a period of performance of less than one year will not be annualized. > For ONGOING PROJECTS, average annual value is determined based on the TOTAL ESTIMATED VALUE (value inclusive of all option periods, regardless of completed/funded status; i.e., TOTAL CONTRACT VALUE). > ONGOING PROJECTS with a period of performance of LESS THAN ONE YEAR will not be annualized. <p>Formula for Calculating AAV:</p> <p>Total average annual value will be calculated by dividing the total project value by the total number of days of period of performance, and multiplying by 366.</p>	The solicitation will remain as stated.
6769	Can vendors use past performances and citations from previous bids?	Yes.
6771	Can we use references from previous proposal responses?	Yes.
6782	If we have a Government past performance that does not have a CPARS, how will that be rated? Will it be less than a PPQ with a CPAR?	Government past performance without a CPARS will still be evaluated based on the information provided, including past performance questionnaires and other relevant documentation. The absence of a CPARS does not result in a lower rating.
6783	For Average Annual Value, what is the end date we should use for calculating an ongoing project? If the due date is extended, do we need to get new PPQs signed? Also, if the "end date" is extended, it could potentially adversely affect the AAV of a project. Or should we use the date the PPQ is signed?	For calculating the Average Annual Value of an ongoing project, use the date through which the expenditures have been incurred. If the due date is extended, it is recommended to get new PPQs signed to reflect the updated performance period. The date the PPQ is signed can be used as a reference for the end date.
6792	In an SBA Mentor/Protégé Joint Venture, is there a minimum requirement for REP from the Protégé, or is it acceptable for all REPs to originate solely from the Mentor?	The Offeror shall demonstrate how the resources of the Mentor and Protégé companies will be provided or relied upon for contract performance.

6794	<p>Per A.1.42, the government defines lateral/vertical onramping as the “reassignment of a contract holder from one group to another within a scope category because of change in size standard” indicating that a “small business contractor must have outgrown their size standard based on natural growth, or through an approved novation agreement in recognition of a successor in interest when Contractor assets are transferred during the term of their SEWP Contract.” Given that the most likely mechanism for a well performing SB on SEWP to have a change in size standard and desire reassignment to an OTSB group and continue to provide strong support via the contract is the sale of stock in which recertification would be required but novation would not necessarily be involved, will the government add such a pathway as a specific process for lateral/vertical onramping?</p>	No.
------	---	-----