

Comment Id	Original Comment	Published Response
1658	Can the Government clarify for Exhibit 3b, if the offeror is only proposing labor rates, would the Government require all labor rates that offeror has or is this only applicable for the specific relevant experience projects	Amendment 8 removed Exhibit 3b from the solicitation.
1662	"Offerors proposing as a prime and as part of a joint venture may submit the same management approach...". Can parts of the Technical Approach be similarly reused?	Yes. Amendment 8 updated the solicitation to include the Technical approach in this section.
1663	"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" If the Joint Venture does not any work awarded to the Joint Venture yet, is it sufficient to only provide work of individual partners? Is it sufficient to only provide work of one individual partner?	Amendment 8 updated and clarified the wording in this section.
1664	Relevant Experience Projects (REPs) are allowed to be commercial contracts or subcontracts. The RFP requires for REPs to be only the projects with NAICS codes listed as in-scope for SEWP VI. However, commercial contracts typically do not have NAICS assigned to them. How should we demonstrate this mapping for commercial contracts? For subcontracts, should we map to the prime contract NAICS code?	Amendment 8 removed the reference to NAICS code with regard to REPs.
1672	Please confirm the companies are allowed to showcase capabilities and offerings of their subcontractors/teammates in the Mission Suitability/Technical Approach regardless of whether the prime a Small or a Other Than a Small business? And regardless of whether they are using that subcontractor Past Performance, as long as they have a document teaming arrangement?	Amendment 8 clarified the wording in A.3.7.3 MISSION SUITABILITY VOLUME in terms of teaming partners, subcontractors, and other business to business relationships.
1673	In order to allow for improved readability for the evaluators, we would propose using 10 point Arial Narrow in graphics, versus Times New Roman.	Amendment 8 clarifies that there is no requirement to use Times New Roman as long as the resulting font size is "no smaller than 10-point type Times New Roman font".
1689	The Government has provided fillable PDF forms for some but not all required response documents. For Exhibits 1 and 2, would the Government please provide either Word versions or fillable PDF versions of the files? Or alternatively is it permissible for offerors to create Word or fillable PDF versions of these files?	Exhibits 1 and 2 were updated in Amendment 7 and 8.
1691	Other NAICS Alignments, on Category C and Category B, if a Federal project can show alignment to different NAICS then the one listed in FPDS.gov, is that allowable and what method to explain the alignment such as perhaps Part III Project Description?	Amendment 8 clarified handling of referenced projects that do not match the NAICS code used for competition.
1692	"The offeror must provide past performance submissions as it relates to the NAICS code being used for competition." Does this mean offerors can only provide past performance that matches the NAICS under which they are bidding? Or does it mean that the past performance must match one (or more) of the NAICS codes included in Exhibit 4 that are relevant to the SEWP VI procurement?	The past performance references NAICS codes must relate to the NAICS code being used for competition. Amendment 8 clarified handling of referenced projects that do not match the NAICS code used for competition.
1712	Please provide evaluation criteria in A.4.4(b)(4) for Program Management A.3.7.3(b)(v) Section vi (page 113).	The referenced criteria was updated in Amendment 8.
1720	1) Is there a requirement for Category C regarding timeframe of projects which can be used for past performance? For example, the project would have needed to be performed within the last 5 years? 2) For category C, can we utilize any existing rates for purposes of proposing labor category rates OR are our proposed rates required to map to our existing customers?	1- Past Performance Projects must be completed or ongoing within three (3) years of the solicitation release date. 2- Exhibit 3c was removed from the solicitation in Amendment 8.
1754	"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." Two REPs for "EACH" of the mandatory experience technical areas suggest that offerors submit 20 REPs for Category B. Should this read the same as the instructions for Category C? "A total of 2 different REPs from different mandatory experience technical areas shall be submitted."	The solicitation was updated on Amendment 8 to clarify that, in this example, only a total of 2 REPs are required.
1774	The RFP states "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." When proposing as a prime and as part of a joint venture within the same Category may we submit the same technical approach?"	Yes. Amendment 8 updated the solicitation to include the Technical approach in this section.

1778	<p>(B) Proposal Content and Page Limitations (Pg 95) states "Each proposal volume shall be submitted in a single searchable PDF file with appropriate bookmarks to at least the section header. Spreadsheets shall be converted to PDF, in the most readable manner practicable, and submitted as part of a single PDF file." The RFP Cover Letter states "proposal shall include completed exhibits in MS Office Excel format with working cell formulas."</p> <p>Please confirm that spreadsheets should be in MS Office Excel format with working cell formulas.</p>	<p>Amendment 8 clarified that Exhibits 3a, 4 and 5 should be submitted as MS Office Excel format with working cell formulas.</p>
1788	<p>Reference: A.3.7.1 Offer Volume (page 98 and 103 of 151) and A.3.7.2 Past Performance Volume (page 105 of 151)</p> <p>Many multiple award contract vehicles utilizes an umbrella NAICS code that does not fully encompass and/or specifically identify the relevancy or breadth of the services that may be provided by a Contractor (e.g., SEAPORT-NXG, OASIS, etc., which have 541330, Exception as NAICS). Task orders issued under these umbrella NAICS may relate to the scope of work conducted in Category A, B, or C; however, will not have a NAICS Code being utilized for competition under SEWP VI.</p> <p>Questions: Will the Government please consider removing the requirement for a Relevant Experience Project (REP) to have the same NAICS code being used for competition so that Task Orders issued under a multiple-award contract with an umbrella NAICS may be utilized?</p> <p>Will the Government please consider removing the requirement that the offerors' past performance references must be issued under the NAICS code being used for SEWP VI so that Task Orders issued under a MAC with an umbrella NAICS may be utilized?</p>	<p>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.</p>
1789	<p>Reference: A.3.7.1 Offer Volume (page 98 and 103 of 151) and A.3.7.2 Past Performance Volume (page 105 of 151)</p> <p>Many multiple award contract vehicles utilizes an umbrella NAICS code that does not fully encompass and/or specifically identify the relevancy or breadth of the services that may be provided by a Contractor (e.g., SEAPORT-NXG, OASIS, etc., which have 541330, Exception as NAICS). Task orders issued under these umbrella NAICS may relate to the scope of work conducted in Category A, B, or C; however, will not have a NAICS Code being utilized for competition under SEWP VI.</p> <p>Questions: Will the Government please consider removing the requirement for a Relevant Experience Project (REP) to have the same NAICS code being used for competition so that Task Orders issued under a multiple-award contract with an umbrella NAICS may be utilized?</p> <p>Will the Government please consider removing the requirement that the offerors' past performance references must be issued under the NAICS code being used for SEWP VI so that Task Orders issued under a MAC with an umbrella NAICS may be utilized?</p>	<p>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.</p>

1791	<p>A.3.7.1 OFFER VOLUME, (a) ISO 9001 and CMMI Certification - The government has stated that "Offerors may not use the ISO 9001:2015 and/or CMMI certifications of a Parent Company, Affiliate, Division, and/or Subsidiary within a corporate structure." This is a significant change from the Draft RFP which did not apply this restriction. Earlier in the RFP, under section A.3.7.1, the government stated that "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 some companies, the ISO 9001:2015 certification may be held by a part of the company that is shared by all its subsidiaries. For clarity, can the government confirm that the ISO 9001:2015 certification requirement will be met if a Meaningful Relationship Commitment Letter is provided that describes this relationship, even if the ISO 9001:2015 certificate is in the name of the parent company?</p>	Amendment 8 updated the wording to allow for certifications where there is a Meaningful Relationship Commitment Letter.
1809	<p>The RFP says, "2. The offeror shall describe their ITC/AV-based solutions and/or services and how the proposed features provide technological leadership in allowing for the next generation of technology in terms of both solutions and services.</p> <p>3. The offeror shall describe their ITC/AV-based solutions and services and how the proposed architectural features provide technological leadership in allowing for the next generation of technology." In 15 pages, it is impossible to describe even a miniscule fraction of our ITC/AV-based solutions, to say nothing of their innumerable architectural features. The key architectural features of, for example, a video accelerator card (listed under SOW Technical Area 1a) are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Graphic Accelerator Chipset or Co-processor • Expansion Bus Interface • Video Memory • AMDAC (Random Access Memory Digital-to-Analog Converter) • Firmware in Flash BIOS • Software Driver <p>Is this (multiplied by thousands of ITC/AV-based solutions) really what you want bidders to provide? If not, please provide different instructions.</p>	Amendment 8 updated the instructions for the Technical Approach to clarify it is based on the offeror's general technical capabilities with regard to the SEWP scope and Acquisition Objectives and not on specific line items.
1810	<p>The RFP says, " 2. The offeror shall describe their ITC/AV-based solutions and/or services and how the proposed features provide technological leadership in allowing for the next generation of technology in terms of both solutions and services." The architectural features of an ITC/AV-based solution are created by the manufacturer, not the value-added reseller. Therefore, the relationship between those features and a bidder's ability to provide the next generation of technology is not obvious. Is the intent of this requirement for bidders to explain the actual features of the products, or the features of the methodologies employed by bidders make those products available to the government?</p>	Amendment 8 updated the instructions for the Technical Approach to clarify it is based on the offeror's general technical capabilities with regard to the SEWP scope and Acquisition Objectives and not on specific line items.

1811	<p>The RFP says, "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.</p> <p>And</p> <p>The offeror must provide a summary description of their offerings and capabilities as it relates to the scope of the proposed Category as provided in A.1.2 GSFC 52.211-91 SCOPE OF WORK (FEB 2016)." Section A.3.7.1 requires bidders to identify 4 of the 8 areas, plus Area 9 to propose. However, section A.3.7.3 refers to the entire scope of work available under the SEWP VI contract, implying that all bidders must address all 9 technical areas in Mission Suitability Volume 3, Subfactor A. Can we assume that our discussion of A.1.2 GSFC 52.211-91 SCOPE OF WORK (FEB 2016) should be restricted to the same 4+1 areas we identified in Volume 1, and that we are not required to demonstrate expertise across the entire scope of services? Please note that if bidders are required (or even allowed) to address all 9 scope areas in Mission Suitability Volume 3, Subfactor A, they will be compelled to create much more elaborate teaming arrangements to comply.</p>	Amendment 8 updated the instructions for the Technical Approach to clarify it is based on the offeror's general technical capabilities with regard to the SEWP scope and Acquisition Objectives and not on the sample Technical Areas.
1812	<p>The RFP says, "Category B: 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>And</p> <p>The offeror must provide a summary description of their offerings and capabilities as it relates to the scope of the proposed Category as provided in A.1.2 GSFC 52.211-91 SCOPE OF WORK (FEB 2016)." Section A.3.7.1 requires bidders to provide REPs that demonstrate experience in 4 technical areas. However, section A.3.7.3 refers to the entire scope of work available under the SEWP VI contract, implying that all bidders must address all 11 technical areas in Mission Suitability Volume 3, Subfactor A. Can we assume that our discussion of A.1.2 GSFC 52.211-91 SCOPE OF WORK (FEB 2016) should be restricted to the same 4 areas we identified in Volume 1, and that we are not required to demonstrate expertise across the entire scope of services? Please note that if bidders are required (or even allowed) to address all 11 scope areas in Mission Suitability Volume 3 Subfactor A, they will be compelled to create much more elaborate teaming arrangements to comply.</p>	Amendment 8 updated the instructions for the Technical Approach to clarify it is based on the offeror's general technical capabilities with regard to the SEWP scope and Acquisition Objectives and not on the sample Technical Areas.
1829	A reference is made to an Attachment D-Contract Deliverable Requirements. The RFP package contained an Attachment D-Contract Data Requirements. Is Attachment D-Contract Data Requirements the same as Attachment D-Contract Deliverable Requirements? If not, will you please provide guidance as to where to locate Attachment D-Contract Deliverable Requirements? Thank you.	Amendment 8 updated the reference to Attachment D to read Contract Data Requirements.
1837	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." To clarify, the government would like 20 REPs from HUBZone, VOSB, SDVOSB, WOSB, EDWOSB, 8a offerors in categories B & C?	The solicitation was updated on Amendment 8 to clarify that, in this example, only a total of 2 REPs are required.
1839	In Category B, for Other than Small Businesses, the RFP requires 4 different REPs in "different mandatory experience technical areas." We ask the Government to clarify if this means that each REP must address one and only one Mandatory Experience Area, and that each REP must address a different Mandatory Experience Area, for a total of 4 such areas. Or, may an offeror indicate that any single REP can address multiple Mandatory Experience areas, such that those four REPs must cover at least four (4) or more Mandatory Experience Areas?	Amendment 8 clarified that each REP must address one and only one Mandatory Experience Area, and that each REP must address a different Mandatory Experience Area, for a total of 4 such areas for OTSBs.

1841	<p>Page 103 "Offerors proposing Categories B and/or C shall complete Exhibit 3b- Category B Solutions Spreadsheet and Exhibit C Solutions Spreadsheet."....."The information including pricing in these spreadsheets will not be reviewed or evaluated and will only be utilized to establish the initial Contract Database of Record upon Contract award."</p> <p>If this is not going to be reviewed OR evaluated, can it be submitted post award?</p>	Amendment 8 removed Exhibit 3b and 3c from the solicitation.
1853	<p>Section A.3.7.1, page 103-104</p> <p>The requirements for Small Businesses state "A total of three (3) different REPs from different mandatory experience technical areas shall be submitted." The requirements for HUBZone, VOSB, SDVOSB, WOSB, EDWOSB, and 8a offerors state "A total of 2 different REPs for each of the mandatory experience technical areas shall be submitted." This requirement is more onerous for socially/economically disadvantaged small businesses, as they would need to provide a total of 20 REPs as-written. Was this NASA's intent, or will the wording be changed to "A total of 2 different REPs from different mandatory experience technical areas shall be submitted?" This wording would be commensurate with the Category C requirement</p>	The solicitation was updated on Amendment 8 to clarify that, in this example, only a total of 2 REPs are required.
1880	<p>Section A.1.51 on Page 76: For offerors whose environmental impact is primarily due to powering their office building, how will the Commitment to Sustainability impact the overall confidence rating? What criteria is being used to evaluate the Commitment to Sustainability confidence level?</p>	Amendment 8 updated the Commitment to Sustainability section.
1892	<p>The RFP 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." Please confirm that mandatory experience and past performance can be held by either JV partner or the joint venture itself by changing the requirement to read "For joint ventures the Offerors may provide the work done and qualifications held individually by either partner to the joint venture as well as any work done by the joint venture itself."</p>	This was updated in amendment 08.
1893	<p>The RFP 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." It is not clear if a REP is required from each JV partner and the JV (as implied by the use of shall), or whether offers may submit REP from any either of the JV partners or the JV. If a REP from all is required, it would require 3 REPs while SDVOSBs are only allowed to submit 2. Request the government clarify that REPs may come from either JV partner or the JV itself.</p>	Amendment 8 updated the wording regarding JVs.
1905	<p>Page 102 of the RFP states, "The SEWP Catalog Price in column 'G' is not to be inclusive of any associated costs for shipping or payment methods." However, page 55 of the RFP says that the DELIVERY-Z CLIN is only for use of OCONUS and expedited delivery. Can the Government confirm that DELIVERY Z-CLIN can be used for standard delivery charges of items ordered across Categories A, B and C? If not, where can the offeror place standard delivery charges?</p>	Amendment 8 removed the referenced wording in A.3.7.1 OFFER VOLUME. Section A.1.29 describes when and how the Delivery-Z CLIN is utilized.
1906	<p>Page 102 of the RFP states, "The SEWP Catalog Price in column 'G' is not to be inclusive of any associated costs for shipping or payment methods." However, page 55 of the RFP says that the DELIVERY-Z CLIN is only for use of OCONUS and expedited delivery. Can the Government confirm that DELIVERY Z-CLIN can be used for standard delivery charges of items ordered across Categories A, B and C? If not, where can the offeror place standard delivery charges?</p>	Amendment 8 removed the referenced wording in A.3.7.1 OFFER VOLUME. Section A.1.29 describes when and how the Delivery-Z CLIN is utilized.
1919	<p>The RFP instructions say "When page limitations apply to a volume or specific section, a page is defined as one side of a sheet, 8-1/2" x 11", with at least one-inch margins on all sides, using not smaller than 12-point type Times New Roman font inclusive of headers, footers, and any graphic captions." ... "The margins may contain headers and footers but shall not contain any proposal content to be evaluated." Request the Government allow 10pt font in headers and footers as they are outside of the evaluated content.</p>	Amendment 8 was updated to allow for a 10 point font in headers and footers.
1941	<p>Can you confirm you want all items, even Excel worksheets like the solutions spreadsheet submitted as PDFs?</p>	Amendment 8 removed the referenced wording in A.3.7.1 OFFER VOLUME. Section A.1.29 describes when and how the Delivery-Z CLIN is utilized.

1945	<p>Page. 100. A.3.7.1 OFFER VOLUME, (a) ISO 9001 and CMMI Certification states "Offerors may not use the ISO 9001:2015 and/or CMMI certifications of a Parent Company, Affiliate, Division, and/or Subsidiary within a corporate structure."</p> <p>Due to the reality of how professional services corporations are structured, this requirement, as written, unduly restricts competition, and we strongly urge NASA to remove it. Specifically, professional services corporations may be organized in many different ways based on their corporate strategy, history, and value proposition to the government. As a result, companies often maintain certifications like ISO 9001 Quality Management System at the parent company level so that its quality processes apply to all its subsidiaries. On the other hand, the more IT-specific CMMI certification may reside with the subsidiary of that parent that focuses on IT solutions—resulting in different corporate entity names on the ISO 9001 and CMMI certificates. The current RFP requirement rules out many proven, large-scale, multi-disciplinary companies that provide a unique value proposition to the government via the ability to combine large-scale IT solution capabilities with mission expertise in areas like health, defense, environment, international development, etc. The current RFP requirement arbitrarily dictates a specific corporate structure and quality management approach as acceptable while disqualifying all others. The inclusion of this requirement is unnecessary for NASA to meet its goals and results in the RFP needlessly limiting competition by disqualifying a large number of companies and artificially reducing the SEWP vendor pool.</p>	Amendment 8 updated the wording to allow for certificates to be used from entities with a Meaningful Relationship Commitment Letter.
1946	Amendment 8 updated the wording to allow for certificates to be used from entities with a Meaningful Relationship Commitment Letter.	Amendment 8 updated the wording to allow for certificates to be used from entities with a Meaningful Relationship Commitment Letter.
1947	The offeror must provide a summary description of their offerings and capabilities as it relates to the scope of the proposed Category as provided in A.1.2 GSFC 52.211-91 SCOPE OF WORK (FEB 2016). The summary shall provide detail as to how the offeror will support the four Acquisition Objectives including... please point the offeror to where we can find the "four Acquisition Objectives?"	The Acquisition Objectives are provided in Attachment A-SEWP Scope, Section A.1. ACQUISITION OBJECTIVES.
1964	Will the government please provide definitions or criteria for how it intends to evaluate effectiveness, reasonableness, and efficiency?	Amendment 8 updated the instructions for the Technical Approach evaluation factor.
1969	For Category B 8(a), the RFP states that offerors must submit two different REPs for each mandatory experience technical area. Can the government please confirm that offerors should only submit 2 REPs, each representing a different mandatory experience technical area?	The solicitation was updated on Amendment 8 to clarify that, in this example, only a total of 2 REPs are required.
1981	<p>Offerors proposing to category B and/ or C shall complete Exhibit 3b- Category B Solutions Spreadsheet and Exhibit 3c- Category C Solutions Spreadsheet. The UNSPSC codes must accurately match the proposed services/technology in each row and must be the full 8-digit UNSPSC code. If the CLIN is for an hourly labor rate, then the associated labor category shall be provided in Column G (Labor Category if Hourly Rate).</p> <p>The information including pricing in these spreadsheets will not be reviewed or evaluated and will only be utilized to establish the initial Contract Database of Record upon Contract award.</p> <p>Is there a minimum required number of Labor Categories to be submitted with the Offeror's proposal submission, or are Offerors permitted to use their discretion in filling out Exhibit 3b?</p>	Amendment 8 removed Exhibit 3b and 3c from the solicitation.
1982	<p>In keeping with the GAO's decision in MetroStar Systems, Inc., B-416377.5; B-416377.8 (April 2, 2020), please confirm that bidder may use a parent company ISO 9001 certification that expressly identifies the bidder and applies to the bidder's quality management system at the time of proposal submission.</p> <p>https://www.gao.gov/assets/b-416377.5.pdf</p>	Amendment 8 updated the wording to allow for certificates to be used from entities with a Meaningful Relationship Commitment Letter.
1983	Can you confirm that the information submitted by Offerors in Exhibit 3b will be immediately available within their catalog upon contract award?	Amendment 8 removed Exhibit 3b from the solicitation.

2008	Under A.3.6.B(7) in the RFP, the Government stated that Offerors proposing as a Prime and as part of a joint venture “may submit the same management approach, certifications, and references for past performance and mandatory experience,” but does not reference the technical approach. Can we assume the absence of “technical approach” is this section of the RFP is an inadvertent omission that the Government will correct since small businesses may need to use the capabilities of a JV or CTA to show their mission suitability?	Yes. Amendment 8 updated the solicitation to include the Technical approach in this section.
2025	For the Phase 3 Mission Suitability volume, we understand it will be evaluated on the "degree of confidence" in the offeror's ability to perform the SEWP VI contract. As a potential new offeror to the SEWP program, it would be extremely valuable if NASA could provide additional insight into the specific factors and evidence that would demonstrate a "high degree of confidence." Providing these additional objective details will help NASA attract a new set of offerors to consider the SEWP contract, especially given that the new service areas of Categories B and C have been added in the SEWP VI solicitation.	Amendment 8 updated the instructions for the Technical Approach evaluation factor.
2033	In reference to Section A.3.7.1, page 98, do the REPs need to be awarded under one of the NAICS code listed in Exhibit 4 in order for the REP to be deemed relevant to this solicitation?	Amendment 8 removed the NAICS code wording with regard to REPs
2038	In reference to Section A.3.7.1B, page 103, for Categories B and C, the RFP states that "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." Can offerors include Exhibit 1 as part of Volume I, rather than as an exhibit to our proposal? Additionally, could offerors provide a response without including the exhibit instructions?"	The solicitation was updated in Amendment 8 to indicate that Exhibit 1 is a separate attachment that is part of Volume I. The Instruction page is not included in Exhibit 1 3 page limit count.
2040	The RFP states, "Offerors proposing to Category B and/or Category C shall complete Exhibit 3b - Category B Solutions Spreadsheet and Exhibit 3c - Category C Solutions Spreadsheet." Could the government please clarify that offerors proposing only to Category B should complete only Exhibit 3b - Category B Solutions Spreadsheet and not Exhibit 3c - Category C Solutions Spreadsheet? Conversely, offerors proposing only to Category C should complete only Exhibit 3c - Category C Solutions Spreadsheet and not Exhibit 3b - Category B Solutions Spreadsheet.	Amendment 8 removed Exhibit 3b and 3c from the solicitation.
2062	In reference to Section A.3.6, The solicitation requires the offerors to “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).” This is extremely broad and difficult to interpret and open to protest. For example, clauses in section 9.104-1 require offerors to have sufficient financial resources, organization, experience, accounting and operating controls, integrity, etc. The range of possible responses could range from “we have nothing else to report” to pages and pages of operating controls, accounting, financial resources, etc. Please clarify this requirement.	The wording with regard to 9.104 was updated in Amendment 8.
2072	<p>In A.3.7.1 and A.3.7.3 states “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.</p> <p>The offeror must provide a summary description of their offerings and capabilities as it relates to the scope of the proposed Category as provided in A.1.2 GSFC 52.211-91 SCOPE OF WORK (FEB 2016).”</p> <p>Question: The solicitation has a discrepancy between Sections A.3.7.1 and A.3.7.3 regarding the required scope, leading to confusion around demonstrating expertise across the 9 areas for this volume.</p> <p>For the Mission Suitability Technical Approach (Subfactor A) in Volume 3, please clarify whether we are required to address all 9 technical areas specified in the Scope of Work, or if they can limit their narrative to only the 4 areas plus Area 9 in the Offer Volume Mandatory Experience/Offerings section (per Section A.3.7.1 instructions).</p>	Amendment 8 updated the instructions for the Technical Approach to clarify it is based on the offeror's general technical capabilities with regard to the SEWP scope and Acquisition Objectives and not on the sample Technical Areas.

2074	<p>In A.3.7.1 and A.3.7.3 states "Category B: 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>The offeror must provide a summary description of their offerings and capabilities as it relates to the scope of the proposed Category as provided in A.1.2 GSFC 52.211-91 SCOPE OF WORK (FEB 2016)."</p> <p>Question: The solicitation has a discrepancy between Sections A.3.7.1 and A.3.7.3 regarding the required scope, leading to confusion around demonstrating expertise across all 11 areas for this volume.</p> <p>For the Mission Suitability Technical Approach (Subfactor A) in Volume 3, please clarify whether we are required to address all 11 technical areas specified in the Scope of Work, or if we can limit their narrative to only the 4 technical areas that correspond with the REPs they submitted in the Offer Volume Mandatory Experience/Offerings section (per Section A.3.7.1 instructions).</p>	Amendment 8 updated the instructions for the Technical Approach to clarify it is based on the offeror's general technical capabilities with regard to the SEWP scope and Acquisition Objectives and not on the sample Technical Areas.
2089	NAICS 334515 is listed as Battery testers, electrical, manufacturing on page 62 as an acceptable NAICS, but 334515 is Instrument Manufacturing for Measuring and Testing Electricity and Electrical Signals. What is the intended applicable NAICS?	The wording for NAICS 334515 was updated in amendment 8.
2111	<p>Will the government confirm if these are all the requirements offerors need to comply with in response to FAR 9.104?</p> <p>To be determined responsible, a prospective contractor must -- (a) Have adequate financial resources to perform the contract, or the ability to obtain them (see 9.104-3 (a)); (b) Be able to comply with the required or proposed delivery or performance schedule, taking into consideration all existing commercial and governmental business commitments; (c) Have a satisfactory performance record (see 9.104-3(b) and Subpart 42.15). A prospective contractor shall not be determined responsible or nonresponsible solely on the basis of a lack of relevant performance history, except as provided in 9.104-2; (d) Have a satisfactory record of integrity and business ethics; (e) Have the necessary organization, experience, accounting and operational controls, and technical skills, or the ability to obtain them (including, as appropriate, such elements as production control procedures, property control systems, quality assurance measures, and safety programs applicable to materials to be produced or services to be performed by the prospective contractor and subcontractors). (See 9.104-3 (a).) (f) Have the necessary production, construction, and technical equipment and facilities, or the ability to obtain them (see 9.104-3(a)); and (g) Be otherwise qualified and eligible to receive an award under applicable laws and regulations</p>	The wording with regard to 9.104 was updated in Amendment 8.
2117	<p>Page 104, Category C 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." Are HUBZone, VOSB, SDVOSB, WOSB, EDWOSB, 8a offerors required to show experience in all sub-areas?</p>	The solicitation was updated on Amendment 8 to clarify that, in this example, only a total of 2 REPs are required.
2121	In the table, what does the asterisk (*) indicate for each category?	Amendment 8 removed the asterisks.
2128	Category C Solutions Spreadsheet: Does NASA have a specific taxonomy for the CLIN numbers?	Exhibit 3b and 3c were removed from the solicitation in Amendment 8.
2139	<p>If a company qualifies as an SB, SDVOSB, HUBZone, etc., under a specific NAIC's code, is that the only work you can bid on?</p> <p>Are we required to submit relevant past performance for each NAICS code we are proposing on?</p> <p>Once awarded a contract can we compete for any work under any NAICS we meet the size standard for? (at the task order level)</p> <p>If we are only proposing to provide services not hardware or software in Category C are we required to complete Exhibit 3 for UNSPSC codes?</p>	<p>Post award, contract holders will be eligible to bid on any requirements in their category for which they meet the NAICS and business size at the task order level, regardless of the NAICS code used for competition at the contract level.</p> <p>Relevant Past Performance should only be submitted as it relates to the one NAICS code being used for competition.</p> <p>A Contract Holder can compete for any work for which they meet the NAICS and size standard.</p> <p>Exhibit 3c was removed from the solicitation in Amendment 8.</p>

2183	<p>On page 103 of the RFP it states that "Offerors proposing to category B and/ or C shall complete Exhibit 3b- Category B Solutions Spreadsheet and Exhibit 3c- Category C Solutions Spreadsheet. The UNSPSC codes must accurately match the proposed services/technology in each row and must be the full 8-digit UNSPSC code. If the CLIN is for an hourly labor rate, then the associated labor category shall be provided in Column G (Labor Category if Hourly Rate). The information including pricing in these spreadsheets will not be reviewed or evaluated and will only be utilized to establish the initial Contract Database of Record upon Contract award".</p> <p>The spreadsheet lists CLINs, OEM Service Providers, Par Numbers, description, UNSPSC Code, price and labor categories.</p> <p>Are Offerors to assign CLINs to labor categories; provide position descriptions; and also provide pricing for the life of the vehicle?</p> <p>Could the Government please provide a sample of this exhibit including where labor categories and multi-year rates would be entered for Offerors that are proposing services only?</p>	Amendment 8 removed Exhibit 3b and 3c from the solicitation.
2198	<p>A.3.7.2 states in Vol 2, PP Volume "The offeror must provide past performance submissions as it relates to the NAICS code being used for competition." Does this mean that the past performance submissions must be the exact same as the overarching Category NAICS, or can the past performance relate to any approved NAICS for the Category (p61-62)?</p>	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.
2296	<p>"Spreadsheets shall also be converted to PDF, in the most readable manner practicable, and submitted as part of a single PDF file."</p> <p>Does this requirement to convert Excel documents into PDF format apply to Exhibit 3a-c?</p>	Amendment 8 clarified that Exhibits 3a, 4 and 5 should be submitted as MS Office Excel format with working cell formulas.
2298	<p>Is there a minimum period of performance for the projects being submitted as REPs in volume 1? (i.e. minimum 1 year of performance)</p>	A 6 month minimum period of performance was added in Amendment 8.
2304	<p>A.3.7.2 states "The offeror must provide past performance submissions as it relates to the NAICS code being used for competition." A.3.7.2 (a) states "Offerors identified as a Small Business in Category B and C shall provide past performance references showcasing relevant work in at least three (3) content representative areas for content to be rated relevant (pertinent)." Requiring the offeror to provide past performance references that all have the same NAICS code doesn't provide the flexibility required to demonstrate past performance in three different content representative areas. Would you please consider removing the requirement that all past performance references must relate to the single NAICS code being used for competition?</p>	No. The solicitation will remain as stated in Amendment 8.
2310	<p>RFP Section 3.7.1, page 98 and 103. The RFP states that vendors may only submit relevant experience in the designated NAICS. Several contracts in NAICS outside this list often contain enterprise-wide IT solutions in support of the primary contract NAICS. Previous GWACs have allowed contractors to cite that relevant experience with a customer sign-off verifying the accuracy of the work description. Would the government consider allowing the REP form customer sign-off to consider work outside of the listed NAICS? For example, many contracts in 541611 contain large amounts of enterprise IT work vendors can otherwise not reference for SEWP. We respectfully request that the government provide a customer sign-off options for REPs in lieu of NAICS mapping if necessary. This ability is particularly important to emerging large businesses, are likely to have otherwise qualifying programs in an unlisted NAICS, with fewer options that meet both the \$30M and NAICS thresholds.</p>	Amendment 8 removed the reference to NAICS code with regard to REPs.
2314	<p>Pg 2 of the Final RFP cover letter indicates that Excel files should be submitted in Microsoft Excel format with working cell formulas, but pg 95 of the RFP indicated that each proposal volume shall be submitted in a single, searchable Adobe PDF document. Please confirm which approach the Government prefers.</p>	Amendment 8 clarified that Exhibits 3a, 4 and 5 should be submitted as MS Office Excel format with working cell formulas.

2327	As stated on Page 103 for Category B & C, offerors are only allowed to submit REPs as per the instruction "Only projects with NAICS codes listed as in-scope for SEWP VI are to be submitted." Some other IDIQs, just as SEWP is structured, use an over-arching NAICS for administrative purposes but task orders can have different PSC codes, that are highly relevant to the SEWP Scope. Please consider highly relevant PSC codes as in-scope for SEWP VI (e.g. PSC Code R425 - Support - Professional:Engineering/Technical). This was a similar approach the recently solicited OASIS contract vehicle used when determining relevancy of projects which seems like a fair and reasonable approach.	Amendment 8 removed the reference to NAICS code with regard to REPs.
2340	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." Can I do the following: 1. REP1 with sub-areas - Network Services, Innovation Services, Information and Data Analytics Services (IDAs), IT Operations and Maintenance / Help Desk/Call Center Support 2. REP2 with sub-areas - Cybersecurity Services, Innovation Services 3. REP3 with sub-areas - Application Services/Software Development, IT Operations and Maintenance / Help Desk/Call Center Support	Amendment 8 clarified that each REP must address one and only one Mandatory Experience Area, and that each REP must address a different Mandatory Experience Area, for a total of 3 such areas for small businesses in Category C. Therefore REP1 must be relevant for one area; REP2 must be relevant for a second area and REP3 must be relevant for a third area.
2343	For the Mission Suitability Volume 3, Subfactor A - For Category B and C, are we required to address all the 10 or 11 Technical areas mentioned in A.3.7.3 ? Can we restrict our response to the Technical Areas we chose to do the REPs for? For e.g. for SB if we respond to 3 Technical areas from the A.3.7.3, then in Volume 3 Subfactor A - can we write the technical approach for those 3 technical areas or we have to write for all the 10 or 11 areas mentioned in A.3.7.3 Scope of service?	Amendment 8 updated the instructions for the Technical Approach to clarify it is based on the offeror's general technical capabilities with regard to the SEWP scope and Acquisition Objectives and not on the sample Technical Areas.
2364	If we are a WOSB and 8a business, are we required to submit a total of 25 REPs (2 REPs for each technical areas plus 3 REPs for small business criteria)	The solicitation was updated on Amendment 8 to clarify that, in this example, only a total of 2 REPs are required.
2385	What does the "*" mean by the Category A, B or C for Volume III in the Proposal Component Column in the Proposal Submission Table?	Amendment 8 removed the asterisks.
2394	Will the government provide a detailed explanation of completing Exhibit 3c - Category C Solutions Spreadsheet that is required to be completed and included by the offeror?	Exhibit 3b and 3c were removed from the solicitation in Amendment 8.
2405	During the industry day on June 4th, the government demonstrated the process of submitting a proposal on the NASA portal and was selecting various offeror information like NAICS Code, does all the offeror's Category B Past Performance INFORMATION FROM THE OFFEROR must all have the same NAICS Code that was entered on the proposal submission portal? For example, all being the NAICS Code 541512.	Amendment 8 clarified that the NAICS code of the references must relate to the NAICS code being used for competition, which is selected by the Offeror and may be other than 541512. A referenced contract may have a different or non-existent NAICS code from the one being used for competition, in which case the Offeror should describe how the work relates to the NAICS code being used for competition.
2406	During the industry day on June 4th, the government demonstrated the process of submitting a proposal on the NASA portal and was selecting various offeror information like NAICS Code, does all the offeror's Category C Past Performance INFORMATION FROM THE OFFEROR must all have the same NAICS Code that was entered on the proposal submission portal? For example, all being the NAICS Code 541512.	Amendment 8 clarified that the NAICS code of the references must relate to the NAICS code being used for competition, which is selected by the Offeror and may be other than 541512. A referenced contract may have a different or non-existent NAICS code from the one being used for competition, in which case the Offeror should describe how the work relates to the NAICS code being used for competition.
2408	For Category C, does all the 3 PPQs must have a NAICS Code of 541512?	Amendment 8 clarified that the NAICS code of the references must relate to the NAICS code being used for competition, which is selected by the Offeror and may be other than 541512. 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.
2413	During the industry day on June 4th, the government demonstrated the process of submitting a proposal on the NASA portal and was selecting various offeror information like NAICS Code, does all the offeror's Category B PPQs must all have the same NAICS Code that was entered on the proposal submission portal? For example, all being the NAICS Code 541512.	Amendment 8 clarified that the NAICS code of the references must relate to the NAICS code being used for competition. 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.

2416	Section A.4.2- Are projects that are completed under a Collaborative Agreement viable projects for mandatory Experience even if they do not have NAICS codes? In the NASA SEWP webinar, it was stated that for commercial projects the offeror must determine what NAICS best applies. Can applying a NAICS also apply for contracts under a collaborative agreement since they are not assigned a NAICS?	Comment is no longer relevant - Amendment 8 removed the reference to NAICS code with regard to REPs.
2418	Reference the Exhibit 3b - Category B Solutions Spreadsheet/Exhibit 3c - Category solutions spreadsheet. Please provide additional instructions on how to fill this out, with column-specific instructions. For example, should these be CLINs from the contracts used as REPs or just CLINs from any prior work performed by the offeror?	Amendment 8 removed Exhibit 3b from the solicitation.
2419	Reference the Exhibit 3b - Category B Solutions Spreadsheet/Exhibit 3c - Category solutions spreadsheet. Is this intended to be our price list? If so, how should offerors show discounts as described in A.1.15?	Amendment 8 removed Exhibit 3b from the solicitation.
2420	Reference Exhibit 3b - Category B Solutions Spreadsheet/Exhibit 3c - Category solutions spreadsheet. Is there a minimum and maximum number of CLINs and LCATS required?	Amendment 8 removed Exhibit 3b from the solicitation.
2421	Reference Exhibit 3b - Category B Solutions Spreadsheet/Exhibit 3c - Category solutions spreadsheet. Is there substantiation required for each CLIN/LCAT, similar to GSA MAS schedules that require invoices to support the LCATs and price catalog?	Amendment 8 removed Exhibit 3b from the solicitation.
2422	Reference A.3.7.3 (b) MANAGEMENT APPROACH (SUBFACTOR B), (4), iii, Page 113. Will there be a penalty or will the Government score offerors as higher risk of unsuccessful performance if a Prime offeror has no history of OCONUS work? Can this requirement please be removed for SB offerors?	Amendment 8 updated the instructions for the Management Approach evaluation factor.
2459	A.3.7.3 (a) TECHNICAL APPROACH (SUBFACTOR a) Page 111: Please confirm whether that all offerors, including SB offerors, will have to write a response demonstrating capability (which requires available resources and prior experience) in all scope areas as described in A.1.2 for the Category in which they are proposing? This is a challenge for many SBs and will require teaming for the sake of the proposal compliance versus teaming that will result in meaningful delivery for NASA and SEWP VI customers. This also does not make sense, given that the REPs and Past Performance do not require that an offeror meet ALL Content Representative Areas/Mandatory Experience Areas.	Amendment 8 updated the instructions for the Technical Approach to clarify it is based on the offeror's general technical capabilities with regard to the SEWP scope and Acquisition Objectives and not on the sample Technical Areas.
2461	A.3.7.3 (b) MANAGEMENT APPROACH (SUBFACTOR B), (2) Page 112: If a small business prime offeror cannot answer "yes" to all questions listed in this section, will they be automatically assessed as high risk and/or low confidence?	The sustainability section was updated in Amendment 8 to remove the questions. There are no specific Yes/No requirements.
2499	A.3.7.1 notes that relevant experience must relate to the NAICS code being used for competition. Does this mean that for Category A the NAICS code on the referenced experience must be 541519, or can it be any NAICS code listed in Exhibit 4, Category A?	Amendment 8 removed the NAICS code wording with regard to REPs
2512	In the SEWP VI Cover Letter it says, "Offeror's proposal shall include completed exhibits in Microsoft Office Excel format with working cell formulas." On page 95 of the 80TECH24R0001 RFP document, it says "Spreadsheets shall also be converted to PDF, in the most readable manner practicable, and submitted as part of a single PDF file." Just for awareness, PDF's CANNOT have working formulas in cells and there is no active cell. What is NASA's preference with regards to submitting an excel sheet.	The solicitation was updated to clarify exhibits in excel format should not be converted to PDF.
2527	Contacting Officers are not always utilizing accurate NAICS codes on contracts and within data sources such as FPDS. This is limiting the use of relevant contracts/project examples for both Mandatory Experience and Past Performance even though the scope of work is directly relevant to several Category Technical Areas. We recommend NASA allow offerors to utilize relevant contracts even if the NAICS code assigned does not map to a designated NAICS within Category A, B, or C respectively.	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.
2537	Are offerors to utilize TRN 12 pt font for completion of all Government provided documents and Exhibits, such as Exhibit 3a?	The font size requirement does not apply to Exhibit 3a.
2538	Please confirm that offerors are to save Exhibit 3a as a PDF for submission and not submit this as an Excel document.	Amendment 8 clarified that Exhibits 3a, 4 and 5 should be submitted as MS Office Excel format with working cell formulas.

2554	In reference to Section A.3.7.1(b), page 103, for Categories B and C, the RFP states that, "An REP must be based on a single specific contract or task order and not based on a single IDIQ contract. " However, in Section A.3.7.2(a), page 106, the RFP states that, "An Offeror may submit a single award IDIQ/ BPA at the contract/ agreement level for as a single past performance reference." Can the Government confirm that an Offeror can use a single award IDIQ at the contract level as a qualifying REP?	Yes. The wording in amendment 8 was updated.
2557	Please clarify if offerors are to submit Exhibit 5 as a PDF combined with all other response elements for Subfactor B for a single PDF file, or if Exhibit 5 should be submitted as a separate PDF file within a Volume III zip folder?	Amendment 8 clarified that Exhibits 3a, 4 and 5 should be submitted as MS Office Excel format with working cell formulas.
2560	In reference to Section A.3.7.1(b), page 103, for Categories B and C, the RFP states that, "Offerors proposing to category B and/ or C shall complete Exhibit 3b- Category B Solutions Spreadsheet and Exhibit 3c- Category C Solutions Spreadsheet. The UNSPSC codes must accurately match the proposed services/technology in each row and must be the full 8-digit UNSPSC code. If the CLIN is for an hourly labor rate, then the associated labor category shall be provided in Column G (Labor Category if Hourly Rate)." Can the Government confirm its intent that Offerors who is limiting its submission to Category B and/or C services that Exhibit 3b and/or 3c are limited to only proposed labor categories and Hourly Labor Rates under Government provided CLIN (to be provided) and NOT products lines as required under Category A submissions?	Amendment 8 removed Exhibit 3b and 3c from the solicitation.
2570	A.3.7.1 OFFER VOLUME, Pg. 100, 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)." What information is the Government requesting to demonstrate responsibility in accordance with FAR 9.104?	The wording with regard to 9.104 was updated in Amendment 8.
2571	A.3.7.1 OFFER VOLUME, Pg. 103, states "Only projects with NAICS codes listed as in-scope for SEWP VI are to be submitted." We have multiple projects relevant to the scope of SEWP VI however they do not list a NAICS code that is in-scope for SEWP VI in FPDS. The reason is because they are awards made under the General Services Administration's (GSA) Multiple Award Schedule (MAS) contract. Awards made under GSA MAS contract flow down the same NAICS that is recorded at the master contract level instead of the task order level. This same scenario was addressed during GSA's Polaris request for proposals. Similar to Polaris, we request that we are able crosswalk our Relevant Experience Project (REP) NAICS to an in-scope NAICS this could be via a submitted signed letter from our REP POC to support crosswalking our project to an in-scope NAICS or updating Exhibit 1 to enable NAICS crosswalking.	Amendment 8 removed the NAICS code wording with regard to REPs
2584	For Exhibit 3c, what data should Category C Services Vendors include in the spreadsheet, if we are not offering hardware items?	Amendment 8 removed Exhibit 3c from the solicitation.
2589	Final RFP, pg. 100, Section 3.7.1 Offeror Volume and pg.120 Section A.4.5. Last bullet – Addressing all elements under FAR 9.104 to demonstrate responsibilities (which references FAR 19.6 in Section A.4.5). As a small business in Category C, please clarify what information needs to be provided to validate our competency and responsibility under FAR 19.6.	The wording with regard to 9.104 was updated in Amendment 8.
2595	For Technical Approach (Subfactor A), can small business offerors include their first-tier subcontractors' capabilities in this volume?	Amendment 8 clarified that the proposal may refer to teaming partners, subcontractors, and other business to business relationships as support of the Offeror's core capabilities.
2611	Reference RFP Section A.3.6(B), page 96: What do the asterixes signify in the Technical Approach Volume table section at the end of each Category title?	Amendment 8 removed the asterisks from the solicitation.

2616	<p>pg 100, A.3.7.1 - a. Are Offerors required to address 9.104-1 (a) through (g) individually? If so, provide additional instructions for inclusion of this information. As an example, 9.104-1(a) states ""Have adequate financial resources to perform the contract, or the ability to obtain them."" Is NASA seeking offerors to submit audited financials? If yes, please add requirement. If no, how will NASA make this determination. Another example is 9.104-1(d) "Have a satisfactory record of integrity and business ethics." What information is required from the offeror for NASA to make this determination.</p> <p>b. Are there any special standards established pursuant to FAR 9.104.2? If so, what are the special standards established for the RFP?</p>	The wording with regard to 9.104 was updated in Amendment 8.
2619	For the Technical Approach for Category A, please confirm that offerors must provide a summary description of their offerings and capabilities as it relates to the scope of Category A for only four (4) of the eight (8) Mandatory Technical Areas and technical area 9 proposed per Volume I (A.3.7.1(b), Category A).	Amendment 8 updated the instructions for the Technical Approach to clarify it is based on the offeror's general technical capabilities with regard to the SEWP scope and Acquisition Objectives and not on the sample Technical Areas.
2636	In reference to A.3.7.1, page 100, will the government confirm if these are all the requirements offerors need to comply with in reference to FAR 9.104 as described in Section A.3.7.1? To be determined responsible, a prospective contractor must -- (a) Have adequate financial resources to perform the contract, or the ability to obtain them (see 9.104-3 (a)); (b) Be able to comply with the required or proposed delivery or performance schedule, taking into consideration all existing commercial and governmental business commitments; (c) Have a satisfactory performance record (see 9.104-3(b) and Subpart 42.15). A prospective contractor shall not be determined responsible or nonresponsible solely on the basis of a lack of relevant performance history, except as provided in 9.104-2; (d) Have a satisfactory record of integrity and business ethics; (e) Have the necessary organization, experience, accounting and operational controls, and technical skills, or the ability to obtain them (including, as appropriate, such elements as production control procedures, property control systems, quality assurance measures, and safety programs applicable to materials to be produced or services to be performed by the prospective contractor and subcontractors). (See 9.104-3 (a).) (f) Have the necessary production, construction, and technical equipment and facilities, or the ability to obtain them (see 9.104-3(a)); and (g) Be otherwise qualified and eligible to receive an award under applicable laws and regulations	The wording with regard to 9.104 was updated in Amendment 8.
2655	In the SEWP VI Cover Letter requirements (it states, "The Offeror's proposal shall include completed exhibits in Microsoft Office Excel format with working cell formulas." On page 95 of the 80TECH24R0001(Section A paragraph 2) SEWP VI RFP document, it says "Spreadsheets shall also be converted to PDF, in the most readable manner practicable, and submitted as part of a single PDF file." Please clarify which is preferred.	The solicitation was updated to clarify exhibits in excel format should not be converted to PDF.
2666	RFP Section A.3.7.1 OFFER VOLUME (b) Mandatory Experience/Offerings states, "Only projects with NAICS codes listed as in-scope for SEWP VI are to be submitted." Are projects with a NAICS code listed as in-scope for SEWP VI, Category A, acceptable as reference for a Relevant Experience Project (REP) for Category B - given that the relevance to the mandatory technical area is explained and verified by the customer with Exhibit 2?	Amendment 8 removed the NAICS code wording with regard to REPs
2670	In Section A.3.7.2 on page 105, the past performance volume requires "past performance submissions as it relates to the NAICS code being used for competition." Will the Government please clarify this requirement? Page 108 requires a narrative description against technology areas. Is the requirement on page 105 about the NAICS only that cited past performance must have an in-scope NAICS associated with that category and not a narrative description against NAICS?	The Past Performance references must relate to the NAICS code being used for competition. 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.
2671	What is the purpose of filling Exhibit-3c (for offerors proposing to Category C), and how do we fill in this spreadsheet?	Exhibit 3c was removed from the solicitation in Amendment 8.
2682	In Section A.3.7.1 on page 98, the RFP states, "relevant experience as it relates to the NAICS code being used for competition" as part of the Offeror Volume. Is this a reference to NAICS 541519 for Category A, and 541512 for Categories B and C?	Amendment 8 removed the NAICS code wording with regard to REPs

2687	Section A.3.7.1, page 98 of the RFP requires fill-ins for clauses and provisions. Are these all contained in section "V. FAR 52.212-3 Offeror Representations and Certifications"? If the Government requires additional fill-ins, will you please identify?	Please see updated Amendment 08, The Offeror shall complete SF1449 Blocks 12 (if applicable), 17, and 30 and the indicated Offeror required fill-ins in the clauses, provisions/representations and certifications, and attachments.
2693	A.3.6 (A)(3) on page 95 of the RFP states that spreadsheets should be converted to PDF and submitted as part of a single PDF file. Does this include the Exhibit 3 and Exhibit 4?	Amendment 8 clarified that Exhibits 3a, 4 and 5 should be submitted as MS Office Excel format with working cell formulas.
2701	For the Technical Approach for Category A, please confirm that offerors must provide a summary description of their offerings and capabilities as it relates to the scope of Category A for only four (4) of the eight (8) Mandatory Technical Areas and technical area 9 proposed per Volume I (A.3.7.1(b), Category A).	Amendment 8 updated the instructions for the Technical Approach to clarify it is based on the offeror's general technical capabilities with regard to the SEWP scope and Acquisition Objectives and not on the sample Technical Areas.
2704	A.3.7.1, bullet 10: For FAR 9.104 information - what is required for an unpopulated JV? As a point of reference for other federal government proposals the government instructed that each JV member submit the required data.	The wording with regard to 9.104 was updated in Amendment 8.
2706	In A.3.7.3.a.1 - The offeror must provide a summary description of their offerings and capabilities as it relates to the scope of the proposed Category as provided in A.1.2 GSFC 52.211-91 SCOPE OF WORK (FEB 2016). Should this be for all 9 areas of Cat A or just for the 4 we propose in Volume I?	Amendment 8 updated the instructions for the Technical Approach to clarify it is based on the offeror's general technical capabilities with regard to the SEWP scope and Acquisition Objectives and not on the sample Technical Areas.
2709	Exhibit 3a- Category A Solutions Spreadsheet: Technical Area Tabs - Column H: Does the government expect all CLIN items to have compliance with TAA, EnergyStar, and/or EPEAT? Or just to simply denote which CLINs have compliance?	Amendment 8 removed Column H.
2720	80TECH24R0001 SEWP VI Final RFP, Sections A.3.7.1 OFFER VOLUME and (b) Mandatory Experience/ Offerings, Page 103 states: "Offerors proposing to category B and/ or C shall complete Exhibit 3b- Category B Solutions Spreadsheet and Exhibit 3c- Category C Solutions Spreadsheet. ... If the CLIN is for an hourly labor rate, then the associated labor category shall be provided in Column G (Labor Category if Hourly Rate). The information including pricing in these spreadsheets will not be reviewed or evaluated and will only be utilized to establish the initial Contract Database of Record upon Contract award." QUESTION: Will the "initial Contract Database of Record" – including contractors' hourly rates – be made publicly available?	Amendment 8 removed Exhibit 3b and 3c from the solicitation.
2734	The Government provides in A.7.3.1 that "Only projects with NAICS codes listed as in-scope for SEWP VI are to be submitted." Can the Government confirm that a project with NAICS 541330 (Exception 1, 2 or 3) may be submitted as a Relevant Experience Project (REP) for mandatory experience under Categories B and C?	The comment is no longer valid - Amendment 8 removed the reference to NAICS code with regard to REPs.
2736	80TECH24R0001 SEWP VI Final RFP, Section A.3.7.1 OFFER VOLUME, Page 103, For Category B and C, "Only [Relevant Experience] projects with NAICS codes listed as in-scope for SEWP VI are to be submitted." 80TECH24R0001 SEWP VI Final RFP, Section A.3.7.2 PAST PERFORMANCE VOLUME, Page 105 states: "The offeror must provide past performance submissions as it relates to the NAICS code being used for competition." QUESTION: NASA has assigned a single specific NAICS Code for each SEWP VI Category (A, B, and C). However, the referenced Final RFP Section A.1.34 lists numerous NAICS Codes in scope for each category. In regards to Volume I – Offer and Volume II – Past Performance instructions, there is conflicting guidance for relevant experience, REPs, and past performance submissions required based on the singular/plural use of "NAICS Code." The SEWP VI Website Proposal Submission demo provided at Industry Day also created confusion regarding these instructions, with NAICS Code selection seemingly being limited to a single NAICS Code.(c) Can the Government please clarify if relevant experience that must be provided in Volume I - Offer as it relates to the NAICS Code being used for competition is limited to the single specific NAICS Code for each SEWP VI Category (A, B, and C) or is inclusive of all NAICS Codes for each Category listed on Pages 61-63? (d) Can the Government please clarify if multiple NAICS Codes can be selected during the proposal submission process via the SEWP VI Website so that all initial offerings will be reflected according to NAICS Codes in the initial Contract Database of Record upon Contract award?	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. Note that only one NAICS code can be selected as the NAICS code used for competition. Exhibit 4 is utilized to notate all NAICS codes applicable to the Offeror and will be utilized post-award.

2756	For Categories B and C in Mandatory Experience, the RFP states, "Offerors proposing to category B and/ or C shall complete Exhibit 3b- Category B Solutions Spreadsheet and Exhibit 3c- Category C Solutions Spreadsheet". Will the Government clarify if they have an expectation of min/max threshold for the number of CLINS the Government expects to see in these solution spreadsheets, similar to what is provided for Exhibit 3A?	Amendment 8 removed Exhibit 3b and 3c from the solicitation.
2814	For Category C, Section A.1.2 identifies 11 Technical Areas (to include 11c Program Management/Ancillary Services), however, Section A.3.7.1 Offer Volume and A.3.7.2 Past Performance Volume only reference 10 Technical Areas. In addition, the Technical Approach (Subfactor A) references Section A.1.2 for a summary description of the scope the offeror provides. Please confirm if 11c Program Management/Ancillary Services should only be discussed in Technical Approach (Subfactor A).	Amendment 8 updated the instructions for the Technical Approach to clarify it is based on the offeror's general technical capabilities with regard to the SEWP scope and Acquisition Objectives and not on the sample Technical Areas.
2822	For Category A there is a statement that 'Each technology area includes specific mandatory technology...'; however, no mandatory technology is defined within the following sections. Are there any specific mandatory technologies for the Technical Areas? If so, please list.	Amendment 8 updated the instructions for the Technical Approach evaluation factor including removal of the phrase "Each technology area includes specific mandatory technology".
2823	What is the meaning of the asterisks under the Technical Approach Volume in the table?	Amendment 8 removed the asterisks.
2826	For Category A should the requested "summary description of ... offerings and capabilities" only cover the 4 specific technical areas being proposed even if the Offeror has capabilities in technical areas that they have chosen not to bid at this time?	Amendment 8 updated the instructions for the Technical Approach to clarify it is based on the offeror's general technical capabilities with regard to the SEWP scope and Acquisition Objectives and not on the sample Technical Areas.
2834	Not all CLINs/products have 'Model Names - Column D', would it be acceptable to mark individual cells as 'n/a' in that case?	Exhibit 3a was updated in Amendment 8 to indicate that The Model Name field is optional.
2847	In RFP, Attachment D- Contract Deliverable Requirements. Name of the attachment is ATTACHMENT D- Contract Data Requirements List. Please confirm if these two are same attachments named differently or two different attachments. Also if this attachment is required with submission?	Amendment 8 updated the reference to Attachment D to read Contract Data Requirements. Attachment D is not required to be submitted.
2858	Are the four acquisition objectives (referenced on page 111) the same as the technical areas or are you referring to the content representative areas?	No. The Acquisition Objectives are provided in Attachment A-SEWP Scope, Section A.1. ACQUISITION OBJECTIVES.
2875	It is unlikely that small businesses have formalized company policies on each of the Sustainability topics listed. Can the Government clarify whether formal policies are required for eligibility or if offerors can describe how their company addresses each topic in day-to-day operations?	Amendment 8 updated the Commitment to Sustainability section.
2879	Section A.4.5 Prospective Contractor Responsibility: Can you clarify what information offerors should provide in the proposal related to responsibility outside of what is already covered in the specified proposal volumes? The section lists elements that will be evaluated but doesn't call out a specific proposal requirement.	The wording with regard to 9.104 was updated in Amendment 8.
2889	1. The scalability and extensibility of the offeror's capabilities that demonstrates the offeror's ability to deliver the fullest range of ITC/AV Solutions and/or Services for the proposed category, both inclusive of the listed technical areas and the breadth and depth beyond those Areas within the scope of the given Category. Does "fullest range" mean that Offerors do not have to have the ability to deliver every single ITC/AV Solution or Service for the category they are proposing? Rather, Offerors should explain what Solutions and Services that can offer in each category?	Amendment 8 updated the instructions for the Technical Approach evaluation factor including removing the wording "fullest range".
2890	(a) TECHNICAL APPROACH (SUBFACTOR A) For All Categories The Government will evaluate the Offeror's technical approach, specified in Section A.3.7.3 (a)(1), Section A.3.7.3 (a)(2), Section A.3.7.3 (a)(3), for effectiveness, reasonableness, and efficiency. Please confirm all Offerors, Unrestricted and Small Business, may include subcontractors' information in our response to the Technical Approach.	Amendment 8 clarified that the proposal may refer to teaming partners, subcontractors, and other business to business relationships as support of the Offeror's core capabilities.

2901	<p>Section A.3.6 (A) (3) states: Examples of how the respective documents within the folder are to be labeled are shown below:</p> <p>GetItDone_Category#- EXHIBIT # GetItDone_Category#- LOA # GetItDone_Category#- PP #</p> <p>Other limitations/instructions identified as follows in A.3.6.b. 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 to the section header.</p> <p>Can the Government please explain further? If this format is meant to be a filename convention it contradicts the guidance that, "Each proposal volume shall be submitted in a single searchable PDF file". Please clarify, as we cannot provide a single, searchable PDF file and comply with the direction for separate filenames for documents within a volume.</p> <p>Will the government please confirm if exhibits, etc. should be incorporated into the volume, or submitted as separate files?</p> <p>If submitted as separate files, will the government confirm if it is acceptable to add the offeror's headers/footers to the exhibits?</p>	The wording referred to in this comment was clarified in Amendment 7 and 8.
2903	<p>"Spreadsheets shall also be converted to PDF, in the most readable manner practicable, and submitted as part of a single PDF file."</p> <p>Does this requirement to convert Excel documents into PDF format apply to Exhibit 4?</p>	Amendment 8 clarified that Exhibits 3a, 4 and 5 should be submitted as MS Office Excel format with working cell formulas.
2921	<p>Exhibit 3b-c Multiple columns: For labor categories, is there any difference between Columns D and G?</p>	Amendment 8 removed Exhibit 3b and 3c from the solicitation.
2922	<p>Exhibit 3b-c Offerors proposing to category B and/ or C shall complete Exhibit 3b- Category B Solutions Spreadsheet and Exhibit 3c- Category C Solutions Spreadsheet.</p> <p>The information including pricing in these spreadsheets will not be reviewed or evaluated and will only be utilized to establish the initial Contract Database of Record upon Contract award.</p> <p>What constitutes "complete"? How many rows? Any particular breakdown of products, services, and labor categories? Would 1000 rows be better than 10 rows?</p>	Amendment 8 removed Exhibit 3b and 3c from the solicitation.
2924	<p>The offeror must provide a summary description of their offerings and capabilities as it relates to the scope of the proposed Category as provided in A.1.2 GSFC 52.211-91 SCOPE OF WORK (FEB 2016).</p> <p>Recommendation: Specify that offerors may only provide summary descriptions of the offerings associated with the same limited list of technical areas being proposed in the Offer Volume. Currently, industry unanimously assumes that all bidders (including SDVOSBs and EDWOSBs, etc.) must address all 9 (or 11) technical areas in Volume 3 and build teams of subcontractors to do so.</p>	Amendment 8 updated the instructions for the Technical Approach to clarify it is based on the offeror's general technical capabilities with regard to the SEWP scope and Acquisition Objectives and not on the sample Technical Areas.
2928	<p>Spreadsheets shall also be converted to PDF, in the most readable manner practicable, and submitted as part of a single PDF file.</p> <p>This contradicts A.3.3 (b) on page 92 which states, "Electronic submissions shall not contain hidden formulas, hidden tables, be locked, be password protected, or contain links to data not included in the electronic copy." It also contradicts the SEWP VI cover letter that states, "The Offeror's proposal shall include completed exhibits in Microsoft Office Excel format with working cell formulas."</p>	Amendment 8 clarified that Exhibits 3a, 4 and 5 should be submitted as MS Office Excel format with working cell formulas.
2964	<p>The Management Plan format in Volume III places significant emphasis on Supply Chain Risk Management (SCRM), which is traditionally associated with the provisioning of hardware and software. Given that Category C is focused on services, would the government give clarification if offerors in Category C should address SCRM requirements strictly as it pertains to providing services?</p>	Amendment 8 updated the SCRM section.

2972	Do we need to cover all 10 sub-areas mentioned in Category C in Volume III - Technical Approach to get High Confidence?	Amendment 8 updated the instructions for the Technical Approach to clarify it is based on the offeror's general technical capabilities with regard to the SEWP scope and Acquisition Objectives and not on the sample Technical Areas.
2973	Do we need to cover all 11 Technical sub-areas mentioned in Category B in Volume III - Technical Approach to get High Confidence?	Amendment 8 updated the instructions for the Technical Approach to clarify it is based on the offeror's general technical capabilities with regard to the SEWP scope and Acquisition Objectives and not on the sample Technical Areas.
2978	Page 103 states that "Offerors proposing to category B and/ or C shall complete Exhibit 3b- Category B Solutions Spreadsheet and Exhibit 3c- Category C Solutions Spreadsheet...The information including pricing in these spreadsheets will not be reviewed or evaluated" Given that pricing will not be evaluated, would the Government permit Exhibits 3b and 3c to be submitted post contract award?	Amendment 8 removed Exhibit 3b and 3c from the solicitation.
2985	Page 112, item 2 of the RFP details instructions for offerors to address "(2) Commitment to Sustainability". Would the Government remove the sustainability requirement for all SB offeror types? Removing the sustainability requirement for all SB offeror types can reduce financial and operational burdens, allowing small businesses to focus on essential growth activities and compete more effectively. This change would provide all SB offeror types the flexibility to adopt sustainable practices at their own pace.	Amendment 8 updated the Commitment to Sustainability section.
2986	Page 112, item 3 of the RFP details instructions for offerors to address "(3) Commitment to Product and Services Diversity". Would the Government remove this requirement for Categories B and C as this seems applicable to product offerors in Category A?	No. Amendment 8 updated the wording to include service offerings.
2999	Is it a requirement that all past performance citations fall under the NAICS code that the contractor has identified in their submission? If no NAICS code is identified in a past performance award, can the contractor make a subjective decision on whether or not the scope of the award falls within the scope of the SEWP VI Category being proposed?	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.
3017	Reference: RFP Section A.3.7.1, Offer Volume, page 100 Question: The Government states Offerors are to "address the elements under this section that are not addressed in another proposal volume." Will the Government please identify what specifically is required to address FAR 9.104 in Volume I Offer Volume?	The wording with regard to 9.104 was updated in Amendment 8.
3021	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?	The solicitation was updated on Amendment 8 to clarify that, in this example, only a total of 2 REPs are required.
3026	Please clarify the number of "Mandatory Experience Sub-areas" required to be covered (RFP page 104). Is there any minimum or maximum for categories B and C? Page 101 states in reference to Category A, "for any four (4) of the eight (8) Mandatory Technical Areas," but there is no specific number or range given for Categories B or C.	Exhibit 3b and 3c were removed from the solicitation in Amendment 8.
3035	The referenced paragraph states that each proposal volume shall be submitted in a single, searchable Adobe Portable Document Format 9PDF) file and that spreadsheets shall be converted to PDF and submitted as part of single PDF file. However, the Cover Letter states that the "proposal shall include completed exhibits in MS Office Excel format with working cell formulas." Please confirm that spreadsheets should be submitted in the native MS Office Excel format with working cell formulas	Amendment 8 clarified that Exhibits 3a, 4 and 5 should be submitted as MS Office Excel format with working cell formulas.
3040	The referenced paragraph states 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. Please confirm that Offerors may also submit the same technical approach as well.	Yes. Amendment 8 updated the solicitation to include the Technical approach in this section.
3044	The referenced section asks offerors to provide information addressing all the elements under FAR 9.104 to demonstrate responsibility. This response could be very extensive and require hundreds of pages of documentation. Please provide guidance on the information required to address this requirement	The wording with regard to 9.104 was updated in Amendment 8.

3047	Section A.3.7.1, Offer Volume, states "The offeror must provide relevant experience as it relates to the NAICS code being used for competition." And Section A.3.7.2, Past Performance Volume, states "The offeror must provide past performance submissions as it relates to the NAICS code being used for competition." Will the Government please confirm that Offerors may use a collection of NAICS codes from the list in Section A.1.34 for REP and PP contracts? This approach does not limit an Offeror to representing capability and experience from only the one NAICS code that is selected at the time of SEWP RFP submission.	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.
3052	Task orders issued under umbrella contracts may be awarded under an umbrella NAICS code that is not being used for competition under SEWP VI. Respectfully request the Government remove the requirement for a Relevant Experience Project (REP) to have the same NAICS code being used for competition so that Task Orders issued under a multiple-award contract can be used?	Amendment 8 removed the NAICS code wording with regard to REPs
3080	Does the Technical Approach have to cover all the Technical Areas in the Scope Category to be rated as High Confidence?	Amendment 8 updated the instructions for the Technical Approach to clarify it is based on the offeror's general technical capabilities with regard to the SEWP scope and Acquisition Objectives and not on the sample Technical Areas.
3091	Can the Government please clarify what is to be included in Exhibit 3b? Does this only apply to vendors who have billing history under previous SEWP contracts?	Amendment 8 removed Exhibit 3b from the solicitation.
3125	[Final RFP, A.3.7.3, pages 110-111] For the Technical Approach, Subfactor A, how does the Government expect offerors to respond to the requirements in terms of supporting the four Acquisition Objectives against the three main questions, while also taking into consideration the ten technical areas?	Amendment 8 updated the instructions for the Technical Approach to clarify it is based on the offeror's general technical capabilities with regard to the SEWP scope and Acquisition Objectives and not on the sample Technical Areas.
3126	[Final RFP, A.3.7.3, pages 110-111] For Small Business Offerors bidding Category C, is the Government expecting offerors to address all of the 10 Technical Areas in relation to the four Acquisition Objectives and the three areas specified in the Instructions to Offerors?	Amendment 8 updated the instructions for the Technical Approach to clarify it is based on the offeror's general technical capabilities with regard to the SEWP scope and Acquisition Objectives and not on the sample Technical Areas.
3127	[Final RFP, A.3.7.3, page 111] The requirement listed as #1 states "...both inclusive of the listed technical areas and the breadth and depth beyond those Areas..." - Will the government please clarify how an Offeror is to respond to "beyond" and how the government will evaluate this undefined requirement?	Amendment 8 updated the instructions for the Technical Approach to remove the wording "beyond those Areas".
3194	In Section A.3.7.1 Offer Volume the solicitation page 98 states "The offeror must provide relevant experience as it relates to the NAICS code being used for competition". Page 103 under Section A.3.7.1 states "Only projects with NAICS codes listed as in-scope for SEWP VI are to be submitted." Are offerors able to use multiple NAICS codes for the Relevant Experience Projects as long as they are listed as in-scope under the respective table under A.1.3.4?	Amendment 8 removed the NAICS code wording with regard to REPs .
3204	Section A.4.4 Phase Three – Mission Suitability, page 120. The RFP states the Government will "assign confidence ratings for each subfactor," and "High Confidence" is defined as "The Government has high confidence that the Offeror understands the requirement, proposes a sound approach, and will be successful in performing the contract with little or no Government intervention." As a small business responding under Category C, we plan to submit a Technical Approach that fully addresses three mandatory experience technical areas of scope that we are required to address in Volume I (via three relevant REPs) and in Volume II (via past performance descriptions relevant to those same technical areas). Using the Government's definition above, if we demonstrate "high confidence" in only the three required technical areas of scope we have chosen, but do not fully address the remaining seven technical areas (that we are not required to address in Volumes I and II), are we still eligible to receive a "high confidence" rating for Subfactor A? If not, the only way many qualified small businesses will be able to receive high confidence ratings (and SEWP awards) is to team extensively with multiple teammates to cover other technical areas of scope.	Amendment 8 updated the instructions for the Technical Approach to clarify it is based on the offeror's general technical capabilities with regard to the SEWP scope and Acquisition Objectives and not on the sample Technical Areas.

3205	<p>Section A.3.7.1, page 103. The RFP states: "Offerors proposing to category B and/ or C shall complete Exhibit 3b- Category B Solutions Spreadsheet and Exhibit 3c- Category C Solutions Spreadsheet. The UNSPSC codes must accurately match the proposed services/technology in each row and must be the full 8-digit UNSPSC code. If the CLIN is for an hourly labor rate, then the associated labor category shall be provided in Column G (Labor Category if Hourly Rate)." Can the Government please clarify the level of information and detail required when populating Exhibit 3c? For example, should offerors provide descriptions (column D) of their proposed services and associated UNSPSC codes with labor categories proposed for each service? Alternately, should offerors identify candidate labor categories and the labor category descriptions (in column D)? To help offerors comply with the requirements, please identify which fields in the table should be left blank, if any.</p>	Amendment 8 removed Exhibit 3c from the solicitation.
3217	<p>"Ordering agencies may request a size-standard re-certification at the order level, at their discretion." Is this re-certification at the Master Contract NAICS level (the one we choose to submit our bid under) or at the sub-NAICS level for the Task Order they issue? If re-certification determines that the contractor has exceeded the size standard, does that need to be immediately updated or done so within our normal SAM update schedule?</p>	Amendment 8 updated the recertification wording in Section A.1.49. Contract level sizing is not affected by order level certification.
3223	<p>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: Should our REP's be also aligned with the NAICS given in crosswalk?</p>	Amendment 8 removed the NAICS code wording with regard to REPs
3224	<p>Page 104 Category B – REPs: 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." Please confirm that a WOSB is required to submit two REPs that align with two distinct Category B - Mandatory Experience Technical Areas.</p>	The solicitation was updated on Amendment 8 to clarify that, in this example, only a total of 2 REPs are required.
3228	<p>The Government states: "The plan shall address how the offeror either currently or will scale to address the broad scope of the SEWP contract offerings. For Category A, the plan shall consider all Technology areas in Attachment A: Scope of Work Section-Scope Category Description and discuss providing continuous support with updated and enhanced IT Solutions. For Category B and C, all Service Areas both directly listed in Attachment A: Scope Category Description and otherwise fitting within the broad ICT/AV scope of SEWP." Would the Government provide more specific information on what the bidders for Categories B and C are expected to respond to? All tasks that include the word "service" (or "services")?</p>	Amendment 8 updated the instructions for the Technical Approach to remove the wording in the comment.
3247	<p>RFP Document - 80TECH24R0001 SEWP VI Final RFP.pdf, Exhibit 3b- Category B Solutions Spreadsheet.xlsx; Section Reference - A.3.7.1(b); Page Number(s) - 103; Question - For the Exhibit 3b- Category B Solutions Spreadsheet, will a response of "not applicable" be considered compliant?</p>	Amendment 8 removed Exhibit 3b from the solicitation.
3257	<p>RFP Section A.1.51 Risk Climate Change Management: Request the Government changes the language in the RFP to reflect that the "Climate Change Risk Management Plan" is required from contractors primarily generating scope 1 direct energy use. For contractors, such as services companies, we request the Government change the requirement to be compliant with FAR 51.223-22 Public Disclosure of Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Reduction Goals-Representation.</p>	Amendment 8 updated the Commitment to Sustainability section.

3267	As NAICS designation can be a subjective decision made by a contracting officer, there may be cases where relevant experience projects have NAICS other than those listed while still meeting the defined requirements (e.g. over \$30 Million of relevant work). Would the Government please clarify what offerors who have relevant experience under NAICS other than those listed should do for Phase I?	Amendment 8 removed the reference to NAICS code with regard to REPs.
3269	The Government states, "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 subcontractor must be only that work specifically defined in the subcontract." As commercial, subcontractor, and state and local government contracts do not typically have NAICS. Could, the Government please confirm that for these contracts offerors can use the Project Description to demonstrate relevance to required NAICS?	Amendment 8 removed the reference to NAICS code with regard to REPs.
3271	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 was updated on Amendment 8 to clarify that, in this example, only a total of 2 REPs are required.
3272	We are currently transitioning from a small to a medium/large business proposing in the unrestricted Category B. Our CMMI application and processes for certification are in progress but will not be completed prior to proposal submission. Will the government consider changing this requirement to read the same as the small business pool, where it must be complete within 12 months of contract award?	The requirement was updated in Amendment 8 to allow Other than Small Businesses to complete their CMMi certification within 12 months of contract award.
3274	Do we have to write the technical response covering all technical areas or only the ones we are covering the REP's and PP'S?	Amendment 8 updated the instructions for the Technical Approach to clarify it is based on the offeror's general technical capabilities with regard to the SEWP scope and Acquisition Objectives and not on the sample Technical Areas.
3278	RFP Document - 80TECH24R0001 SEWP VI Final RFP.pdf; Section Reference A.4.5; Page Number(s) - 120-121; Language Cited - Prospective Contractor Responsibility; Question - Per the evaluation criteria language: Failure by the offeror to affirmatively demonstrate adequate compliance with the general standards of 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 nonresponsibility. Per FAR 9.104-2 Special Standards at acquisition.gov, item (a) states "The special standards shall be set forth in the solicitation (and so identified) and shall apply to all offerors." Question: what special standards, if any, apply to the SEWP VI solicitation?	The wording with regard to 9.104 was updated in Amendment 8. including the removal of the reference to special standards.
3284	RFP Document - 80TECH24R0001 SEWP VI Final RFP.pdf; Section Reference A.3.7.1, A.4.5; Page Number(s) - 100, 120-121; Language Cited - Prospective Contractor Responsibility; Question - Section A.3.7.1 instructs Offerors to "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)." But the A.4.5 evaluation criteria states: "Failure by the offeror to affirmatively demonstrate adequate compliance with the general standards of 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 nonresponsibility. Question: can the Government confirm that it is compliant for Offerors to provide responses to FAR 9.104-1 and 9.104-2 only?	The wording with regard to 9.104 was updated in Amendment 8.
3286	How should we provide a NAICS crosswalk in Exhibit 2b/c be filled if we are providing State and local/commercial contracts as reference projects?	Assuming the comment refers to Exhibit 2, Past Performance, 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.
3297	Is the information to be submitted in Exhibit 3b and Exhibit 3c limited to only the projects used for REPs, only projects used for Past Performance, or both?	Exhibit 3b and 3c were removed from the solicitation in Amendment 8.

3299	What is the boundary in which a vendor should pull the information from in order to complete Exhibit 3b and Exhibit 3c?	Amendment 8 removed Exhibit 3c from the solicitation.
3335	Please confirm in which Volume Offerors should include, FAR 52.212-3, FAR 52.204-17, FAR 52.209-2, FAR 52.204-24, FAR 52.209-12, and FAR 52.219-1.	This was updated in amendment 08.
3353	For Exhibit 3B – Category B Solutions Spreadsheet, is there a minimum number of CLINs that the offeror must propose for each Technical Area?	Amendment 8 removed Exhibit 3b from the solicitation.
3354	For Exhibit 3B – Category B Solutions Spreadsheet, may the offeror simply propose Labor Categories and associated Labor Rates, or must packaged solutions also be proposed?	Amendment 8 removed Exhibit 3b from the solicitation.
3356	For Exhibit 3B – Category B Solutions Spreadsheet, if the CLIN is for an hourly labor rate, should Column C (Provider Part Number) be left blank?	Amendment 8 removed Exhibit 3b from the solicitation.
3358	For Exhibit 3C – Category C Solutions Spreadsheet, is there a minimum number of CLINs that the offeror must propose for each Technical Area?	Amendment 8 removed Exhibit 3c from the solicitation.
3359	For Exhibit 3C – Category C Solutions Spreadsheet, may the offeror simply propose Labor Categories and Labor Rates, or must packaged solutions also be proposed?	Amendment 8 removed Exhibit 3c from the solicitation.
3361	For Exhibit 3C – Category C Solutions Spreadsheet, if the CLIN is for an hourly labor rate, should Column C (Provider Part Number) be left blank?	Amendment 8 removed Exhibit 3c from the solicitation.
3362	<p>A.3.7.1 Offer Vol</p> <p>We are a SDVOSB proposing services in Category B and Category C we have questions concerning the REPs, and Vol II Tech write-up REPs - for Category B we have determined that we qualify for 8 of the 10 Mandatory Exp Tech Areas and for Category C we have determined that we qualify for 5 of the 10 Mandatory Exp Tech Areas. We have three REPs for each category, some cover two of the Mandatory Exp Tech Areas and others cover four or five but the combination of the three REPs for Category B and the three for Category C cover all areas we qualify for. Question: in part III of exhibit 1 (which does not allow for carry over to the next page, form needs to be fixed) say we are proposing contract xyz, which qualifies for 4 of the mandatory exp tech areas, are we to discuss how contract xyz qualifies for these 4 areas only? or are we to discuss what we were tasked to do on contract xyz even if it does not apply to the 4 mandatory exp tech areas?</p> <p>(a) TECHNICAL APPROACH (SUBFACTOR A)</p> <p>The offeror must provide a summary description of their offerings and capabilities as it relates to the scope of the proposed Category as provided in A.1.2 GSFC 52.211-91 SCOPE OF WORK (FEB 2016). Does this mean we have to talk about all 10 mandatory exp areas in categories B & C or do we only talk about the areas we have experience in, for example in category B we qualify for 8 of the 10 areas, so are we to only discuss the 8 areas?</p>	Amendment 8 updated the instructions for the Technical Approach to clarify it is based on the offeror's general technical capabilities with regard to the SEWP scope and Acquisition Objectives and not on the sample Technical Areas.
3381	For the Subfactor A Technical Approach, Offerors are required to use the categories outlined in A.1.2 GSFC 52.211-91 SCOPE OF WORK (FEB 2016). The SOW provided as part of the Solicitation does not appear to match this description. Please clarify.	Amendment 8 updated the instructions for the Technical Approach to clarify it is based on the offeror's general technical capabilities with regard to the SEWP scope and Acquisition Objectives as defined in Attachment A and not on the sample Technical Areas.
3390	For Exhibit 3b it is unclear what the Government is asking for in Column G. Will the Government provide what nomenclature is required in Column G?	Amendment 8 removed Exhibit 3b from the solicitation.
3448	For Exhibit 3a - column H, is the EPEAT level required for answering compliance?	Amendment 8 removed column H from Exhibit 3a.
3449	For Exhibit 3a - column H, is there a specific syntax required for answering compliance?	Amendment 8 removed column H from Exhibit 3a.
3451	Within A.3.7.3 MISSION SUITABILITY VOLUME, (a) TECHNICAL APPROACH (SUBFACTOR A) Would the Government clarify if the contractor should address all category technical areas in its response, or just the technical areas the contractor is bidding on?	Amendment 8 updated the instructions for the Technical Approach to clarify it is based on the offeror's general technical capabilities with regard to the SEWP scope and Acquisition Objectives and not on the sample Technical Areas.
3463	Can the Government clarify how it will evaluate for "for effectiveness, reasonableness, and efficiency" throughout Phase 3 - Mission Suitability?	Amendment 8 updated the instructions for the Technical Approach evaluation factor.
3467	Exhibit 1 - Relevant Experience Project Table - refers to Section A.3.4.1(b), no such Section exists in the Final RFQ. Should this refer to Section A.3.7.2(b)?	The reference was corrected in amendment 8

3482	In Exhibit 3c- Category C Solutions Spreadsheet, should the proposed labor categories include just the labor categories that the offeror is using in their provided relevant experience projects? Or are offerors intended to include all labor categories that they anticipate using in task orders on the contract?	Amendment 8 removed Exhibit 3c from the solicitation.
3486	In the Information tab of Exhibit 3c, are offerors only required to fill in the Offeror's Company Name and Business Size in this tab?	Amendment 8 removed Exhibit 3c from the solicitation.
3490	In Exhibit 3c, are the proposed rates provided in the spreadsheet ceiling rates for task orders, or will each task order require separate pricing?	Amendment 8 removed Exhibit 3c from the solicitation.
3500	In Attachment A (page 6), in the Contract Holder Personnel section it states "The Contractor Holder Program Office shall consist, at the very least, a designated Program Manager (PM) and Deputy Program Manager (DPM)." This is in conflict with Attachment A, Section A.5.2 that states "The Contractor Program Office will consist of at least a designated Program Manager." Please confirm whether the Contractor's Program Office will need to have a Deputy Program Manager (DPM) in addition to a designated Program Manager (PM)?	Amendment 8 clarified that both a Program Manager and a Deputy Program Manager are required.
3501	As per page 95, spreadsheets need to be converted to PDF, in the most readable manner and submitted as a single pdf. Does Exhibit 3a-Category A Solutions Spreadsheet also need to be submitted as a PDF?	Amendment 8 clarified that Exhibits 3a, 4 and 5 should be submitted as MS Office Excel format with working cell formulas.
3537	The Exhibit 3c asks offerors to provide a Part Number for each line item. Services do not have part numbers. Will the Government please confirm that offerors may leave column C blank?	Amendment 8 removed Exhibit 3c from the solicitation.
3539	The Exhibit 3c asks offerors to provide LCATS along with a Catalog Price for each line item. Given the broad scope of SEWP VI requirements, the number of LCATs could potentially run into the hundreds. Moreover, for each LCAT, there could be several levels (based on experience and other qualifications), increasing the number of line items. a) Is it the Government's expectation that offerors are to provide an exhaustive list of LCATs on this Exhibit? b) Will the Government please confirm that offerors will not be restricted to only those LCATs provided as part of the Exhibit at the order level?	Amendment 8 removed Exhibit 3c from the solicitation.
3540	The Exhibit 3c asks offerors to provide a Catalog Price for each LCAT. Services typically are not priced as catalog items, as labor rates escalate over time—an issue that will be particularly consequential over the 10-year period of performance for SEWP VI. The Exhibit does not account for escalation. Will the Government please confirm that the "Catalog Price" for each LCAT is illustrative only, and that offerors will not be restricted to those rates at the order level?	Amendment 8 removed Exhibit 3c from the solicitation.
3552	Per A.4.2 - Phase One Offer Volume, p. 115: Per the RFP: "The evaluation will be conducted on a Pass/Fail Basis. Offerors will be evaluated based on providing the requirements as specified in Section A.3.7.1(a) that includes a valid ISO 9001 and CMMI certification". Would the Government please confirm the CMMI certification is only applicable to Category B bids as identified on page 100?	Amendment 8 updated Section A.4.2 to clarify that CMMI is only required for Category B submissions.
3557	Page 103 states: "The UNSPSC codes must accurately match the proposed services/technology in each row and must be the full 8-digit UNSPSC code. If the CLIN is for an hourly labor rate, then the associated labor category shall be provided in Column G (Labor Category if Hourly Rate)." Is the contractor required to propose general labor categories and pricing or just labor categories for our proposed CLINS? Please provide additional guidance for this and what data should be input into Exhibit 3.	Exhibit 3b and 3c were removed from the solicitation in Amendment 8.
3564	What is the Government's rationale for allowing "a single award IDIQ/ BPA at the contract/ agreement level" as a past performance but seemingly prohibiting the same to be submitted as an REP?	Amendment 8 updated the REP wording to mirror that of the Past Performance section.
3582	A.3.6(A)(3) Page 95 states, "Spreadsheets shall also be converted to PDF." However, page 2 of the RFP Cover Letter states, "Offeror's proposal shall include completed exhibits in Microsoft Office Excel format with working cell formulas." Please clarify if Excel Exhibits should be submitted in Excel or converted to PDF.	Amendment 8 clarified that Exhibits 3a, 4 and 5 should be submitted as MS Office Excel format with working cell formulas.

3603	RFP Page 98 Section A.3.7.1: This sections states "The offeror must provide relevant experience as it relates to the NAICS code being used for competition. On RFP page 103 it states "The Offeror shall provide a REP from NASA contracts, other government contracts and/or commercial contracts." Please clarify how Offerors should associate commercial work with NAICS code 541512 for Category B or C to align with the requirement to the page 98 requirement "provide relevant experience as it relates to the NAICS code being used for competition."	Amendment 8 removed the reference to NAICS code with regard to REPs.
3607	"1. Does your company have in place a documented environmental management system?" Will Offerors be rated unfavorably for effectiveness, reasonableness, and efficiency if they do not have a documented environmental management system? This is something many non-manufacturers do not have in place.	Amendment 8 updated the Commitment to Sustainability section to remove the referenced question.
3609	"6. Does your company monitor its carbon emissions to set reductions targets or objectives?" Will Offerors be rated unfavorably for effectiveness, reasonableness, and efficiency if they do not monitor its carbon emissions? This is something many non-manufacturers do not have the means to monitor.	Amendment 8 updated the Commitment to Sustainability section to remove the referenced question.
3611	"2. Does your company have a formal sustainability/environmental policy?" Will Offerors be rated unfavorably for effectiveness, reasonableness, and efficiency if they do not have a formal sustainability/environmental policy? This is something many non-manufacturers do not have in place.	Amendment 8 updated the Commitment to Sustainability section to remove the referenced question.
3613	"5. Has your company established sustainability purchasing guidelines for your direct suppliers that address issues such as environmental compliance, employment practices, and product/ingredient safety?" Will Offerors be rated unfavorably for effectiveness, reasonableness, and efficiency if they do not have established sustainability purchasing guidelines? This is something many non-manufacturers do not have.	Amendment 8 updated the Commitment to Sustainability section to remove the referenced question.
3614	Re: Commitment to Sustainability: given that the SEWP contract now includes services in addition to commercial item purchase would the government be willing to develop a separate set of questions for Categories B and C? Question 5 as currently written is challenging for an offeror to respond to given that many of the bidders for these Categories only offer services and make few purchases as part of those service contracts.	Amendment 8 updated the Commitment to Sustainability section.
3615	Exhibit 3: Please confirm that Exhibit 3c – Category C Solutions Spreadsheet shall be included in Volume I. Please clarify whether Exhibit 3c should be submitted as an Excel spreadsheet or PDF document.	Exhibit 3c was removed from the solicitation in Amendment 8.
3623	Re: Commitment to Sustainability. Given that many businesses now allow remote work and several of the questions in this section seem intended for businesses with warehouses/physical office space, will the Government consider an alternate set of questions for businesses that have minimal to no office space as there are not a lot of options that can be proposed if you are business with no office space.	Amendment 8 updated the Commitment to Sustainability section.
3634	Page 111 A.3.7.3 (b).1 Management Approach, Commitment to Supply Chain Management Category C is reserved for small businesses, many of whom do not resell or sell products or partner with product vendors. Would the Government consider requiring Category C bidders to only provide the C-SCRM plan?	Amendment 8 updated the SCRM section.
3638	Page 103 states, "Offerors proposing to category B and/or C shall complete Exhibit 3B...and 3c..." This is not listed in the table on Page 95. Please confirm that the Exhibit 3 is EXCLUDED from page count.	Amendment 8 removed Exhibit 3b and 3c from the solicitation.
3641	Page 113 A.3.7.3.(b)(4)(iii) Program Management, CONUS and OCONUS Support: This section asks Offerors to provide their approach to support OCONUS work. Category C is reserved for small businesses, many of whom do not intend to bid on OCONUS work. Given this, can the Government please consider removing this requirement for Category C bidders?	Amendment 8 updated the instructions for the Management Approach evaluation factor.
3646	On Exhibit 3A - What goes into the Compliance Column (H) on the attachment? There are no guidelines as to what the data is expected to represent.	Amendment 8 removed column H from Exhibit 3a.

3648	<p>Pages 1, 111 Attachment A: SEWP Scope; RFP A.3.7.3 (a) Technical Approach (Subfactor A): Category C is reserved for small businesses, many of whom do not intend to provide product-based solutions. Volume III Technical Approach asks bidders to "provide detail as to how the offeror will support the four Acquisition Objectives. Objective 1 states "To have hardware and software solutions and services available to address an increasingly difficult, complex, and changing set of NASA-specific scientific and engineering problems while also providing Information Technology, Communication (and AV (ITC/AV) product-based solutions to assist all Federal Agencies in meeting their ITC/AV needs." Can the Government please remove the product-based solutions requirement for small business Offerors?</p>	Amendment 8 updated the instructions for the Technical Approach to clarify the approach is in terms of products solutions and/or services.
3662	<p>Exhibit 3a- Category A Solutions Spreadsheet Technical Area tabs "Model Name" Many products do not have a Model Name. Please confirm this column may be left blank as long as the "Description" column is completed.</p>	Exhibit 3a was updated in Amendment 8 to indicate that The Model Name field is optional.
3663	<p>Exhibit 3a- Category A Solutions Spreadsheet Technical Area tabs "Model Name" Many products do not have a Model Name. Please remove this column from each of the Technical Area tabs.</p>	Exhibit 3a was updated in Amendment 8 to indicate that The Model Name field is optional.
3665	<p>Exhibit 3a- Category A Solutions Spreadsheet Technical Area tabs "Compliance" The RFP instructions state, "Offerors shall denote in column 'H' under compliance if a technology solution is TAA, EPEAT, and/or 508 Compliant." Please provide additional instructions as to how offerors should complete this column. Is it "yes/no" for all?</p>	Amendment 8 removed column H from Exhibit 3a.
3666	<p>Exhibit 3a- Category A Solutions Spreadsheet Technical Area tabs "Compliance" The RFP instructions state, "Offerors shall denote in column 'H' under compliance if a technology solution is TAA, EPEAT, and/or 508 Compliant." Please provide additional instructions as to how offerors should complete this column. Should it actually be split into separate columns for TAA, EPEAT, and 508?</p>	Amendment 8 removed column H from Exhibit 3a.
3667	<p>Exhibit 3a- Category A Solutions Spreadsheet Technical Area tabs "Compliance" The RFP instructions state, "Offerors shall denote in column 'H' under compliance if a technology solution is TAA, EPEAT, and/or 508 Compliant." Please provide additional instructions as to how offerors should complete this column. Should offerors list in this column which of these each CLIN is compliant with?</p>	Amendment 8 removed column H from Exhibit 3a.
3668	<p>Exhibit 3a- Category A Solutions Spreadsheet Technical Area tabs "Compliance" The RFP instructions state, "Offerors shall denote in column 'H' under compliance if a technology solution is TAA, EPEAT, and/or 508 Compliant." Please provide additional instructions as to how offerors should complete this column. Is EnergyStar compliance not a consideration?</p>	Amendment 8 removed column H from Exhibit 3a.
3670	<p>Exhibit 3a- Category A Solutions Spreadsheet Technical Area tabs "Compliance" The RFP instructions state, "Offerors shall denote in column 'H' under compliance if a technology solution is TAA, EPEAT, and/or 508 Compliant." Please provide additional instructions as to how offerors should complete this column. Is EPEAT compliance simply yes/no, or do you need the level (bronze/silver/gold)?</p>	Amendment 8 removed column H from Exhibit 3a.

3673	<p>A.3.7.1 OFFER VOLUME, (b) Mandatory Experience/ Offerings, For Category B and C, page 103 AND A.1.34, pages 61-63.</p> <p>Section A.1.34.b states that for Categories B and C “Only projects with NAICS codes listed as in-scope for SEWP VI are to be submitted.” Section A.1.34 provides a very limited list of in-scope NAICS codes for Categories B and C.</p> <p>As many REPs perform highly relevant work under a variety of NAICS codes, would the Government consider eliminating in-scope NAICS requirement under Section A.1.34.b. In this case, the burden of proof for REP relevancy would be on the Offeror’s description in Exhibit 1, Part III Project Description.</p>	Amendment 8 removed the reference to NAICS code with regard to REPs.
3681	A.3.7.3 (a), page 110-111 AND A.4.4, page 118. Does the Technical Approach have to cover all the Technical Areas in the Scope Category to be rated as High Confidence? Or should only Scope Technical Areas covered/claimed with Relevant Experience Project (REP) be addressed in the Technical Approach?	Amendment 8 updated the instructions for the Technical Approach to clarify it is based on the offeror's general technical capabilities with regard to the SEWP scope and Acquisition Objectives and not on the sample Technical Areas.
3683	A.3.7.3 (a), page 110-111 AND A.4.4, page 118. Does the Technical Approach have to cover all the Technical Areas in the Scope Category to be rated as High Confidence? If not, how is the Government planning to evaluate/differentiate/rank offerors with regard to degree to which they cover all Technical Areas? For example, if Company A is the world leader in a single Technical Area, and Company B acceptably cover all Technical Areas, how will the Government distinguish between them?	Amendment 8 updated the instructions for the Technical Approach to clarify it is based on the offeror's general technical capabilities with regard to the SEWP scope and Acquisition Objectives and not on the sample Technical Areas.
3684	RFP Page 101, page 104, page 109-109; Category A - C bullet requirements; In several sections the RFP mentions Technical Areas and experience Sub-areas however, there is no definitions of what the works is for those areas. This makes it hard to know what to write to the specific requirements. Can the Government provide a PWS to these areas?	Amendment 8 updated the instructions for the Technical Approach to clarify it is based on the offeror's general technical capabilities with regard to the SEWP scope and Acquisition Objectives and not any specific PWS or requirement.
3702	Mission Suitability, Technical Approach requirements appear to request both summary and detailed information on a companies capabilities. Based on these requirements and the desired page length, is it possible for the government to further define their desired response for the technical approach via an amendment or offer a webinar to industry partners in support of this specific solicitation requirement?	Amendment 8 updated the instructions for the Technical Approach to clarify it is based on the offeror's general technical capabilities with regard to the SEWP scope and Acquisition Objectives.
3708	Please define what "effectiveness", reasonableness", and "efficiency", mean?	Amendment 8 updated the instructions for the Technical Approach evaluation factor.
3710	How is effectiveness, reasonableness, and efficiency weighted to determine high confidence?	Amendment 8 updated the instructions for the Technical Approach evaluation factor.
3711	For all categories, what is the minimum criteria to meet high confidence rating with respect to "effectiveness", reasonableness", and, "efficiency"?	Amendment 8 updated the instructions for the Technical Approach evaluation factor.
3727	Do the same recency requirements for Past Performance also apply to the Relevant Experience Projects?	Amendment 8 updated the REP wording to have similar recency requirements as Past Performance.
3741	80TECH24R0001 SEWP VI Final RFP/A.3.6 (B) Proposal Submission Table/Pg 96 - What are the asterisks for in the Mission Suitability Volume section of the table?	The asterisks were removed in Amendment 8.

3744	The Government has clearly made the SEWP VI vehicle accessible to small businesses (\$500,000 and \$2,000,000 for PP and REPS). Businesses operating at this size level, or even higher, likely will not have an OCONUS contract place of performance unless the business itself is located OCONUS. This requirement in the Mission Suitability Volume, as written, seems to effectively eliminate small businesses who meet the revenue standards for PP and Experience. Will the Government clarify how this will be weighted in the Mission Suitability evaluation? Will the Government consider removing this required response or revising to request a readiness plan (given that a comprehensive response for high confidence will be extraordinary challenging given the Subfactor page count)?	Amendment 8 updated the instructions for the Management Approach evaluation factor.
3745	80TECH24R0001 SEWP VI Final RFP/A.3.71(c) Offeror NAICS Size Standard Crosswalk (Exhibit 4)/Pg 103 - Will the Government confirm that the RFP instructions for the NAICS the Offeror selects to be used for competition and submits for Exhibit 4, the NAICS Code Crosswalk and the Relevant Project Experience for either Category B or C on Exhibit 1 are individual standalone RFP requirements and unrelated requirements. Meaning the NAICS selected by the Offeror and submitted on Exhibit 4 the NAICS Size Standard Crosswalk does not have to necessarily correspond or match the NAICS codes utilized in the submission of Exhibit 1 Relevant Experience Project Table?	Amendment 8 removed the NAICS code wording with regard to REPs
3747	80TECH24R0001 SEWP VI Final RFP/A.3.7.3(a) Mission Suitability Volume/Pg 111 - Could the government elaborate on what specific technologies or approaches are considered "next generation" in the context of Category B services?	Industry should respond as they envision next generation services and technologies evolving relevant to their general offerings and capabilities.
3757	A.3.7.1 OFFER VOLUME, (b) Mandatory Experience/ Offerings, For Category B and C: Do REPs require 12 months of work performed to be considered? Is there a minimum number of months a REP must have performed work reflected (e.g. if a contract was awarded and the first 12 months base period has not been completed)?	Amendment 8 updated the section to indicate projects must have been under contract for at least six months prior to submission of offer.
3758	"Only projects with NAICS codes listed as in-scope for SEWP VI are to be submitted." How will NASA handle commercial contracts regarding their NAICS? Further, how will any claims of relevancy to a NAICS for commercial work be substantiated?	Amendment 8 removed the NAICS code wording with regard to REPs.
3765	In an MPJV, the RFP reads as if a REP is required from (1) the mentor, (2) the protégé, and (3) the JV. However, this is over-restrictive and defeats the purpose of an MPJV. Further, as an 8(a) HUBZone, WOSB MPJV, we are required to provide only two REPS. Therefore, the requirement for three REPS already contradicts this.	Amendment 8 updated the wording with regard to MPJVs and REP and Past Performance submissions.
3778	Can subcontractors be discussed in the mission suitability if the subcontractor is not used for any REPs or past performance?	The Mission Suitability Volume must be responded to in terms of the Offeror. Subcontractors may be referenced as support of the Offeror's core capabilities
3779	If an offeror does not have a full scope of capabilities, will they be evaluated at lower suitability than those who cover the full scope?	Amendment 8 updated the instructions for the Technical Approach to remove references implying evaluation is based on a full scope of capabilities.
3786	Please provide a detailed breakdown of how exactly NASA will determine mission suitability - technical and management. What is meant by "the breadth and depth beyond those Areas within the scope of the given Category"?	Amendment 8 updated the instructions for the Technical Approach evaluation factor.
3792	If we are using a commercial contract for past performance/REP, do we determine the representative NAICS for the segment of work performed under the contract?	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.
3799	Does an awardee certify their size standard at the task order level as opposed to recertifying their size at the first option period?	Amendment 8 updated A.1.49 POST AWARD SIZE STANDARD REPRESENTATIONS to clarify the recertification process.
3800	RFP Language: "The Government will evaluate...for effectiveness, reasonableness, and efficiency." Question: What are NASA's definitions for these adjectival terms ("effectiveness;" "reasonableness;" "efficiency") as they relate to the overall "High Confidence" rating this proposal section will receive?	Amendment 8 updated the instructions for the Technical Approach evaluation factor.

3804	<p>RFP Language (pp. 120): "The Government has high confidence that the Offeror understands the requirement, proposes a sound approach, and will be successful in performing the contract with little or no Government intervention."</p> <p>Question: Given the highly subjective nature of the evaluation of this Volume, provide Offerors examples of the types of details NASA is looking for in Offerors' responses to demonstrate their understanding and soundness to receive this confidence rating.</p>	Amendment 8 updated the instructions for the Technical Approach evaluation factor.
3817	Exhibit 3a- Category A Solutions Spreadsheet: Can the government, or vendors, separate out TAA, EPEAT, and 508 Compliant in Column H into three separate columns?	Amendment 8 removed Column H.
3827	A.3.7.1(b) Technical Area Tabs: Are all proposed products in Category A required to be TAA, EPEAT, and 508 Compliant? Will NASA consider adding a separate column to indicate compliance (Yes or No) for each requirement?	No, all proposed products in Category A are not required to be TAA, EPEAT, and 508 Compliant. Amendment 8 removed Column H.
3828	A.1.44 Section 508 and A.3.7.1(b): In regard to 508 Compliance, can the Offeror indicate compliance as long as an ACR/ VPAT can be provided for the offered product?	Amendment 8 removed Column H. 508 compliance will be documented post award.
3851	What are the specific criteria that will be used to assess (1) effectiveness; (2) reasonableness; and (3) efficiency? How will a vendor be rated to be acceptable vs. not acceptable?	Amendment 8 updated the instructions for the Technical Approach evaluation factor.
3856	The RFP States: "If the CLIN is for an hourly labor rate, then the associated labor category shall be provided in Column G (Labor Category if Hourly Rate). The information including pricing in these spreadsheets will not be reviewed or evaluated and will only be utilized to establish the initial Contract Database of Record upon Contract award." How extensive should these spreadsheets be? Do we have to provide items across the entire scope of the Category (even if we currently do not provide services/technology in some of the sub-categories)? Further instructions or clarifications on how to use these sheets is necessary to understand how to comply.	Exhibit 3b and 3c were removed from the solicitation in Amendment 8.
3862	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? How will the government evaluate Category C writeup to get a high confidence?	Amendment 8 updated the instructions for the Technical Approach evaluation factor.
3865	In Section A.3.7.1 the second bullet point states the offeror must provide relevant experience as it relates to the NAICS code being used for competition. Is this different than the REP (Mandatory Experience)? If so, how is it different?	Amendment 8 removed the NAICS code wording with regard to REPs
3883	For Category B Socio-Economic Groups, may a contractor combine REPS to address all 10 technical areas, may one REP be sufficient to address all 10 technical areas, or does the Government require 2 separate REPS that individually address all 10 technical areas?	No. The solicitation was updated on Amendment 8 to clarify that, in this example, only a total of 2 REPs are required.
3886	A.3.7.1.(b) "...how the proposed features provide technological leadership in allowing for the next generation of technology." Can you please give examples of what demonstrates features in a services offering for category C? These requirements are not aligned with the evaluation criteria in A.4.4 which will assess effectiveness, reasonableness, and efficiency.	Amendment 8 updated the instructions for the Technical Approach evaluation factor.
3897	For JV's, will a REP be required by the protoge company? Or can all REP examples come from the mentor company and JV itself?	Amendment 8 updated the wording with regard to MPJV REP and Past Performance submissions.
3921	If REP examples have a different main NAICS code (e.g., 541611) than the Category-specific NAICS (e.g., 541512) as specified in the RFP, will the government consider allowing the REP if the scope of work aligns with the description of the category-specific NAICS and there is justification from the customer? For example, we provide Information and Data Analysis Services (IDAS) on a 541611 contract, rather than 541512. Would the REP be considered since the scope of work aligns with the Technical Area?	Comment is no longer relevant - Amendment 8 removed the reference to NAICS code with regard to REPs.

3924	<p>Section A.4.4 (a) & (b), pages 118-119 (Subfactors A and B) of the RFP: The RFP states for all categories the offeror's technical approach in Section A.3.7.3(a)(1), Section A.3.7.3(a)(2), and Section A.3.7.3(a)(3) will be evaluated for effectiveness, reasonableness, and efficiency. This is also required for the management approach and similar sections. However, in all A.3.7.3(a) or (b) sections, the government does not define effectiveness, reasonableness, or efficiency to understand how the offeror will be evaluated.</p>	Amendment 8 updated the instructions for the Technical and Management Approach evaluation factors.
3932	<p>Volume III includes 20 in-depth requirements, to include those addressing Supply Chain Risk Management, Program Management, Commitment to Sustainability, and Commitment to Product and Services Diversity - in order to provide any in-depth response simply to address compliance across each area and the sub-requirements under each - Would the Government extend the page limit for Volume 3 from 15 pages to 25 pages for each category? If not extending the page limit, would the Government consider removing some of those requirements or shifting them to a separate volume without page limit? The subjectivity of measuring compliance across these requirements could open up protest as there does not appear to be an adequate way to address the details of these requirements with the font and page limits currently allocated.</p>	Amendment 8 updated the instructions for the Technical and Management Approach evaluation factors.
3937	<p>RFP Language: Spreadsheets shall also be converted to PDF, in the most readable manner practicable, and submitted as part of a single PDF file.</p> <p>Question: Will the Government confirm that in addition to the single PDF, the Excel source file(s) shall also be submitted to show formulas? If not required, is the offeror allowed to submit the source file as a courtesy?</p>	Amendment 8 clarified that Exhibits 3a, 4 and 5 should be submitted as MS Office Excel format with working cell formulas.
3938	<p>RFP Language: Spreadsheets shall also be converted to PDF, in the most readable manner practicable, and submitted as part of a single PDF file.</p> <p>Question: Will the Government allow offerors to reformat/paginate the Excel spreadsheets to ensure that all columns and rows are visible and the pages can be saved to the required 8.5x11 or 11x17 PDF page size?</p>	Amendment 8 clarified that Exhibits 3a, 4 and 5 should be submitted as MS Office Excel format with working cell formulas.
3941	<p>RFP Language: The excel exhibits provided are formatted using 9-12-point type Times New Roman font.</p> <p>Question: The provided spreadsheets include the mixed use of Calibri font and Times New Roman. Will the Government confirm that the offerors may change all text to Times New Roman?</p>	Yes. The font type and size requirements do not apply to the excel spreadsheets 3a, 4 and 5.
3942	<p>RFP Language: The excel exhibits provided are formatted using 9-12-point type Times New Roman font.</p> <p>Question: Will the Government confirm that "9-12-point type" means 9-point, 10-point, and 11-point font is allowed?</p>	Yes. The font type and size requirements do not apply to the excel spreadsheets 3a, 4 and 5.
3954	<p>Can offerors proposing as a prime and as part of a joint venture submit the same technical approach? Section A.3.6 (B) (7) currently only confirms they may submit the same management approach, certifications, past performance, and mandatory experience.</p>	Yes. Amendment 8 updated the solicitation to include the Technical approach in this section.
3981	<p>RFP Section: A.3.6 (A) Proposal Format and Organization - PDF Attachments Question: In the examples of the Zip file folder structure, three folders are identified, one for each volume, with examples of the individual respective documents within the folders (e.g., GetItDone-Category#-Exhibit #). However, the paragraph just under the example states: 'Other limitations/instructions identified as follows in A.3.6.b. Each proposal volume shall be submitted as a single searchable Adobe PDF file, with appropriate bookmarks to at least the section header. Spreadsheets shall also be converted to PDF and submitted as part of a single PDF file.'</p> <p>Will the Government please clarify if the separate PDF templates and attachments (e.g., REPs) shall be submitted separately from the proposal volumes or embedded into the proposal volumes as a single PDF document? For instance, should we combine the SF1449, ISO 9001 and CMMI Certifications, Exhibit 1 - Relevant Experience Project Table, LOA, and MSAICS size standard crosswalk documents into one PDF?</p>	Amendment 8 clarified that all PDF documents within each Volume should be combined into a single PDF documents. Other files such as the excel spreadsheet should be added to the Proposal zip file as separate files.

3983	<p>RFP Section: RFP A.3.7.1 Offer Volume; A 3.7.2 Past Performance Volume Question: Section A.3.7.1 Bullet 2 states that "The offeror must provide relevant experience as it relates to the NAICS code being used for competition.", similarly in Section A.3.7.2 Paragraph 1, states that "The offeror must provide past performance submissions as it relates to the NAICS code being used for competition. "We understand this to mean that an offeror can bid only 1 NAICS code (although it can compete for task orders in various NAICS codes) and that all REP and Past Performance must be under that single NAICS Code. Is this a correct understanding? If so, we request that the singular "code" be changed to the plural "codes".</p> <p>If it is intended that all REF and Past Performance citations be within a single NAICS code, we note that such requirement precludes the ability of small businesses to compete without having a corresponding benefit to the Government. We have successfully operated as a government contractor and subcontractor for over 15 years. We operate in several different NAIC codes and would need to draw from two different NAICS codes to provide the required number of relevant REF and Past Performance citations. In addition, evaluation of experience in only one NAICS code is inconsistent with the intent that contractors can compete for task orders in multiple NAICS codes in that it denies the Government the ability to evaluate relevant qualifications.</p>	<p>Amendment 8 removed the NAICS code wording with regard to REPs. IN terms of Past Performance, The offeror must provide past performance submissions as it relates to the SEWP VI in scope NAICS code being used for competition at the master contract level, as noted on the SF1449.</p> <p>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.</p>
3990	Is Exhibit 3b meant to be a breakdown of CLINs from each proposed Relevant Experience Project (REP)?	Amendment 8 removed Exhibit 3b from the solicitation.
3993	Is it acceptable for Offerors to leave the part number blank in Exhibit 3b? Many OEMS do not use SKU or part number equivalent for Labor categories for Task/Delivery Orders	Amendment 8 removed Exhibit 3b from the solicitation.
3996	<p>Exhibits B & C Question 1 Column D is for Description. Is this for LCAT job description? If so, can this be a separate document? Question 2 This contract is for 10 years can the spread sheet be modified to include columns for each year to consider escalation?</p>	<p>Amendment 8 removed the NAICS code wording with regard to REPs. IN terms of Past Performance, The offeror must provide past performance submissions as it relates to the SEWP VI in scope NAICS code being used for competition at the master contract level, as noted on the SF1449.</p> <p>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.</p>
4024	under page 96 proposal components - volume 1 (b) Mandatory experience exhibit...are you referring Exhibit 3a	The table was updated in Amendment 8.
4026	If a technology solution is not TAA, EPEAT, and/or 508 Compliant, for example a software or warranty, should the offeror leave the cell blank or put in N/A?	Amendment 8 removed column H from Exhibit 3a.
4061	Please confirm whether an REP must be specifically designated in one of the NAICS listed in the associated Category tables provided in A.1.34, pp61-63.	Amendment 8 removed the NAICS code wording with regard to REPs
4066	Subcontract NAICS designation. The RFP states "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" and we are required to fill out Exhibit 1 for each REP. Implied in A.1.34 but not overtly stated, each REP is required to be awarded in one of the specified NAICS based on the tables in A.1.34 by category. In the case of a subcontract award, there is no 1449 or FPDS report to prove a specific NAICS since it is not a prime contract. In addition, most subcontract awards do NOT have NAICS actually specified in the subcontract agreement and based on FAR 19.102 and more specifically in the associated subcontracting rules in FAR 52.219-9 (7), the NAICS must be assigned by the prime contractor and not the government based on the predominance of the work of the subcontract. With that in mind, we recommend that the government add NAICS as a required field in both Exhibit 1 and Exhibit 2 with the signoff of the associated contracting officer or corporate official to confirm the predominance of work in that NAICS.	<p>Amendment 8 removed the NAICS code wording with regard to REPs.</p> <p>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.</p>

4067	<p>Reference Page 103 - (b) Mandatory Experience/ Offerings: Given the broad scope of services and products that will be made available under categories B&C, it appears the government is requesting that contractors propose technology and labor category solutions to task order requirements that are unknown at the time of proposal submission.</p> <p>Question: Will the Government confirm the requirement for bidders under Category B and/or C to complete Exhibit 3b-Category B Solutions Spreadsheet and Exhibit 3c- Category C Solutions Spreadsheet along with detailed instructions or examples?</p>	Amendment 8 removed Exhibit 3b and 3c from the solicitation.
4072	<p>Reference Page 98 - A.3.7.1 OFFER VOLUME: states "The offeror must provide relevant experience as it relates to the NAICS code being used for competition." However, 3.7.1. (b) For Category B and C states "Only projects with NAICS codes listed as in-scope for SEWP VI are to be submitted."</p> <p>Question: Will the Government clarify the requirement that all relevant experience must be within the one NAICS code that the offeror selects for competition? As opposed to the ability to submit different projects that have any of the NAICS codes listed as in-scope.</p> <p>Additionally, requiring the offeror to provide REPS that all have the same NAICS code limits the flexibility to demonstrate experience in (4) different REPs from different mandatory experience technical areas. Will the Government consider removing the requirement that all REPS must relate to a single NAICS code being used for competition?</p>	Amendment 8 removed the NAICS code wording with regard to REPs
4074	<p>Requirement for full capabilities or not. The RFP states we are to write to "The scalability and extensibility of the offeror's capabilities that demonstrates the offeror's ability to deliver the fullest range of ITC/AV Solutions and/or Services for the proposed category, both inclusive of the listed technical areas and the breadth and depth beyond those Areas within the scope of the given Category." Under the small business REP and PPQ requirements in previous volumes, we were required to demonstrate experience in only 3-4 of the 10 service areas. For this specific section, it seems to be implying that we have to demonstrate more than this. Please clarify. Must we, as a small business, demonstrate capabilities in ALL areas, potentially needing to build a bigger team, or are we to demonstrate our ability to simply cover the 3-4 component service areas of our REP/PPQ performance work?</p>	Amendment 8 updated the instructions for the Technical Approach to clarify it is based on the offeror's general technical capabilities with regard to the SEWP scope and Acquisition Objectives and not on the sample Technical Areas.
4075	<p>The RFP states "The offeror shall describe their ITC/AV-based solutions and/or services and how the proposed features provide technological leadership in allowing for the next generation of technology in terms of both solutions and services." We are a small business and much of our work is core O&M work and training on existing systems where we do limited "technological leadership". We can cover the required 3-4 areas within the REP/PPQ requirements. However, this evaluation criteria seems to imply that we must be a leading edge company, potentially in multiple service areas, to get an award while our services are just as valuable to the government. Can a small company like ours still get an award? How should we approach this section?</p>	There is no requirement for a company to cover the entirety of the SEWP scope. Amendment 8 updated the instructions for the Technical Approach to clarify it is based on the offeror's general technical capabilities with regard to the SEWP scope and Acquisition Objectives and not on the sample Technical Areas.
4076	<p>The RFP states "The offeror shall describe their ITC/AV-based solutions and services and how the proposed architectural features provide technological leadership in allowing for the next generation of technology." We are a small business and much of our work is core O&M work and training on existing systems where we do limited "technological leadership". We can cover the required 3-4 areas within the REP/PPQ requirements. However, this evaluation criteria seems to imply that we must be a leading edge company, potentially in multiple service areas, to get an award while our services are just as valuable to the government. Can a small company like ours still get an award? How should we approach this section?</p>	There is no requirement for a company to cover the entirety of the SEWP scope. Amendment 8 updated the instructions for the Technical Approach to clarify it is based on the offeror's general technical capabilities with regard to the SEWP scope and Acquisition Objectives and not on the sample Technical Areas.
4077	<p>In each of the component RFP areas for Mission Suitability, the RFP states that the offeror will be evaluated based on "effectiveness, reasonableness, and efficiency." These are extremely vague terms that are hard to write against. Please clarify the definition of effectiveness, reasonableness, and efficiency. Are there any specific technical components or operational metrics we must demonstrate or commit to?</p>	Amendment 8 updated the instructions for the Technical Approach evaluation factor.

4078	The RFP states "The Government will evaluate the Offeror's technical approach, specified in Section A.3.7.3 (a)(1), Section A.3.7.3 (a)(2), Section A.3.7.3 (a)(3), for effectiveness, reasonableness, and efficiency." Please clarify the definition of effectiveness and how this will specifically be evaluated. Are there any specific technical components or operational metrics we must demonstrate or commit to?	Amendment 8 updated the instructions for the Technical Approach evaluation factor.
4079	The RFP states "The Government will evaluate the Offeror's technical approach, specified in Section A.3.7.3 (a)(1), Section A.3.7.3 (a)(2), Section A.3.7.3 (a)(3), for effectiveness, reasonableness, and efficiency." Please clarify the definition of reasonableness and how this will specifically be evaluated. Are there any specific technical components or operational metrics we must demonstrate or commit to?	Amendment 8 updated the instructions for the Technical Approach evaluation factor.
4081	The RFP states "The Government will evaluate the Offeror's technical approach, specified in Section A.3.7.3 (a)(1), Section A.3.7.3 (a)(2), Section A.3.7.3 (a)(3), for effectiveness, reasonableness, and efficiency." Please clarify the definition of efficiency and how this will specifically be evaluated. Are there any specific technical components or operational metrics we must demonstrate or commit to?	Amendment 8 updated the instructions for the Technical Approach evaluation factor.
4083	Reference Page 103 - (b) Mandatory Experience/ Offerings: Page 103 states: "Offerors proposing to category B and/ or C shall complete Exhibit 3b- Category B Solutions Spreadsheet and Exhibit 3c- Category C Solutions Spreadsheet. The UNSPSC codes must accurately match the proposed services/technology in each row and must be the full 8-digit UNSPSC code. If the CLIN is for an hourly labor rate, then the associated labor category shall be provided in Column G (Labor Category if Hourly Rate). The information including pricing in these spreadsheets will not be reviewed or evaluated and will only be utilized to establish the initial Contract Database of Record upon Contract award." Question: Regarding Exhibit 3b, Categories B and C, given they are not being evaluated, what is the Government's intent, post award for the use of any proposed labor categories and rates?	Amendment 8 removed Exhibit 3b and 3c from the solicitation.
4095	The RFP seems to require REPs from all MPJV members, contradicting the rule allowing only two REPs for 8(a) HUBZone, WOSB MPJVs. Can you clarify the actual REP requirement?	Amendment 8 updated the wording with regard to MPJV REP and Past Performance submissions.
4101	Is the protégé in an MPJV also obligated to provide past performance separately from the JV?	Amendment 8 updated the wording with regard to MPJV REP and Past Performance submissions.
4109	A.1.2 Page 32 The RFP is clear on the number of technical areas to be addressed (based on business size and category) for both Offeror and Past Performance Volumes, REP and past performance respectively. Mission Suitability implies that the Government wishes the offeror to address expansion to additional technical areas. 1) Does the Government expect the offeror to address all technical areas in this volume? 2) If the answer to 1 is yes, will the Government permit the use of named or unnamed subcontractors to achieve the expansion?"	1) No.
4111	A.3.7.1 (b) Page 103 For an OTSB subcontractor to a SB Prime in either CAT B or CAT C, is there a requirement that the OTSB submit Exhibit 3b or 3c - Category Solution Spreadsheet or is that just the responsibility of the SB prime?	Amendment 8 removed Exhibit 3b and 3c from the solicitation.
4133	The Solicitation states, "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." Did the Government intentionally exclude only the Volume III Technical Approach (Subfactor A)?	Amendment 8 updated the solicitation to include the Technical approach in this section.
4138	Please confirm that the spreadsheets being required to be in PDF includes any attachments provided by the Government in an excel format, per "Spreadsheets shall also be converted to PDF, in the most readable manner practicable, and submitted as part of a single PDF file. " on page 95.	Amendment 8 clarified that Exhibits 3a, 4 and 5 should be submitted as MS Office Excel format with working cell formulas.

4142	<p>Please confirm that the Government would like the Exhibit-3C document to be converted as a PDF and submitted within Volume 1-Offeror Volume, per the Requirement on page 95, "Spreadsheets shall also be converted to PDF, in the most readable manner practicable, and submitted as part of a single PDF file. "</p> <p>Please clarify where the Exhibit 3c should be inserted.</p>	Exhibit 3c was removed from the solicitation in Amendment 8.
4145	Will the government please clarify if Exhibit 3c which is required with this volume should be in PDF format?	Exhibit 3c was removed from the solicitation in Amendment 8.
4154	Will there be a validation or verification process to ensure that the submitted Exhibit 3c pricing information meets the government's requirements before being added to the Contract Database of Record?	Exhibit 3c was removed from the solicitation in Amendment 8.
4157	Will there be an opportunity for feedback or a review period before the Exhibit 3c pricing information is finalized in the Contract Database of Record?	Exhibit 3c was removed from the solicitation in Amendment 8.
4158	Are there any additional documents or support resources available to help with the preparation of Exhibit 3c pricing spreadsheets?	Exhibit 3c was removed from the solicitation in Amendment 8.
4159	If discrepancies or errors are found in the Exhibit 3c pricing information after contract award, what is the process for making corrections?	Exhibit 3c was removed from the solicitation in Amendment 8.
4160	<p>The last bullet on page 99 and 7th bullet in A.3.7.1 indicates "(i)information from first- tier subcontractors . . . 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."</p> <p>1) Is this only applicable to Volume I Mandatory Experience or Volume I Mandatory Experience and Volume II Past Performance?</p> <p>2) Relevant to this point, are "capabilities" demonstrated anywhere other than Volume I Mandatory Experience and Volume II Past Performance.</p> <p>3) Does the Government mean if either Mandatory Experience or Past Performance show capabilities or past performance than a first-tier subcontractor may not be used.</p> <p>4) Does "necessary for award" mean that only the minimum requirements must be met? For example, three, Category Representative Area Mandatory Experience projects for a small business (Vol I) and one, two, or three Past Performance References encompassing at least three Content Representative Areas for a Small Business?</p>	The referenced wording was removed in Amendment 8.
4161	Should the Exhibit 3c pricing information cover all potential services and products that might be offered during the contract period, or only those anticipated at the time of award?	Exhibit 3c was removed from the solicitation in Amendment 8.
4162	For Exhibit 3c, should the 'SEWP Catalog Price' include all potential costs such as taxes, fees, and shipping, or just the base price?	Exhibit 3c was removed from the solicitation in Amendment 8.
4167	<p>The first bullet on page 100 and 8th bullet in A.3.7.1 indicates "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."</p> <p>1) Where should this information be provided (e.g., Volume I, MRCL, JV Agreement)?</p> <p>2) Are there any limitations on the amount of work to be provided? For example, only recent and relevant projects?</p>	Amendment 8 updated the wording with regard to MPJV REP and Past Performance submissions.
4168	Can the government please clarify Where is the Section C.1.3.3 referring to?	The reference was corrected in Amendment 8.
4170	How can we complete Exhibit 3c from a services perspective? Do we need a subscription for the UNSPSC codes? How do we get the UNSPSC codes for services?	Exhibit 3b and 3c were removed from the solicitation in Amendment 8.

4180	<p>Per the Solicitation:</p> <p>A.4.5 Prospective Contractor Responsibility</p> <p>(a) The procedures for determining whether prospective contractors and subcontractors are responsible are set forth in Federal Acquisition Regulation (FAR) Subpart 9.1 and NASA FAR Subpart 1809.1. Failure by the offeror to affirmatively demonstrate adequate compliance with the general standards of 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. As with all aspects of prospective contractor responsibility, a finding of non-responsibility can be made at any time prior to contract award. 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.</p> <p>We have researched all aspects of this FAR Clauses and contacted the Small Business Administration to inquire about: 1) What is required to secure this Certificate of Competency; 2) Can SBA provide one for the Joint Venture that we have formed to bid the NASA SEWP VI solicitation; and 3) How long will it take for SBA to perform the due diligence necessary to give us this letter. They stated that they had not seen this requirement before, and they would need to research before committing to a timeframe.</p> <p>1) We are convinced that this requirement cannot be met prior to the 11 July due date. According to the SBA www-site, the current estimate of time to create the Certification is about 8-months.</p> <p>2) Would the government consider identifying this requirement as a Post Award requirement?</p>	The referenced section was removed in Amendment 8.
4186	FAR and NASA FAR Clauses incorporated by reference. In the short list of NASA FAR clauses, there is no reference to the clause mentioned in A.4.5 (NASA FAR 1809.1)	The referenced section was updated in Amendment 8.
4194	Can we use Commercial experience both in REP and PP. If yes, than how to provide NAICS code as there was no specific mention of NAICS code in commercial contracts.	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.
4204	Pg 104 Category C: The instructions state "A total of 2 different REPs from different mandatory experience technical areas shall be submitted." Then there is a list of 10 Category C – Mandatory Experience Sub-areas. Are these sub-areas what you are referring to as the technical areas you reference?	Yes. The wording was updated in Amendment 8.
4241	A.3.7.1.(b) Mandatory Experience/Offerings: The instructions for HUBZone, VOSB, WOSB, EDWOSB, 8a offerors is written as if bidders provide 2 REPs for each of the 10 mandatory experience technical areas. This would be 20 REPs. Will the Government the number of REPs expected for these socio-economic bidders? Recommend if the Government is intending only 2 REPs they use language similar to what they used for Other than Small and Small Business above.	The solicitation was updated on Amendment 8 to clarify that, in this example, only a total of 2 REPs are required.
4243	A.3.7.1.(b) Mandatory Experience/Offerings: The instructions for HUBZone, VOSB, WOSB, EDWOSB, 8a offerors is written as if bidders provide 2 REPs for each of the 10 mandatory experience technical areas. This would be 20 REPs. Will the Government the number of REPs expected for these socio-economic bidders? Recommend if the Government is intending only 2 REPs they use language similar to what they used for Other than Small and Small Business above.	The solicitation was updated on Amendment 8 to clarify that, in this example, only a total of 2 REPs are required.
4246	How will the Govt evaluate Labor Categories on Attachment 3c in the absence of a cost narrative? If small business offerors are to submit rates for Labor Categories (as 3c seems to require in its current form, a wide range can be expected. What will the Govt use to determine a "reasonable" range?	Amendment 8 removed Exhibit 3c from the solicitation.
4247	<p>page 950oc RFP A.3.6(A)(3) Request for Clarification Conflict between Sections RFP Section A.3.3(b) states that there shall be no hidden formulas which indicates an Excel document. A.3.6(A)(3) states all documents must be submitted in PDF format.</p> <p>Exhibits 3a, 3b, 3c, and 4 are all Excel documents. Does the Government want all proposal Excel files submitted in PDF format?"</p>	Exhibit 3c was removed from the solicitation in Amendment 8.

4259	Page 11 Document RFP A.3.7.3(a)1. The scalability and extensibility of the Offeror's Capabilities that demonstrates the offeror's ability to deliver the fullest range of ITC/AV Solutions and/or Services for the proposed category, both inclusive of the listed technical areas and the breadth and depth beyond those Areas within the scope of the given Category. "Please provide clarification of "breadth and depth beyond the Technical Areas" - is the Government asking for emerging technologies? Why is the Gov't asking for capabilities beyond the defined scope of work and technical areas?	Amendment 8 updated the instructions for the Technical Approach evaluation factor.
4260	Page 11 Document RFP A.3.7.3(a)1. The scalability and extensibility of the Offeror's Capabilities that demonstrates the offeror's ability to deliver the fullest range of ITC/AV Solutions and/or Services for the proposed category, both inclusive of the listed technical areas and the breadth and depth beyond those Areas within the scope of the given Category. Please provide clarification of "breadth and depth beyond the Technical Areas" - is the Government asking for emerging technologies? Why is the Gov't asking for capabilities beyond the defined scope of work and technical areas?	Amendment 8 updated the instructions for the Technical Approach evaluation factor.
4261	Page 11 Document RFP A.3.7.3(a) As part of Volume III, SubFactor A, are offerors required to address all Technical Mandatory Sub-Areas as part of their 15-page responses to Categories B & C?	Amendment 8 updated the instructions for the Technical Approach to clarify it is based on the offeror's general technical capabilities with regard to the SEWP scope and Acquisition Objectives and not on the sample Technical Areas.
4262	Reference Exhibit 3b - Given that the solicitation does not include price as an evaluation factor, it is our understanding that Exhibit 3b is to be used post contract award to establish pricing on contract as requirements become defined within orders issued and awarded; therefore, this exhibit is not required to be submitted with pricing as part of our proposal submission for the evaluation. Is this the understanding, correct? If not please clarify the what is to be included the exhibit and its purpose.	Amendment 8 removed Exhibit 3b from the solicitation.
4264	Page 18 Document RFP A.4.4 The Gov't will evaluate the Offeror's technical approach, specified in Section A.3.7.3(a)(1), Section A.3.7.3(a)(2), Section A.3.7.3(a)(3), for effectiveness, reasonableness, and efficiency. Section A.3.7.1(b) Category A states: Offerors shall complete Exhibit 3a - Category A Solutions Spreadsheet and propose technology solutions for any four (4) of the eight (8) Mandatory Technical Areas 1. thru 9. How many Technical Areas must be addressed in the Mission Suitability Technical Approach for Category A How many Technical Areas for Category B? and Category C?	Amendment 8 updated the instructions for the Technical Approach to clarify it is based on the offeror's general technical capabilities with regard to the SEWP scope and Acquisition Objectives and not on the sample Technical Areas.
4265	Category C - What happens to a SB that outgrows their size standard? What is the procedures for validating size standard annually, if any?	Amendment 8 updated A.1.49 POST AWARD SIZE STANDARD REPRESENTATIONS to clarify the recertification process.
4266	What recertification is required for SB Size Standard? When will this be required?	Amendment 8 updated A.1.49 POST AWARD SIZE STANDARD REPRESENTATIONS to clarify the recertification process.
4278	Section A.3.6.(a) states: "Spreadsheets shall also be converted to PDF, in the most readable manner practicable, and submitted as part of a single PDF file." However, page 2 of the Final RFP Cover Letter states the opposite: "The Offeror's proposal shall include completed exhibits in Microsoft Office Excel format with working cell formulas." Please clarify which Excel spreadsheets should be converted to PDF and which Excel spreadsheets should be left in Excel format.	Exhibit 3c was removed from the solicitation in Amendment 8.
4280	Section A.3.6.(A).(2) states: "The excel exhibits provided are formatted using 9-12-point type Times New Roman font." Please confirm that Offerors should leave the Excel exhibits in the original font provided by the Government, even if that font is smaller than the required 12-point Times New Roman font.	Yes. The font type and size requirements do not apply to the excel spreadsheets 3a, 4 and 5.
4281	On page 97, Document RFP, B. Proposal Content and page limitation: 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. If we are bidding as prime and JV for Category B, can we use the same technical approach as the REPs are same for the prime bid and JV bid.	Yes. Amendment 8 updated the solicitation to include the Technical approach in this section.

4282	Section A.3.7.1 states: "The offeror must provide relevant experience as it relates to the NAICS code being used for competition." Please confirm that this statement refers to the required Relevant Experience Projects (REPs) for Category B and Category C.	Amendment 8 removed the NAICS code wording with regard to REPs
4289	A.1.32 p. 59 Attachment I - A.2.1 GSFC 52.211-101 LIST OF ATTACHMENTS. (NOV 2022) The following documents are attached hereto and made a part of this contract:- Commercial Small Business Subcontracting Plan (Other than Small Businesses) - Requires a Commercial Plan. Would the Government consider a Masterplan or Individual Plan in compliance with FAR 52.219-9?	Amendment 8 clarifies that an individual plan can be submitted.
4302	Page 96, A.3.6 Proposal Preparation—General Instructions, B. Proposal Content and Page Limitations: An asterisk has been included for Category A, B and C under Technical Approach volume, but no explanation or clarification for the asterisk has been provided. Please add the necessary clarification for the asterisk.	Amendment 8 removed the asterisks.
4309	Page 100 and 103 A.3.7.1 OFFER VOLUME, Exhibit 3a- Category A Solutions Spreadsheet The solicitation states that 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. Are we permitted to submit only the past experience of the JV members, or must we also include any work done by the joint venture as a whole?	Amendment 8 updated the wording with regard to MPJV REP and Past Performance submissions.
4318	Section A.3.6(A)(3), p. 95 - Will the Government please confirm that each proposal volume should be submitted in a single PDF file, to include all required exhibits, spreadsheets, and attachments?	Amendment 8 updated the proposal instructions noting that some file, such as excel spreadsheets, should be submitted as separate files.
4319	The solicitation states that "Only projects with NAICS codes listed as in-scope for SEWP VI are to be submitted." If the primary NAICS for a project doesn't fall within the NAICS, but customer confirms that the work performed does. Can the offeror use that project?	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.
4320	RFP Cover Letter and Section A.3.6 (A)(3), p. 95 - Will the Government please clarify if Excel spreadsheets should be submitted in their native format in order to maintain working cell formulas or converted to PDF format for submission?	Exhibit 3c was removed from the solicitation in Amendment 8.
4324	Can you confirm that the following is meant to be added to after the JV agreement? What is the page limit? "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."	Amendment 8 updated the wording with regard to MPJV REP and Past Performance submissions.
4331	When proposing in Category B or Category C, how will the UNSPSC code and labor category information provided in Exhibit 3b and/or Exhibit 3c be evaluated?	Amendment 8 removed Exhibit 3b from the solicitation.
4334	Our company does not own any physical buildings and only leases office space. Would the Government consider removing the Commitment to Sustainability questions "3. Does your company use or intend to use renewable energy sources? And 4. Does your company have a recycling program?" as we do not have control over the energy sources or recycling program in our leased office space.	Amendment 8 updated the Commitment to Sustainability section.
4335	Would the Government consider removing the Commitment to Sustainability question "1. Does your company have in place a documented environmental management system?" As a small business, having a documented environmental management system would create a significant burden.	Amendment 8 updated the Commitment to Sustainability section.
4344	Page 95 states, "Spreadsheets shall also be converted to PDF, in the most readable manner practicable, and submitted as part of a single PDF file." However, page 2 of the Final RFP Cover Letter states, "The Offeror's proposal shall include completed exhibits in Microsoft Office Excel format with working cell formulas." Please clarify: should Excel files such as Exhibit 3b and Exhibit 4 be converted to PDF and inserted into offerors' Volume I PDF as appendices? Or should they remain as Excel files?	Exhibit 3c was removed from the solicitation in Amendment 8.
4351	Page 103 and Exhibit 3b- Category B Solutions Spreadsheet. For Category B Hourly Rate CLINS, please clarify instructions for each column. For CLIN, do we assign a number? For Provider and Provider Part Number, do we leave these blank? For Description, do we put the labor category title (e.g., Senior Project Manager)? Are UNSPSC Codes required for labor categories? Is the labor rate \$ amount to be included under "SEWP Catalog Price" or "Labor Category"?	Amendment 8 removed Exhibit 3b from the solicitation.

4356	Page 103 and Exhibit 3b- Category B Solutions Spreadsheet. For Hourly Rate CLINS, does NASA require 10 years' worth of labor rates for each labor category, or does the Year One rate suffice?	Amendment 8 removed Exhibit 3b from the solicitation.
4358	Page 103 and Exhibit 3b- Category B Solutions Spreadsheet. For Hourly Rate CLINS, may labor rates be based on and equal to GSA Federal Supply Schedule rates?	Amendment 8 removed Exhibit 3b from the solicitation.
4366	Please clarify how each individual question (1-7) in the commitment to sustainability subfactor will be evaluated in determining if the subfactor will receive "high confidence" or "minimal confidence". Will an offeror be given a "minimal confidence" rating if they answer "no" to any question? Are there regulations or standards to which our responses will be measured against?	Amendment 8 updated the Commitment to Sustainability section.
4371	Page 96, under Section A.3.6(B)(2), states that, "The Excel exhibits provided are formatted using 9-12-point type Times New Roman Font." However, the provided Exhibit 3a and Exhibit 4 Excel files are formatted primarily in Calibri 11-point type. Additionally, while Exhibit 3b and Exhibit 3c provide information in Times New Roman 12, the default formatting for information entry is set to Calibri 11-point type. QUESTION: Can the Government please confirm that it will be acceptable for Offerors to modify the provided Exhibit files to meet the given formatting specifications?	Yes. The font type and size requirements do not apply to the excel spreadsheets 3a, 4 and 5.
4372	Section A.3.7.1 states that "The offeror must provide the relevant experience as it relates to the NAICS code being used for competition." Will the Government clarify if the NAICS code used in the provided relevant experience in Category B or C needs to match the NAICS code used in the submission of the proposal to the NASA SEWP portal, so long as they both reside in the "Offeror NAICS Size Standard Crosswalk (Exhibit 4)"?	Amendment 8 removed the NAICS code wording with regard to REPs
4378	Would Government please confirm that Technical Area 9a is the same as Technical Area 9?	Yes, the reference was updated in Amendment 8.
4386	Regarding this requirement from A.3.7.1.b: "Offerors shall denote in column 'H' under compliance if a technology solution is TAA, EPEAT, and/or 508 Compliant." Does denoting compliance indicate that TAA, EPEAT and 508 compliance are mandatory (where it applies) for the proposed technology solutions, or just additional/optional information?	Amendment 8 removed Column H.
4397	A.3.6 (A) provides file names for volumes as well as individual documents. Please confirm that the ISO certification files, LOA files, Exhibit 1 files, Exhibit 4 files, etc. should all be submitted as separate proposal files, that the files should NOT be merged into a single PDF file for Volume I.	Amendment 8 clarified that all PDF documents within each Volume should be combined into a single PDF documents. Other files such as the excel spreadsheet should be added to the Proposal zip file as separate files.
4400	A.3.1.7(a) states: "Offerors may not use the ISO 9001:2015 and/or CMMI certifications of a Parent Company, Affiliate, Division, and/or Subsidiary within a corporate structure." However, the defined and documented scope of a Parent company's ISO 9001 or CMMI implementation can flow-down to lower divisions or subsidiaries of the Parent company, where the lower entity "subscribes" to the governance and management controls defined by the ISO and/or CMMI Quality Management System. In this case, Meaningful Relationship is established by the ISO and/or CMMI implementation. Will the government recognize this as a valid ISO 9001 and/or CMMI certification if the Offeror provides documented evidence of this in an MRCL?	Yes. The Solicitation was updated in Amendment 8.
4404	For Ex 3b - Category B Solutions Spreadsheet, since this work is for services, should the column C for the "Provider Part Number" be left blank? If so should it should be filled in, what should be inserted here?	Amendment 8 removed Exhibit 3b from the solicitation.
4406	Page 111, under Section A.3.7.3, indicates that vendors should write to "the fullest range of ITC/AV Solutions...". Please clarify if NASA would like vendors to provide detailed descriptions of our approach and capabilities related to all technical areas under a specific category.	No. Amendment 8 updated the instructions for the Technical Approach to clarify it is based on the offeror's general technical capabilities with regard to the SEWP scope and Acquisition Objectives and not on the sample Technical Areas.
4410	Page 111, under Section A.3.7.3, indicates that vendors should write to "the fullest range of ITC/AV Solutions...". Please clarify if NASA would like vendors to address only the service areas which align to their Past Performance References and Relevant Experience Projects.	No. Amendment 8 updated the instructions for the Technical Approach to clarify it is based on the offeror's general technical capabilities with regard to the SEWP scope and Acquisition Objectives and not on the sample Technical Areas.

4423	For Ex 3b - Category B Solutions Spreadsheet, if multiple contract years should be included on the Solutions Spreadsheet, what is the format for proposing out year rates? Should we add a column for each year or duplicate the spreadsheet for each year?	Amendment 8 removed Exhibit 3b from the solicitation.
4427	<p>"• Page 112, under Section A.3.7.3(b)(1)(v), states, ""The Offeror shall either fill out Exhibit 5: C-SCRM Attestation Form or provide a copy of a valid active Open Trusted Technology Provider™ Standard (O-TTPS) Certification to attest to meeting the ISO 20243 standard.""</p> <p>• Page 96, under Section A.3.6(B)'s Proposal Submission Table, implies that Exhibit 5 is excluded from the page-limited section of the Mission Suitability Volume's Management Approach Volume III-B.</p> <p>• Page 93, under Section A.3.3(d), states, ""The electronic files shall not include embedded attachments in PDF.""</p> <p>Exhibit 5 is provided by the Government in PDF format. QUESTION: Can the Government please clarify that Exhibit 5 should be submitted as a stand-alone PDF attachment?"</p>	Amendment 8 clarified that Exhibits 3a, 4 and 5 should be submitted as MS Office Excel format with working cell formulas.
4429	For Ex 3b - Category B Solutions Spreadsheet, should overtime and/or shift rates for non-exempt labor categories be included in the Solutions Spreadsheet or are these rates proposed at the Task Order level?	Amendment 8 removed Exhibit 3b from the solicitation.
4437	The RFP states "Offerors may not use the ISO 9001:2015 and/or CMMI certifications of a Parent Company, Affiliate, Division, and/or Subsidiary within a corporate structure." We followed the SEWP VI draft. The draft only required that the bidder have a current ISO 9001:2015 certification and made no mention of further limiting factors that would be required of the certificate and how it is held within a corporate structure. Until recently, our company held more than one ISO 9001:2015 Certification under different parts of the overall corporate structure. However, a business decision was made to consolidate those certifications under a single certificate. So while the scope of this new single certificate is better than the previous scope across multiple certificates, the name on the certificate may not meet the requirement as currently stated in the RFP. So, while this change to the RFP language may seem minor to the government, it is not insignificant to bidders. No question...just a comment...thank you.	Thank you for the comment.
4452	Section A.3.7.3(b)(4)(ii) states "For Category B and C, all Service Areas both directly listed in Attachment A: Scope Category Description and otherwise fitting within the broad ICT/AV scope of SEWP." Attachment A does not contain a heading entitled "Scope Category Descriptions." Please confirm offerors should use RFP Section A.1.2. to address this requirement.	Amendment 8 updated the instructions for the Technical Approach evaluation factor.
4475	Could Government please clarify the reference to Attachment A in the program management section 4(ii)? "For Category A, the plan shall consider all Technology areas in Attachment A: Scope of Work Section-Scope Category Description. Attachment A references back to the RFP, stating that "Representative technical areas for each category are in A.1.2 GSFC 52.211-91 SCOPE OF WORK."	Amendment 8 updated the instructions for the Technical Approach to clarify it is based on the offeror's general technical capabilities with regard to the SEWP scope and Acquisition Objectives and not on the sample Technical Areas.
4484	Due to the limited instructions on how to complete the Ex 3b - Category B Solutions Spreadsheet, please provide a sample(s) of a completed spreadsheet.	Amendment 8 removed Exhibit 3b from the solicitation.
4486	<p>The mandatory experience instructions state that "An REP must be based on a single specific contract or task order and not based on a single IDIQ contract." However, in section A.3.7.2, the past performance instructions allow for the use of a single award BPA at the contract level, "An Offeror may submit a single award IDIQ/BPA at the contract/agreement level for as a single past performance reference. However, Offerors are not permitted to submit a multiple award or GWAC as an individual past performance reference."</p> <p>Will the Government confirm this language should also apply for the Relevant Experience Project (REP) for mandatory experience to allow for the use of a single award BPA or IDIQ? A single-awardee BPA often has multiple call orders that apply to a single body of work. For example, a customer may award two call orders in succession where the second call order is just a continuation of the work. Since there is a single awardee, this should be considered the same contract.</p>	Wording for REPs was updated in Amendment 8 to be similar to the past performance wording.

4489	<p>A.3.7.3(b)(2) MISSION SUITABILITY VOLUME/MANAGEMENT APPROACH (SUBFACTOR B)/Commitment to Sustainability. Very few Category C offerors (i.e., small businesses) currently have the sustainment artifacts required by this section, which thus establishes a set of unreasonable requirements for small business firms' evaluations. Request these requirements be deleted for Category C offerors.</p> <p>A.3.7.3 (b)(4) MISSION SUITABILITY VOLUME/MANAGEMENT APPROACH (SUBFACTOR B)/Program Management. This section requires Category C offerors to manage up to ten (10) customer requests for (RFI's, RFQ's, etc.) task order proposals, GWAC contract administration, and task order administration each and every day. This is also an unreasonable requirement for small businesses to meet. Request the government amend the requirement to five (5) customer requests per day.</p>	Amendment 8 updated the Commitment to Sustainability section.
4496	Exhibit 3c If the offeror is proposing labor rates, is the rate per hour to be included in column F, SEWP Catalog Price?	Exhibit 3c were removed from the solicitation in Amendment 8.
4498	A.3.6 (B) PROPOSAL CONTENT AND PAGE LIMITATIONS. In the Proposal Submission Table, what do the asterisks next to Category A, Category B, and Category C line items in the Mission Suitability Volume refer to?	Amendment 8 removed the asterisks.
4501	Proposal Content and Page Limitations table: what does the "*" denote under Mission Suitability Volume, Technical Approach, Categories A through C?	Amendment 8 removed the asterisks.
4527	The RFP states that offerors should provide a "summary description of their offerings and capabilities as it relates to the scope of the proposed Category". Does that summary of offerings and capabilities only apply to those technical areas highlighted in the associated REPs, or must it describe them for EVERY technical area in that Category?	Amendment 8 updated the instructions for the Technical Approach to clarify it is based on the offeror's general technical capabilities with regard to the SEWP scope and Acquisition Objectives and not on the sample Technical Areas.
4528	If vendors must provide a description of their offerings and capabilities for all technical areas of the Scope of Work, will there be a penalty (assigned a minimal confidence score) applied if a vendor has no offerings or capabilities in one or more of those technical areas?	Amendment 8 updated the instructions for the Technical Approach to clarify it is based on the offeror's general technical capabilities with regard to the SEWP scope and Acquisition Objectives and not on the sample Technical Areas.
4531	Mission Suitability Technical Approach, please clarify if the offeror must address all Technical Areas to be evaluated highly.	Amendment 8 updated the instructions for the Technical Approach to clarify it is based on the offeror's general technical capabilities with regard to the SEWP scope and Acquisition Objectives and not on the sample Technical Areas.
4541	A.3.7.1 Offer Volume, (b) Mandatory Experience / Offerings, Category B §.103 Please confirm the rates utilized to establish the initial Contract Database of Record upon contract award represent ceiling rates for the resultant contract.	Amendment 8 removed Exhibit 3b from the solicitation.
4542	Offerors proposing to category B and/ or C shall complete Exhibit 3b- Category B Solutions Spreadsheet and Exhibit 3c- Category C Solutions Spreadsheet. we are an SDVOSB proposing only services in category B and Category C, do we need to complete this form? if we do where do we get the SEWP catalog price? also, the solicitation states "price will not be evaluated" so do these forms need to be completed and submitted with our proposal at the contract level or should they be completed at task order levels?	Amendment 8 removed Exhibit 3b and 3c from the solicitation.
4568	For Exhibit 3c, Proposed Offerings, can the Government please confirm if a UNSPSC code is required if an Offeror is proposing an hourly labor rate?	Amendment 8 removed Exhibit 3c from the solicitation.
4577	For Exhibit 3c, Proposed Offerings, can the Government please confirm if the technical area tab is intended to collect CLINs (labor categories and hourly labor rates) for the SEWP base year only, or is the intention to include multiple contract years within the single tab? If multi-year, how should data be entered?	Amendment 8 removed Exhibit 3c from the solicitation.
4581	<p>A.3.1.7(a) states: "Offerors may not use the ISO 9001:2015 and/or CMMI certifications of a Parent Company, Affiliate, Division, and/or Subsidiary within a corporate structure."</p> <p>It is possible for an ISO 9001 certification to be issued to a group of subsidiaries under a common parent. In this case, all subsidiaries within the group are named on the ISO certification. Will the Government accept an ISO 9001 certificate that specifically names the offeror as being in scope of the 9001 Quality Management System (QMS)?</p>	Amendment 8 update the certification requirements with regards to businesses with a Meaningful Relationship Commitment Letter.

4586	For Exhibit 3c, Proposed Offerings, can the Government please provide guidance on how an Offeror should indicate escalation for hourly labor rates?	Exhibit 3b and 3c were removed from the solicitation in Amendment 8.
4591	For Exhibit 3c, Proposed Offerings, can the Government please provide guidance on how an Offeror should indicate which year of the contract an hourly labor rate is effective?	Exhibit 3b and 3c were removed from the solicitation in Amendment 8.
4598	A.3.7.1(b) Category B and C states: "The UNSPSC codes must accurately match the proposed services / technology in each row and must be the full 8-digit UNSPSC code." Does the government anticipate Exhibit 3b and 3c to be completed with a list of labor categories? If so, is each labor category required to have a unique UNSPSC code?	Exhibit 3b and 3c were removed from the solicitation in Amendment 8.
4621	A.3.7.2 (A) states: "Offerors identified as HUBZone, SDVOSB, EDWOSB, 8a in Category B and C shall provide past performance references showcasing relevant work in at least two (2) content representative areas for content to be rated relevant (pertinent)." To be rated relevant, do HUBZone, SDVOSB, EDWOSB, and 8(a) offerors need to provide references that cover a total of two (2) content representative areas? Or does each individual reference need to cover the two (2) content representative areas on its own?	The solicitation was updated on Amendment 8 to clarify that, in this example, only a total of 2 REPs are required.
4628	If a Past Performance reference has a different NAICS code listed in FPDS-NG from the NAICS code listed on the contract's award form, will the Government accept either NAICS code to determine relevancy?	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.
4629	If a Past Performance reference has a broad scope covering technical areas beyond the definition of the contract's assigned NAICS code, will the Government evaluate and accept the relevant scope of the contract as described in Volume II regardless of the 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.
4632	We have contracts with scopes that align to the SEWP VI acquisition objectives and Category B and C scope. However, the contracts were issued under NAICS codes 541712 and 541715. Will the Government evaluate these contracts relevant if we provide a letter from the Contracting Officer and/or Program Manager of each contract, verifying that the work performed is relevant to a NAICS code listed in RFP section A.1.34?	A letter from the CO or PM is not required. The Offeror should describe how the work relates to the NAICS code being used for competition.
4636	A.3.7.1 (b) Mandatory Experience/ Offerings, Technical Area Tabs: - Column 'H' requires offerors to denote compliance if a technology solution is TAA, EPEAT, and/or 508 Compliant. Will the Government please confirm that a "Yes" or "No" should be used to denote compliance in Column 'H' in Exhibit 3a?	Amendment 8 removed Column H.
4638	A.3.7.1 (b) Mandatory Experience/ Offerings; 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." Will the Government please revise this to state: "A total of 2 different REPs from different mandatory experience technical areas shall be submitted."?	The solicitation was updated on Amendment 8 to clarify that, in this example, only a total of 2 REPs are required.
4639	When completing Exhibit 3c- Category C Solutions Spreadsheet, can offers include hourly labor rates for specific UNSPSC Codes?	Exhibit 3c was removed from the solicitation in Amendment 8.
4640	When completing Exhibit 3c- Category C Solutions Spreadsheet, can offers include task rates for specific UNSPSC Codes?	Exhibit 3c was removed from the solicitation in Amendment 8.
4642	Enclosure 1- SEWP VI Providers - Will the Government please explain the rationale for the de-scoping of the list of designated providers versus the Draft RFP? Additionally, will the Government consider adding other industry-leading providers that are not currently on the list, specifically in the area of Audio/Visual (A/V)?	Amendment 8 provided an updated listing of Designated Providers including significantly increasing the number and types of providers.
4647	Enclosure 1- SEWP VI Providers - The Designated Provider list does not include industry leading manufacturers for several key Technical Areas. For example, equipment to meet the requirements of Technical Area 6a Audio/Visual Equipment is limited to Samsung Group and LeGrand. Industry leaders like Crestron and Extron are not included. Would the Government consider the inclusion of additional companies to the designated provider list?	Amendment 8 provided an updated listing of Designated Providers including significantly increasing the number and types of providers.

4654	Section A.3.6 (a) (3) pg.95 of the RFP states, "Excel spreadsheets shall be converted to PDF, in the most readable manner practicable, and submitted as part of a single PDF file. Please confirm the converted Excel spreadsheet needs to be on 8-1/2" x 11" paper, with 1-inch margins, in 10-point Times New Roman Font, in a landscape page orientation?"	Amendment 8 clarified that Exhibits 3a, 4 and 5 should be submitted as MS Office Excel format with working cell formulas.
4659	Will the government please provide evaluation criteria for Section A.4.4.vi?	Amendment 8 updated the evaluation criteria section.
4661	For Volume III, Technical Approach, item 1, "The scalability and extensibility of the offeror's capabilities that demonstrates the offeror's ability to deliver the fullest range of ITC/AV Solutions and/or Services for the proposed category, both inclusive of the listed technical areas and the breadth and depth beyond those Areas within the scope of the given Category" Does the government expect the offeror to respond to each of the 11 technical areas under Category C or only the technical areas in which the offeror is providing REPs for?	Amendment 8 updated the instructions for the Technical Approach to clarify it is based on the offeror's general technical capabilities with regard to the SEWP scope and Acquisition Objectives and not on the sample Technical Areas.
4663	Section A.3.6 (b) (2) pg.96 of the RFP states that the excel exhibits provided are formatted using 9 - 12 point Times New Roman font. Does the Offeror need to change the font sizes (e.g., to size 10 or 12) before converting the document to a PDF for proposal submission?	No. Note that Amendment 8 removed the requirement to convert the spreadsheet to PDF.
4669	Section A.3.7.3(a)1 of the RFP states that an offeror must include a description of how their technical approach demonstrates the, "...ability to deliver the fullest range of ITC/AV Solutions and/or Services for the proposed category, both inclusive of the listed technical areas and the breadth and depth beyond those Areas within the scope of the given Category." Would the Government please clarify if an offeror is required to provide a description of how their technical approach addresses each of the eleven technical areas within the Category they are proposing against in order to receive a high confidence rating in Mission Suitability? For instance, if an offeror is proposing against Category B, will they only receive high confidence rating if their technical approach addresses all Technical Areas 1b through 11b individually?	Amendment 8 updated the instructions for the Technical Approach to clarify it is based on the offeror's general technical capabilities with regard to the SEWP scope and Acquisition Objectives and not on the sample Technical Areas.
4675	Exhibit 3B – Category B Solutions Spreadsheet – For Category B Service Providers, Column C is not relevant for services/labor categories because there would be no associated "Provider Part Number". Would the Government provide an updated Exhibit 3b with the column removed?	Amendment 8 removed Exhibit 3b from the solicitation.
4692	The Relevant Experience Project requirements for HUBZone, VOSB, SDVOSB, WOSB, EDWOSB, and 8a offerors seem to be more stringent than the requirements for Small Business offerors. Would the Government please clarify if this was done deliberately? Specifically, HUBZone, VOSB, SDVOSB, WOSB, EDWOSB, 8a offerors are required to provide, "a total of 2 different REPs for each of the mandatory experience technical areas shall be submitted." Whereas small business offerors are only required to provide "a total of three (3) different REPs from different mandatory experience technical areas..."	The solicitation was updated on Amendment 8 to clarify that, in this example, only a total of 2 REPs are required.

4701	<p>"What type of information does the Government want us to use to address the elements under FAR 9.104, specifically:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Having adequate financial resources to perform the NASA SEWP contract -Being able to comply with the proposed delivery or performance schedule -Having a satisfactory, or better, history of performance on our contracts <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Having a satisfactory record of integrity and business ethics -Having the necessary organization, experience, accounting, operational controls and technical skills -Having the necessary production and technical equipment and facilities -Being otherwise qualified and eligible to receive an award under applicable laws and regulations " 	The wording with regard to 9.104 was updated in Amendment 8.
4714	In Section A.3.7.3.b.2 of the SEWP VI RFP, the Government asks, "Does your company have in place a documented environmental management system?" Is an offeror able to claim an environmental management system via a meaningful relationship? Please advise.	Amendment 8 updated the Commitment to Sustainability section.
4716	The RFP says to submit Excels with working formulas, but also says that "Spreadsheets shall also be converted to PDF, in the most readable manner practicable, and submitted as part of a single PDF file." Can the Government clarify which Excel spreadsheets are to be submitted in Excel and which should be in PDF?	Amendment 8 clarified that Exhibits 3a, 4 and 5 should be submitted as MS Office Excel format with working cell formulas.
4720	Requesting the language be removed regarding the inability to use Parent Company or affiliates ISO certifications for SEWP VI bid. This language was not included in the DRAFT RFQ and our company has invested significant time and money into preparation to respond to this bid. We were planning to use our affiliate's ISO certification until our's was finalized. We are currently in process of the ISO Certification but will not have it at the time of proposal submission. We will have the ISO Certification prior to contract award.	Amendment 8 update the certification requirements with regards to businesses with a Meaningful Relationship Commitment Letter.
4726	Please confirm that offerors must provide a comprehensive list of labor categories in Exhibit 3b/c that would cover ANY services that might fit under the scope of work and be awarded via task orders on SEWP VI. This comprehensive list should also include levels (e.g., Systems Administrator Level I, Level II, Level III, Level IV)?	Amendment 8 removed Exhibit 3b and 3c from the solicitation.
4727	Is it the intent of Exhibit 3b/c to establish ceiling rates on SEWP VI which would then be discounted at the task order level? (similar to the way GSA operates their GWACS)	Amendment 8 removed Exhibit 3b and 3c from the solicitation.
4734	Will the government please clarify the evaluation criteria of "effectiveness, reasonableness, and efficiency"?	Amendment 8 updated the instructions for the Technical Approach evaluation factor.
4739	Is there any kind of escalation allowed for the Exhibit 3b/c labor categories in future years?	Amendment 8 removed Exhibit 3b and 3c from the solicitation.
4759	Section 2 of the Management Plan asks for companies to address questions related to Sustainability. Many small businesses do not have, or do, the items that the section is inquiring about. If a small business doesn't have in place an environmental management system for example, how does this affect the overall rating of the offeror's Management Plan (Subfactor B) in the Mission Suitability Volume?	Amendment 8 updated the Commitment to Sustainability section.
4760	Please confirm that offerors are to include a response to the Exhibit 3b and 3c requirements in a separate section and not as part of the REPs.	Amendment 8 removed Exhibit 3b and 3c from the solicitation.
4761	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." This requirement appears to be slightly different than the others listed for Small Businesses and Socioeconomic businesses. Please confirm that the government is actually requesting a total of 2 different REPS from different mandatory experience technical areas (i.e., 2 total REPS), and not for all mandatory experience technical areas (i.e., 20 total REPS).	The solicitation was updated on Amendment 8 to clarify that, in this example, only a total of 2 REPs are required.
4774	Please clarify the information to be provided in the technical approach.	Amendment 8 updated the instructions for the Technical Approach evaluation factor.

4780	Page 104, A.3.7.1. Offer Volume, pages 103-104, Category B, Under Category B, the RFP states that "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." This differs from the same section for Small Businesses and Other than Small Businesses, which state that REPs must be submitted for different mandatory experience technical areas. Could the Government please clarify if the language should be the same as the the others in Category B and Category C? For example: "For HUBZone, VOSB, SDVOSB, WOSB, EDWOSB, 8a offerors....: a total of 2 different REPs from different mandatory experience technical areas shall be submitted."	The solicitation was updated on Amendment 8 to clarify that, in this example, only a total of 2 REPs are required.
4785	In "Volume III – Mission Suitability," as a small business, do we need to write to all technical areas within a categories B and C, or just the ones that relate to our past performance?	Neither. Amendment 8 updated the instructions for the Technical Approach to clarify it is based on the offeror's general technical capabilities with regard to the SEWP scope and Acquisition Objectives and not on the sample Technical Areas.
4787	Page 103, Offer Volume, Section A.3.7.1. Can the government clarify whether Exhibit 3 is excluded from Volume I-Offeror Volume page count. It is not explicitly excluded in the current instructions.	The table was updated in Amendment 8 to indicate that Exhibit 3 is excluded from the page count.
4796	Some of the elements within the commitment to Sustainability feel like they would be difficult to fully meet for a small business contractor that only provides services. Would the government consider modifying this requirement to only be provided by other than small businesses in the management section?	Amendment 8 updated the Commitment to Sustainability section.
4804	The Government states, "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". May offerors proposing as a prime and as part of a joint venture also submit a technical approach that contains some duplication or replication of language?	Yes. Amendment 8 updated the solicitation to include the Technical approach in this section.
4807	Page 119, Commitment to Sustainability, Section A.4.4 (2), Can the government please clarify what constitutes a "recycling program?"	Amendment 8 updated the Commitment to Sustainability section.
4815	Page 19, Commitment to Sustainability, Section A.4.4 (2), We are a Small Business with 100% remote employees, please clarify what is intended by the question "does your company monitor its carbon emissions to set reductions targets or objectives?"	Amendment 8 updated the Commitment to Sustainability section.
4834	Exhibit 3b- Category B Solutions Spreadsheet column G "Labor Category (if Hourly Rate) meant for the LCAT or rate?"	Amendment 8 removed Exhibit 3b from the solicitation.
4835	Exhibit 3b- Category B Solutions Spreadsheet column G is for rate data, is this the expected rate with discount?	Amendment 8 removed Exhibit 3b from the solicitation.
4836	Exhibit 3b- Category B Solutions Spreadsheet column F "SEWP Catalog Price" for the total price (Rate*FTE) or is this for the rate with or without discount?	Amendment 8 removed Exhibit 3b from the solicitation.
4837	Exhibit 3b- Category B Solutions Spreadsheet is there a discount where should that be shown?	Amendment 8 removed Exhibit 3b from the solicitation.
4838	Exhibit 3b- Category B Solutions Spreadsheet Are LC names, degrees, years of experience to be listed?	Amendment 8 removed Exhibit 3b from the solicitation.
4843	Page 119, Commitment to Sustainability, Section A.4.4 (2), Can the Government please expand on and explain how Commitment to Sustainability will be used as an evaluation factor?	Amendment 8 updated the Commitment to Sustainability section.
4845	Exhibit 3b- Category B Solutions Spreadsheet Per Exhibit 3b, Offerors proposing to category B and/ or C shall complete Exhibit 3b- Category B Solutions Spreadsheet and Exhibit 3c- Category C Solutions Spreadsheet. The UNSPSC codes must accurately match the proposed services/technology in each row and must be the full 8-digit UNSPSC code. If the CLIN is for an hourly labor rate, then the associated labor category shall be provided in Column G (Labor Category if Hourly Rate). The information including pricing in these spreadsheets will not be reviewed or evaluated and will only be utilized to establish the initial Contract Database of Record upon Contract award. Should the the base year be provided only? "	Amendment 8 removed Exhibit 3b and 3c from the solicitation.
4848	Page 119, Commitment to Sustainability, Section A.4.4 (2), Regarding Commitment to Sustainability, why is this required for a Category B or Category C services contract? It's clearly relevant to a Category A Product proposal.	Amendment 8 updated the Commitment to Sustainability section.
4852	Page 119, Commitment to Sustainability, Section A.4.4 (2), Regarding Commitment to Sustainability, can the government provide guidance on what corporate characteristics would be more favorably rated?	Amendment 8 updated the Commitment to Sustainability section.

4857	Page 119, Commitment to Product and Services Diversity A.4.4 (3), Please expand on and explain how Commitment to Product and Services Diversity will be used as an evaluation factor, including guidelines on how the commitment will be evaluated?	The Government will evaluate if the Offeror's response indicate they understand the requirements and demonstrate an ability to be successful in performing the contract with little or no Government intervention.
4858	We understand Category B Unrestricted offerors cannot reference team members in their Relevant Experience (Volume I) and Past Performance (Volume II) responses. However, nothing explicitly prevents this in Mission Support. Can offerors propose solutions from our entire SEWP Team in the Tech Approach and Management Sections?	Yes. Amendment 8 clarified the wording in A.3.7.3 MISSION SUITABILITY VOLUME in terms of teaming partners, subcontractors, and other business to business relationships.
4870	Is it the government's intention that offerors describe how the proposed features and architectural features of the individual solutions for each Technical Area provide technological leadership in allowing for the next generation of technology, or is the government asking offerors to describe how they generally provide technological leadership in allowing the next generation of technology?	Amendment 8 updated the wording in this section.
4872	Can the Government provide guidance on how to complete Exhibit 3b and 3c specific to service labor categories since it states that price/cost is not being evaluated, but Exhibit 3b and 3c are pass/fail requirements of Volume 1: Offer.	Amendment 8 removed Exhibit 3b and 3c from the solicitation.
4873	Reference SEWP VI RFP; page 111; A.3.7.1(b) and A.3.7.3(a); Reference RFP text: "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." "The offeror must provide a summary description of their offerings and capabilities as it relates to the scope of the proposed Category as provided in A.1.2 GSFC 52.211-91 SCOPE OF WORK (FEB 2016)." Question: For Category A, are offerors required to address all 9 technical areas in their Mission Suitability Technical Approach (Subfactor A) narrative, or should they only address the 4 areas they selected in the Offer Volume Mandatory Experience / Offerings section?	Amendment 8 updated the instructions for the Technical Approach to clarify it is based on the offeror's general technical capabilities with regard to the SEWP scope and Acquisition Objectives and not on the sample Technical Areas.
4874	Should offerors describe how they will support the four acquisition objectives of SEWP and questions #1, #2, and #3 when describing each individual solution for each Technical Area?	Amendment 8 updated the instructions for the Technical Approach to clarify it is based on the offeror's general technical capabilities with regard to the SEWP scope and Acquisition Objectives and not on the sample Technical Areas.
4896	Reference SEWP VI RFP; page 95; A.3.6; Could the Government please confirm that all spreadsheets must be converted to pdf files, including the government-spreadsheets issued with the solicitation?	Amendment 8 clarified that Exhibits 3a, 4 and 5 should be submitted as MS Office Excel format with working cell formulas.
4900	What sustainability standards must offerors meet to be considered effective, reasonable, and efficient? For example, must offerors have a documented environment management system, sustainable energy/environmental policy, and recycling program in place to be considered effective, reasonable, and efficient, and if so, what standards must these policies and programs meet to be considered effective, reasonable, and efficient (recycle at least 50% of recyclable waste, etc.)?	Amendment 8 updated the Commitment to Sustainability section.
4903	What are the minimum performance standards for sustainability programs and policies to be considered effective, reasonable, and efficient?	Amendment 8 updated the instructions for the Technical Approach evaluation factor.
4914	Per A.3.6 (A)(3), "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 to the section header. Spreadsheets shall also be converted to PDF, in the most readable manner practicable, and submitted as part of a single PDF file." Please confirm that spreadsheet conversion to the most readable manner practical supersedes the requirement for PDFs to be searchable.	Amendment 8 clarified that Exhibits 3a, 4 and 5 should be submitted as MS Office Excel format with working cell formulas.
4943	Request for Clarification. Conflict between Sections. RFP Section A.3.3(b) states that there shall be no hidden formulas which indicates an Excel document. A.3.6(A)(3) states all documents must be submitted in PDF format. Exhibits 3a, 3b, 3c, and 4 are all Excel documents. QUESTION: Does the Government want all proposal Excel files submitted in PDF format?	Amendment 8 clarified that Exhibits 3a, 4 and 5 should be submitted as MS Office Excel format with working cell formulas.

4947	80TECH24R0001 SEWP VI Final RFP. Para A.1.34 (North American Industry Classification System (NAICS) & NAICS Codes Within Scope) identifies predominant (541512 and 541519) NAICS codes governing applicability to SEWP VI task order solicitations, and then lists additional NAICS codes for support Categories A, B and C that must be used within the scope of SEWP VI to prove experience in mandatory category technical sub-areas. The listed NAICS codes do not include commonly used, Government-selected NAICS codes for which many federal and commercial contracts are awarded with relevant experience across SEWP VI technical areas. These include NAICS codes 541611, 541712, 541715, 541330 which are included on other NASA service contracts with highly relevant work. We request that NASA amend the current RFP to expand the list of acceptable, in-scope NAICS codes to include these so that qualified bidders can submit their relevant experience projects for evaluation against SEWP VI requirements or add narrative that states other NAICS codes are acceptable with proposal information that details the relevance of work as compared to the SEWP technical area(s).	The comment is no longer relevant - Amendment 8 removed the reference to NAICS code with regard to REPs.
4974	Technical Area 11b: Program Management/Ancillary Services and Supplies is referred to in the A.1.2 GSFC 52.211-91 SCOPE OF WORK. For Category B, Mission Suitability, Technical subfactor, should Offerors address Technical Area 11b in their proposal response? Or Should Offerors focus on Technical Areas 1b through 10b as set forth in Volume I and Volume II proposal instructions?	Amendment 8 updated the instructions for the Technical Approach to clarify it is based on the offeror's general technical capabilities with regard to the SEWP scope and Acquisition Objectives and not on the sample Technical Areas.
4987	A.3.6 (B), page 96: What is the purpose/meaning of the bold print and asterisks in the Proposal Submission Table under the Mission Suitability Volume III? Cat A, B, and C?	Amendment 8 removed the asterisks and Bold Print.
4988	The contract holder's user manual states the Contractor Holder Program Office will consist of, at the very least, a designated Program Manager (PM) and Deputy Program Manager (DPM). However, SOW section A.5.2 states "The Contractor Program Office will consist of at least a designated Program Manager." Please confirm the mandatory personnel to be located within the Contractor Holder Program Office.	Amendment 8 updated the section to indicate a Program Manager and Deputy Program Manager are required.
5007	How is the government evaluating (quantifying) "breadth" of experience across agencies for Small Businesses?	The Government will evaluate if the Offeror's response indicate they understand the requirements and demonstrate an ability to be successful in performing the contract with little or no Government intervention.
5018	A.3.7.3 Mission Suitability Volume - Subfactor B - For Category C - Page 112 (2) Commitment to Sustainability - these sections are key decision makers for an award - as a small business that maintains its corporate HQ in rented space and its staff works on customer site or remotely from their home offices, it is difficult to respond to many of the 7 questions with enough detail or significance that would lead to a determination of a High Confidence level. Can you please provide additional guidance for how a small business can meet these requirements (particularly measuring/reducing carbon emissions, greenhouse gas emissions, water usage) other than saying we seek to be environmentally aware in our day to day operations?	Amendment 8 updated the Commitment to Sustainability section.
5023	In the mission volume 15-page writeup, do we need to showcase our approach and experience for all service areas?	Amendment 8 updated the instructions for the Technical Approach to clarify it is based on the offeror's general technical capabilities with regard to the SEWP scope and Acquisition Objectives and not on the sample Technical Areas.
5041	In Category C- ITC/AV Mission-Based (Information Technology Communication (ITC) and Audio Visual (AV)) Services there are 11 service areas, the last one being Technical Area 11c: PROGRAM MANAGEMENT/ANCILLARY SERVICES. Should we provide our experience and approach for 11c in volume 3?	No. Amendment 8 updated the instructions for the Technical Approach to clarify it is based on the offeror's general technical capabilities with regard to the SEWP scope and Acquisition Objectives and not on the sample Technical Areas.
5050	A.3.7.3(a)1: "The scalability and extensibility of the Offeror's Capabilities that demonstrates the offeror's ability to deliver the fullest range of ITC/AV Solutions and/or Services for the proposed category, both inclusive of the listed technical areas and the breadth and depth beyond those Areas within the scope of the given Category." Please provide clarification of "breadth and depth beyond the Technical Areas" - is the Government asking for emerging technologies? Why is the Gov't asking for capabilities beyond the defined scope of work and technical areas?	Amendment 8 updated the instructions for the Technical Approach evaluation factor.

5052	<p>The Solicitation states "Offerors proposing to Category B and/or C shall complete Exhibit 3b- Category B Solutions Spreadsheet and Exhibit #c- Category Solutions Spreadsheet".</p> <p>Question: It is the Government's intention for Offers proposing for either Category B or Category C to complete Both Solutions Spreadsheet B and C to be compliant?</p>	Amendment 8 removed Exhibit 3b and 3c from the solicitation.
5053	Regarding the requirement that offerors proposing in Categories B and C complete the Category Solutions Spreadsheet, it seems that the requirement for this spreadsheet was created from a perspective of assuming that those proposing in Categories B and C are also providers of products and that we are familiar with completing similar requests. Many small business service based offerors are not familiar with UNSPSC codes and are not able to confidently know exactly how to complete the spreadsheet. We respectfully request that much more detail on completing this spreadsheet for Category B and C be provided. Please provide the information assuming that the this is the first time the offeror has been required to complete anything similar. In order to ensure that we provide the government with the exact information it is looking for, we request that you give exact instructions.	Amendment 8 removed Exhibit 3b and 3c from the solicitation.
5060	As part of Volume III, SubFactor A, are offerors required to address all Technical Mandatory Sub-Areas as part of their 15-page responses to Categories B & C?	Amendment 8 updated the instructions for the Technical Approach to clarify it is based on the offeror's general technical capabilities with regard to the SEWP scope and Acquisition Objectives and not on the sample Technical Areas.
5068	<p>The Government only requires Small Businesses to provide capability in 4 of the 9 technical areas in Volume 1 and prove past performance in Volume 2 for 3 of the 9 technical areas related to Category A. However, the technical approach instructions require descriptions of the "extensibility and scalability" of the offeror's capabilities.</p> <p>Are offerors submitting as Group A2- Small Business Set Aside required to provide a summary description of their offerings and capabilities as it relates to ALL nine (9) technical areas?</p> <p>OR</p> <p>Is it acceptable for offerors submitting as Group A2- Small Business Set Aside to provide a summary description of their offerings and capabilities ONLY as it relates to the four (4) technical areas proposed in Exhibit 3 Category A – Mandatory Experience Technical Areas?</p>	Amendment 8 updated the instructions for the Technical Approach to clarify it is based on the offeror's general technical capabilities with regard to the SEWP scope and Acquisition Objectives and not on the sample Technical Areas.
5074	For offerors submitting as Group A2- Small Business Set Aside, it is not mandatory to have experience in all nine (9) technical areas. In this case it is acceptable to provide a summary description of the offeror's future offerings and capabilities as it relates to these technical areas. If an offeror submitting as Group A2- Small Business Set Aside does not have experience in all nine (9) technical areas, is it acceptable to provide a summary description of it's future offerings and capabilities as it relates to these technical areas? In other words, is it acceptable to describe the plan to "scale" and bring capabilities to meet future requirements?	Amendment 8 updated the instructions for the Technical Approach to clarify it is based on the offeror's general technical capabilities with regard to the SEWP scope and Acquisition Objectives and not on the sample Technical Areas.
5077	<p>The Gov't will evaluate the Offeror's technical approach, specified in Section A.3.7.3(a)(1), Section A.3.7.3(a)(2), Section A.3.7.3(a)(3), for effectiveness, reasonableness, and efficiency. Section A.3.7.1(b) Category A states: Offerors shall complete Exhibit 3a - Category A Solutions Spreadsheet and propose technology solutions for any four (4) of the eight (8) Mandatory Technical Areas 1. thru 9.</p> <p>How many Technical Areas must be addressed in the Mission Suitability Technical Approach for Category A?</p> <p>How many Technical Areas for Category B? and Category C?</p>	Amendment 8 updated the instructions for the Technical Approach to clarify it is based on the offeror's general technical capabilities with regard to the SEWP scope and Acquisition Objectives and not on the sample Technical Areas.
5079	Attachment A, section A.5.1 mentions for contractors to see C.1.3.3 for ordering guide specifications however that section doesn't exist in the RFP. Which document can this be found in?	The reference was updated in Amendment 8.
5082	<p>"The Offeror shall provide a REP from NASA contracts, other Government contracts, and/or commercial contracts."</p> <p>Question: What forms of documentation would the Government accept as proof of Past Performance for non-NAICS-associated contracts that we serviced as a subcontractor?</p>	The comment is no longer valid - Amendment 8 removed the reference to NAICS code with regard to REPs.

5083	3. 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?	Amendment 8 removed the asterisks.
5092	"The Offeror shall provide a REP from NASA contracts, other Government contracts, and/or commercial contracts." Question: How could an Offeror present a commercial contract as a past performance that does not have a NAICS associated with it?	The comment is no longer valid - Amendment 8 removed the reference to NAICS code with regard to REPs.
5097	With the requirement to use AbilityOne for certain purchases based on NAICS code, FAR 8.005 requires the use of FAR 52.208-9 in solicitations and contracts. Will the Government add this clause in a future amendment?	FAR clause 52.208-9 was added in Amendment 8.
5098	Are you looking for a focus in our technical and management write ups on NASA specific needs and pain points, or are you looking for overall government solutions that will benefit multiple agencies?	The response should be with regard to the SEWP scope and Acquisition Objectives as defined in Attachment A.
5105	A.3.7.3.(a).1 instructs offerors to respond to the "listed technical areas" RFP A.1.2 lists 11 Technical Areas for Category B RFP A.3.7.1.(b) lists 10 Technical Areas for Category B RFP A.3.7.2.(a).12 lists 10 Content Representative Areas for Category B Exhibit 2 lists 10 Technical Areas for Category B When responding to the instructions in A.3.7.3.(a).1 which list of Technical Areas should be written against: the list with 1b - 11b or the lists with 1-10?	Amendment 8 updated the instructions for the Technical Approach to clarify it is based on the offeror's general technical capabilities with regard to the SEWP scope and Acquisition Objectives and not on the sample Technical Areas.
5108	he solicitation states "Only projects with NAICS codes listed as in-scope for SEWP VI are to be submitted". Many subcontracts and most all commercial contracts do not specify the NAICS code of the work being performed, and often time on larger programs the work performed by the subcontractor may not be aligned with the overall NAICS. For example a subcontractor may perform IT Services to support a large global logistics program. Question: How does the government intend for offerors to substantiate the relevant NAICS for work performed as a subcontractor or under a commercial contract? Will the details provided in the relevant experience project table be sufficient to identify the relevant NAICS code?	Amendment 8 removed the reference to NAICS code with regard to REPs.
5123	Would the Government please provide the Labor Categories that are required to be listed in Exhibit 3b?	Amendment 8 removed Exhibit 3b from the solicitation.
5125	Would the Government please clarify what the expectations are regarding the source of the required list of labor categories for Exhibit 3b?	Amendment 8 removed Exhibit 3b from the solicitation.
5126	If the Offeror is responding to Category B, are they still required to provide a UNSPSC code for each CLIN/Labor category in Exhibit 3b?	Amendment 8 removed Exhibit 3b from the solicitation.
5131	Page 103 Paragraph 4 indicates that "Offerors proposing to category B and/or C shall complete Exhibit 3b- Category B Solutions Spreadsheet and Exhibit 3c- Category C Solutions Spreadsheet" however within these Exhibit spreadsheets there is no indication of the government's desired/required number of Proposed Initial CLINs; should Offerors assume the quantity or related technical areas for Exhibits 3b & 3c are at their own discretion?	Amendment 8 removed Exhibit 3b and 3c from the solicitation.
5132	If Offerors are not allowed to utilize the ISO certificates of a parent company, will NASA allow both large and small business up to 12 months to explore whether an ISO certificate can be obtained?	Amendment 8 update the certification requirements with regards to businesses with a Meaningful Relationship Commitment Letter.
5138	Are all proposed products in Category A required to be TAA, EPEAT and 508 Compliant? Will NASA consider adding a separate column to indicate compliance (Yes or No) for each requirement?	No. Amendment 8 removed Column H.
5139	In regard to 508 Compliance, can the Offeror indicate compliance as long as an ACR/ VPAT can be provided for the offered product?	Amendment 8 removed Column H (the referenced section of this comment).
5162	Question: Does the offeror need to address all functional areas identified for the category they are responding to in their Technical Approach or only the areas that our REP's cover?	Amendment 8 updated the instructions for the Technical Approach to clarify it is based on the offeror's general technical capabilities with regard to the SEWP scope and Acquisition Objectives and not on the sample Technical Areas.

5183	Page 96 includes a table with three lines labeled with an asterisk (*); however, there appears to be nowhere that denotes what this indicates. Could the government please define what an asterisk means?	Amendment 8 removed the asterisks.
5194	"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." Question: Can the government confirm if each individual partner of the joint venture must provide REPs of, in our case, the Small Business requirement of Category C REPs being \$2M in size? Or will it be acceptable for one member of the JV to provide the REP of this size requirement?	Amendment 8 updated wording with regards to Joint Ventures.
5196	How will the government define "high confidence?" Should we consider filling out information for more than 4 categories of products? Or should we consider offering mostly TAA compliant products?	Amendment 8 updated the instructions for the Technical Approach to clarify it is based on the offeror's general technical capabilities with regard to the SEWP scope and Acquisition Objectives and not on the sample Technical Areas. There is no reference to TAA within the evaluation criteria.
5198	A.3.7.3 Mission Suitability Volume, (a) Technical Approach, (b) Management Approach, pages 110-113. Are the contractor's Technical and Management responses only for selected Category Technical Areas or for the entire scope within each area covering all Tech Areas? For example, if a contractor is selecting Category B, Technical Areas 2b, 5b, and 7b as part of their REP and Past Performance, are we to write the tech/management sections specifically for those tech areas?	No. Amendment 8 updated the instructions for the Technical Approach to clarify it is based on the offeror's general technical capabilities with regard to the SEWP scope and Acquisition Objectives and not on the sample Technical Areas.
5200	RFP Cover Letter states "Proposal shall include completed exhibits in MS Office Excel format with working cell formulas". Conflicts with instructions in Final RFP, on Page 95, that states "Spreadsheets shall also be converted to PDF", please clarify.	Amendment 8 clarified that Exhibits 3a, 4 and 5 should be submitted as MS Office Excel format with working cell formulas.
5212	Regarding A.3.7.3(a)1 on page 111, can the government clarify expectations/qualifiers of "breadth and depth beyond technical areas"? How does the government plan to evaluate this section for "High Confidence"?	The Government will evaluate if the Offeror's response indicate they understand the requirements and demonstrate an ability to be successful in performing the contract with little or no Government intervention.
5215	Per RFP page 103: "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." The (b) Mandatory Experience/Offerings instructions for Category B and C instructs offerors to submit "A total of four (4) different REPs from different mandatory experience technical areas..." Please advise if this means offerors should submit a total of 40 REP forms (four REPs completed for each one of the 10 mandatory experience technical area) or if this means offerors should submit 4 REP forms TOTAL (four REPs completed in totality that, in aggregate, meet the 10 mandatory experience technical areas).	The solicitation was updated on Amendment 8 to clarify that, in this example, only a total of 4 REPs are required.
5229	If the offeror is submitting under Category C Small Business, does the offeror have to submit a Commitment to Sustainability Plan? Some of these questions are not applicable, so how would the Government like the offeror to respond to those questions, if applicable? *I*	Amendment 8 updated the Commitment to Sustainability section.
5232	For labor based CLINs offerors must provide the hourly rate within column G. Does the offeror also need to provide a SEWP Catalog Price for labor based CLINs? If so, what should the basis of the SEWP Catalog Price be?	Exhibit 3b and 3c (referenced in this comment) were removed from the solicitation in Amendment 8.
5234	Do the contracts used for the REP and Past Performance need to fall within the NAICS codes listed on in Category B and C on page 63? Or if the tasks performed fall within the experience categories but the NAICS code for the contract is not listed; can the contract be used as a REP and Past Performance?	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.
5240	A.3.7.3 MISSION SUITABILITY VOLUME pg 111 (a) TECHNICAL APPROACH (SUBFACTOR A)./ The proposal shall clearly and fully demonstrate the offeror's capability, knowledge, and experience regarding the technical requirements of this RFP. QUESTION: Can the government clarify the areas they are referring to in reference to technical requirements of this RFP? *I*	Amendment 8 updated the instructions for the Technical Approach to clarify it is based on the offeror's general technical capabilities with regard to the SEWP scope and Acquisition Objectives in Attachment A.

5242	<p>A.3.7.3 MISSION SUITABILITY VOLUME pg 111 (a) TECHNICAL APPROACH (SUBFACTOR A). 1.The scalability and extensibility of the offeror's capabilities that demonstrates the offeror's ability to deliver the fullest range of ITC/AV Solutions and/or Services for the proposed category, both inclusive of the listed technical areas and the breadth and depth beyond those Areas within the scope of the given Category.</p> <p>Question: Can the Government please explain what they mean by extensibility and breadth and depth beyond those areas within the scope of the given category.</p> <p>Can the Government please clarify as it is listed under technical approach (subfactor A) under #1 as it refers to providing services for the proposed category both inclusive of the listed technical areas - does this pertain to the technical areas from the Past Performance (for example category C small business offerors shall provide past performance references showcasing relevant work in at least three (3) content representative areas for content to be rated relevant (pertinent). *I*</p>	Amendment 8 updated the instructions for the Technical Approach to clarify it is based on the offeror's general technical capabilities with regard to the SEWP scope and Acquisition Objectives and not on the sample Technical Areas.
5243	Will the Government confirm that Offerors proposing as a prime offeror and as part of a joint venture can submit the same Technical Approach in addition to submitting the same management approach, certifications, references for past performance and mandatory experience? Similar to the management approach the technical approach for a team will likely have some duplicative language to the individual team members.	Yes. Amendment 8 updated the solicitation to include the Technical approach in this section.
5249	Reference Volume I for Categories B and C, "Offerors proposing to category B and/or C shall complete Exhibit 3b - Category B Solutions Spreadsheet and Exhibit 3c - Category C Solutions Spreadsheet..." Can NASA provide more clarifying instructions to complete this spreadsheet since no other pricing is being asked for in this solicitation. Second, is this spreadsheet being evaluated?	Amendment 8 removed Exhibit 3b and 3c from the solicitation.
5251	RFP Cover letter states, "This competitive acquisition will result in a Government-Wide Acquisition Indefinite Delivery Indefinite Quantity Contract with the ability to issue Firm Fixed Price, Time and Material, Labor Hour, Fixed Price Award Fee, Fixed Price Incentive Fee, and Fixed Price Economic Price Adjustment task orders." QUESTION: Since many contract types are listed, what contract type should pricing in Exhibit 3 represent? Will offerors be able to provide additional CLIN pricing at the task order level depending on contract type?	For Category A, The Offeror can provide any pricing schema they want to include in the initial load of the SEWP Database of Record post-award. See A.1.23 TECHNOLOGY REFRESHMENT for a description of post-award updates to the Contract Holders Offerings and pricing.
5257	Can we mention the experience of teaming partners that we work with in the Mission Suitability Volume to explain our reach and strategy for providing a diverse range of products and services, if those teaming partners are not providing past performance experience and we do not have a Meaningful Relationship Commitment Letter with those companies?	Amendment 8 clarified the wording in A.3.7.3 MISSION SUITABILITY VOLUME in terms of teaming partners, subcontractors, and other business to business relationships.
5258	In the Attachment C – SEWP Contractor Holder User Manual, it mentions additional CLIN Guidance. Could the Government confirm that for Exhibit 3 excel documents, offerors should be submitting Pricing for all 10 years?	No. For Category A, The Offeror can provide the current pricing they want to include in the initial load of the SEWP Database of Record post-award. See A.1.23 TECHNOLOGY REFRESHMENT for a description of post-award updates to the Contract Holders Offerings and pricing.
5263	Page 103 paragraph 1 states that "A REP must be based on a single specific contract or task order and not based on a single IDIQ contract." May offerors base REPs on single award IDIQ contracts for a single customer?	Yes. The wording in amendment 8 was updated.
5270	Page 103 paragraph 1 states that "A REP must be based on a single specific contract or task order and not based on a single IDIQ contract." May offerors base REPs on single award BOA or BPA for a single customer?	Yes. The wording in amendment 8 was updated.
5275	The wording in Category B is, "A total of two (2) different REPS for each of the mandatory experience technical areas shall be submitted. In Category C, the wording is "A total of two (2) different REPS from different mandatory experience technical areas shall be submitted." In Category C, is it required to provide REPs for all technical areas, or is there a minimum of technical areas?	The solicitation was updated on Amendment 8 to clarify that, in this example, only a total of 2 REPs are required.

5280	<p>The RFP 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""</p> <p>Question: Would the Government please confirm that recency is established by submitting contracts completed or ongoing within three years of the solicitation release date? Would the Government please remove the word ""most"" from the citation above?</p>	<p>Yes, recency is established by submitting contracts completed or ongoing within three years of the solicitation release date. Amendment 8 removed the word "most".</p>
5282	<p>Category A has clear UNSPSC codes associated with each technical area yet Categories B and C technical areas do not. The RFP states that the full list of codes can be found in Attachment C however, there is no full list in attachment C as stated in the RFP. Please provide the list of in-scope UNSPSC codes and how they correspond to each technical area for Categories B and C so that offerors competing in this category can be sure we are providing the government with the correct information.</p>	<p>Exhibit 3b and 3c were removed from the solicitation in Amendment 8.</p>
5290	<p>Regarding Section 2 of the Management Plan, specifically questions number 5 and 6, many Small Businesses do not have the time, knowledge, or the monetary resources to do things like "create sustainability purchasing guidelines for your direct suppliers that address issues such as environmental compliance, employment practices, and product/ingredient safety", and "monitor carbon emissions". What is the reasoning behind including these specific questions as being required for Small Businesses? Will a SB management plan be looked at less favorably if they do not do these things?</p>	<p>Amendment 8 updated the Commitment to Sustainability section.</p>
5301	<p>Reference Volume III Mission Suitability, Technical Approach, Project Descriptions: 1. What exactly should the summary descriptions entail – is this overall for the Category or should we provide our offerings and capabilities for each Scope of Work task area, but the overall 15-page limit is constrained?</p> <p>2. Where or what are the four acquisition objectives to ensure all bidders are responding to the same objectives?</p> <p>3. Does each summary description have to also include items 1-3, or are they separate requirements in addition to the Summary Descriptions?</p>	<p>Amendment 8 updated the instructions for the Technical Approach to clarify it is based on the offeror's general technical capabilities with regard to the SEWP scope and Acquisition Objectives in Attachment A. The 2 listed items as updated in Amendment 8 should be separately addressed.</p>
5313	<p>Reference Volume III Mission Suitability, Project Descriptions, do we need to address 11b for Category B since this one was not included in any of the Category B lists in Section L, and same for 11c for Category C?</p>	<p>Amendment 8 updated the instructions for the Technical Approach to clarify it is based on the offeror's general technical capabilities with regard to the SEWP scope and Acquisition Objectives and not on the sample Technical Areas.</p>
5315	<p>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."</p> <p>Please confirm that for Category B- Mandatory Experience Technical Areas 1-10 REPs a total of two REPs are required covering at least two different mandatory experience areas.</p>	<p>The solicitation was updated on Amendment 8 to clarify that, in this example, only a total of 2 REPs are required covering 2 different technical areas each.</p>
5327	<p>In the RFP, Section A.3.7.1(b), Pg. 104, the language for required REPs for HUBZone, VOSB, SDVOSB, WOSB, EDWOSB, 8(a) offerors requires "A total of 2 different REPs for each of the mandatory experience technical areas"</p> <p>This language differs significantly from the requirement for other than small business and for small business, which requires different REPs from different mandatory experience technical areas, but does not require coverage for all technical areas. Please clarify that the 2 REPs must be from different areas, but 2 are not required for each technical area.</p>	<p>The solicitation was updated on Amendment 8 to clarify that, in this example, only a total of 2 REPs are required.</p>
5345	<p>For the REP NAICS requirement, may offerors submit projects from other NAICS if the project contained significant activity that would fall under an in-scope NAICS?</p>	<p>The comment is no longer valid - Amendment 8 removed the reference to NAICS code with regard to REPs.</p>

5358	In Category B, Small Businesses are required to provide 3 REPs "from different mandatory experience technical areas", but HUBZone, VOSB, SDVOSB, WOSB, EDWOSB, and 8a are required to provide 2 REPs "for each of the mandatory experience technical areas." Two REPs for EACH technical area would be $2 \times 10 = 20$ REPs. Are offerors in those socioeconomic categories required to provide TWENTY REPs where regular SB are only required to provide three?	The solicitation was updated on Amendment 8 to clarify that, in this example, only a total of 2 REPs are required covering 2 different technical areas each.
5418	"Offerors proposing to category B and/ or C shall complete Exhibit 3b- Category B Solutions Spreadsheet and Exhibit 3c - Category C Solutions Spreadsheet." Please clarify the use of "and/or" - Does this require offerors that are only submitting in Category C to provide Solutions Spreadsheets for both category B and C?	Exhibit 3b and 3c were removed from the solicitation in Amendment 8.
5435	Are offerors to detail support for the "four Acquisition Objectives" for each of the three items in the list under A.3.7.3(a)?	Amendment 8 updated the instructions for the Technical Approach to clarify it is based on the offeror's general technical capabilities with regard to the SEWP scope and the first three Acquisition Objectives.
5439	Are we correct to understand that for Categories B and C that Offerors should list all services and labor categories that the offeror may wish to offer at any point under SEWP VI on the Solutions Spreadsheet?	Exhibit 3b and 3c were removed from the solicitation in Amendment 8.
5456	<p>The Professional Services Council (PSC) is providing this comment and has identified this issue as an item of high importance to the government services industry as a whole. PSC is the voice of the government technology and professional services industry, representing the full range and diversity of the government services sector. PSC is the most respected industry leader on legislative and regulatory issues related to government acquisition, business and technology. PSC helps shape public policy, leads strategic coalitions, and works to build consensus between government and industry. PSC's more than 400 member companies represent small, medium, and large businesses that provide services and solutions to federal agencies. Our members employ hundreds of thousands of Americans in all 50 states.</p> <p>The RFP states that "Offerors may not use the ISO 9001:2015 and/or CMMI certifications of a Parent Company, Affiliate, Division, and/or Subsidiary within a corporate structure." This is a departure from other governmentwide acquisitions, notably GSAs Alliant 3, OASIS+, and the Department of State Evolve IDIQ which all allow certification credit within meaningful relationships.</p> <p>Government service providers have a wide range of corporate structures based on their own unique history and value proposition. For many companies, there is a scenario where the certification, although in the name of a Parent Company, expressly covers the scope of multiple entities' systems, because the ISO 9001 certifications are issued to cover specific quality management systems, not specific entities. Allowing certifications from other corporate entities in a corporate structure would allow the full range of proven IT solution providers to compete for SEWP VI, not arbitrarily limit competition, and provide for a complete and diverse SEWP vendor pool after award. The current RFP requirement dictates a specific</p>	Amendment 8 update the certification requirements with regards to businesses with a Meaningful Relationship Commitment Letter.
5467	The evaluation for each section of the Mission Suitability volume states that it will be evaluated for "effectiveness, reasonableness, and efficiency" but does not define these terms or how these terms relate to the confidence ratings. The confidence ratings also only differ in the amount of "Government intervention" required but does not define what the scope of "little or no Government intervention" is or define Government intervention. Please clarify these evaluation terms.	Amendment 8 updated the evaluation criteria wording for Mission Suitability.
5480	Would Government please confirm/clarify the character and word limit as stated in the sentence "A brief description is to be provided in Column 'D' for each Technical Areas with no more than 2500 characters, 500 words." Is this meant to be 2,500 characters or 500 words?	Amendment 8 updated the wording to "no more than 2500 characters, and no more than 500 words"

5484	<p>Per the RFP, "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. ... Only projects with NAICS codes listed as in-scope for SEWP VI are to be submitted." The contract NAICS for larger, broad-scoped contracts is often not reflective of all of the different types of work executed thereunder and may still be relevant to the mandatory experience technical area. Particularly for small business subcontractors, work performed relevant to SEWP may be in non-SEWP NAICS. May Offerors submit REPs from other NAICS codes and provide justification for relevance to SEWP VI?</p>	Amendment 8 removed the reference to NAICS code with regard to REPs.
5486	<p>The Professional Services Council (PSC) is providing this comment and has identified this issue as an item of high importance to the government services industry as a whole. PSC is the voice of the government technology and professional services industry, representing the full range and diversity of the government services sector. PSC is the most respected industry leader on legislative and regulatory issues related to government acquisition, business and technology. PSC helps shape public policy, leads strategic coalitions, and works to build consensus between government and industry. PSC's more than 400 member companies represent small, medium, and large businesses that provide services and solutions to federal agencies. Our members employ hundreds of thousands of Americans in all 50 states.</p> <p>NASA seems to have included Exhibits 3b and 3c for IT services, which were not included in the draft RFP, to reflect Exhibit 3a for IT products. PSC believes that inclusion of these worksheets, which require Offeror identification and listing of their appropriate CLINs; LCATS; and catalog prices, inappropriately equates offerors who provide IT products to offerors who provide IT services. Additionally, such a requirement would unfairly favor existing contract holders with already established CLINs and LCATS. Under PSC's reading of DARS 204.71, the government should hold responsibility of identifying appropriate CLINs, not potential vendors. PSC believes that requesting service vendor identification of novel CLIN structures, which unlike commodities, do not have UNSPSC codes specified by the customer (i.e. under task order), would create confusion and burden throughout contract administration under Categories B and C for services. Offerors could potentially identify any CLIN structure for services and associate those numbers with any amount of labor categories, unless they</p>	Amendment 8 removed Exhibit 3b and 3c from the solicitation.
5494	<p>A.3.7.3 pg. 1115 SCRM is generally associated with companies that provide physical products; however, for a company that is exclusively a provider of services SCRM is somewhat vague and less applicable. Will the Government please remove the extensive SCRM requirement for Category B and/or C where only services are part of the offer and not physical products?</p>	Amendment 8 updated the SCRM section.

5495	<p>The Professional Services Council (PSC) is providing this comment and has identified this issue as an item of high importance to the government services industry as a whole. PSC is the voice of the government technology and professional services industry, representing the full range and diversity of the government services sector. PSC is the most respected industry leader on legislative and regulatory issues related to government acquisition, business and technology. PSC helps shape public policy, leads strategic coalitions, and works to build consensus between government and industry. PSC's more than 400 member companies represent small, medium, and large businesses that provide services and solutions to federal agencies. Our members employ hundreds of thousands of Americans in all 50 states.</p> <p>The Mission Suitability Volume, Management Approach requires Offerors to address their commitment to Supply Chain Management (SCRM) and their commitment to Sustainability. For Categories B & C, which are focused on I.T. Service delivery instead of systems, equipment and technology, PSC believes that these two areas, SCRM and Sustainability, are not relevant to determining whether a services delivery Offeror is suited to be an awardee, and will be counter-productive to the government both receiving the most qualified vendors and also including small business concerns in competition. SCRM is relevant to procurement of I.T. products with a physical supply chain that may be global in nature, but very limited in respect to services. For example, for a small services business under NAICS Codes 5415__ providing process Innovation Services under Category C, there may be no ancillary products or corporate risks associated with SCRM, therefore no way to detail steps for reduction or mitigation or participation with SCRM. Such a business may have a recycling program,</p>	Amendment 8 updated the SCRM and Commitment to Sustainability sections.
5501	<p>A.3.7.1 pg. 104 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.</p> <p>For category C, are SBs required to provide 3 REPs for each sub-area (30 total REPs), or a total of 3 REPs that cover 3 separate sub-areas?</p>	The solicitation was updated on Amendment 8 to clarify that, in this example, only a total of 3 REPs are required that cover 3 separate Technical Areas.
5509	<p>RFP, Page 103, Section A.3.7.1.b.Cat C.</p> <p>We are bidding Cat C. According the RFP, page 103, "Offerors proposing to category B and/ or C shall complete Exhibit 3b- Category B Solutions Spreadsheet and Exhibit 3c- Category C Solutions Spreadsheet. The Exhibit 3c- Category C Solutions Spreadsheet includes columns for Provider (OEM/Service Provider) by CLIN and Provider Part Number by CLIN.</p> <p>1. We are a reseller of cloud SKUs as well as a service provider. For services, what information is required to be placed in Provider (OEM/Service Provider) and Provider Part Number columns?</p> <p>2. The spreadsheet includes a column for Labor Category (if Hourly Rate). How is this connected to parts in each line item? How do we assign an hourly rate to a part or OEM provider? Do you want proposed CLINS based on different Services but no components?</p>	Exhibit 3b and 3c were removed from the solicitation in Amendment 8.
5525	<p>Per the RFP, "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. ... Only projects with NAICS codes listed as in-scope for SEWP VI are to be submitted." Since Commercial contracts have no NAICS, may Offerors submit REPs with a justification for relevance to SEWP VI?</p>	The comment is no longer valid - Amendment 8 removed the reference to NAICS code with regard to REPs.

5536	<p>Under “For Category B and C”, Page 103 of the RFP states, “Only projects with NAICS codes listed as in-scope for SEWP VI are to be submitted.” Often times the federal government groups work which may include tasks outside of the top level NAICS code awarded. In the recent past other government wide acquisition contract (GWAC) procurements have allowed this type of justification given this common scenario.</p> <p>For example, vendor is awarded a research project with a top level NAICS code of 541720 but it includes significant IT services (covering 541330, 541430, 541512, 541519).</p> <p>Considering this, is NASA willing to accept an REP with different NAICS codes not currently assigned to this procurement? This of course would be validated by a government official representing the program (COR, CO) approving there is significant work that falls under the NAICS code within the scope of this NASA SEWP procurement?</p>	The comment is no longer valid - Amendment 8 removed the reference to NAICS code with regard to REPs.
5540	<p>Mission Suitability: Commitment to Sustainability - The questions listed on page 112 appear to be more applicable to manufacturers. What does the Government consider “reasonable and effective” for companies who are service providers working in an office environment?</p>	Amendment 8 updated the Commitment to Sustainability section.
5545	<p>Mission Suitability: Commitment to Sustainability - Is answering “No” or “N/A” to the questions listed on page 112 considered reasonable for the evaluation criteria for service providers working in an office environment?</p>	Amendment 8 updated the Commitment to Sustainability section.
5547	<p>A.3.7.1 (page 100) states, "Offerors may not use the ISO 9001:2015 and/or CMMI certifications of a Parent Company, Affiliate, Division, and/or Subsidiary within a corporate structure." When both parent company and bidding entity are large businesses, please clarify if it would be acceptable for the ISO certification to be in the name of the parent company as long as the bidding entity address is one of the certified facilities and a Meaningful Relationship Commitment Letter is included as part of the proposal.</p>	Amendment 8 update the certification requirements with regards to businesses with a Meaningful Relationship Commitment Letter.
5553	<p>A.3.7.3(a) on page 110; Should ITC/AV be viewed as a broad term referencing the entire SEWP scope, or is a Category C Offeror required to discuss capabilities supporting all these functions? For example, our company focuses on IT Services, not Audio/Visual. If we do not discuss AV capabilities/solutions, will we not be rated with high confidence for this section?</p>	Amendment 8 updated the instructions for the Technical Approach to clarify it is based on the offeror's general technical capabilities with regard to the SEWP scope and Acquisition Objectives and not on the sample Technical Areas.
5554	<p>A.1.24; Exhibit 1 (REP) and Exhibit 2 (PPQ).</p> <p>We have multiple large contracts where the NAICS of the prime contract is not one of those listed in A.1.34. While the predominance of the work is not in IT, the contracts are large enough (over \$5M per year) where the IT components of the work are above the size thresholds required under the small business size rules presented for SEWP VI (well over \$1M per year). We would request to add the ability to use these references in a similar manner done under other recent GWAC procurements, where the size/composition of the IT work for a specific contract may be confirmed through a specific NAICS (as it works now) or through a size confirmation process using Exhibit 1 and/or 2. It would require simply adding a section to both Exhibit 1 and 2 with the value of the IT portion of the work (and associated NAICS for this work) that is separate from the NAICS of the prime contract. The confirmation/concurrence is performed through the signature of the Contracting Officer or Corporate Official (in the case of a subcontract) of the Exhibit. If you do not allow for this addition, you will be precluding many viable small business offerors that have strong IT capabilities.</p>	<p>Amendment 8 removed the NAICS code wording with regard to REPs.</p> <p>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.</p>
5556	<p>Meaningful Relationship Letters - Meaningful Relationship Letters are required for using past performance of subcontractors of small business prime offerors. Does this mean that we can use “subcontractor teammates” in our technical volume offering without being disqualified if we are not using their experience/past performance examples to meet the minimum experience or past performance requirements?</p>	Amendment 8 clarified that the proposal may refer to teaming partners, subcontractors, and other business to business relationships as support of the Offeror's core capabilities.

5577	Section A.3.7.1(a) states that "Offerors proposing to Category A and Category C are not required to have a CMMI certification"; however, Section A.4.2 states "Offerors will be evaluated based on providing the requirements as specified in Section A.3.7.1(a) that includes a valid ISO 9001 and CMMI certification." Please update Section A.4.2 if CMMI documentation is not required for small businesses.	Section A.4.2 was updated in Amendment 8.
5582	"If the CLIN is for an hourly labor rate, then the associated labor category shall be provided in Column G (Labor Category if Hourly Rate)" Can you please clarify where the labor category should be listed for the rate in Column G?	Exhibit 3b and 3c were removed from the solicitation in Amendment 8.
5587	Since Exhibit 3 isn't being reviewed or evaluated, should the labor categories be priced at the TO level? If not, how many labor categories do you anticipate to be provided?	Exhibit 3b and 3c were removed from the solicitation in Amendment 8.
5590	<p>For Past Performance Volume Page 105 of the RFP states, "The offeror must provide past performance submissions as it relates to the NAICS code being used for competition." Often times the federal government groups work which may include tasks outside of the top level NAICS code awarded. In the recent past other government wide acquisition contract (GWAC) procurements have allowed this type of justification given this common scenario.</p> <p>For example, vendor is awarded a research project with a top level NAICS code of 541720 but it includes significant IT services (covering 541330, 541430, 541512, 541519).</p> <p>Considering this, is NASA willing to accept an REP with different NAICS codes not currently assigned to this procurement? This of course would be validated by a government official representing the program (COR, CO) approving there is significant work that falls under the NAICS code within the scope of this NASA SEWP procurement?</p>	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.
5591	The offeror must provide past performance submissions as it relates to the NAICS code being used for competition - Is the offeror then limited to past performance submissions for 541519 for Category A, or can the past performance be for any NAICS code in the Exhibit 4 Crosswalk Category A tab?	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 and may be other than 541519, then the Offeror should describe how the work relates to the NAICS code being used for competition.
5611	<p>Category B - "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. Each Project must have had a minimum of \$5M in total value size of a single order or contract and must be described using the Exhibit 1 REP template.</p> <p>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."</p> <p>Will the Government please clarify for SBs with additional designations (SDVOSB, 8a, etc.), whether the 2 REPs need to both address "each of the mandatory experience technical areas" or if it is acceptable for both REPs to address some or all of the mandatory technical areas?</p> <p>Will the Government please clarify for SBs with no additional designations, whether the 3 REPs need to address "different mandatory experience technical areas" or if they can address the same areas, or combination of the same and different areas? For example, if an SB has 3 REPs that each individually address all of the mandatory experience technical areas, this would inherently seem to not meet the requirement because the 3 REPs that are not "from different mandatory experience technical areas", but rather the same areas.</p>	Amendment 8 clarified that each REP must address one and only one Mandatory Experience Area, and that each REP must address a different Mandatory Experience Area, for a total of 3 REPs covering 3 areas for small businesses.

5614	Should ITC/AV be viewed as a broad term referencing the entire SEWP scope, or is a Category C Offeror required to discuss capabilities supporting all these functions? For example, our company focuses on IT Services, not Audio/Visual. If we do not discuss AV capabilities/solutions, will we not be rated with high confidence for this section?	Amendment 8 updated the instructions for the Technical Approach to clarify it is based on the offeror's general technical capabilities with regard to the SEWP scope and Acquisition Objectives and not on the sample Technical Areas.
5618	How many labor categories do we need to include in Exhibit 3c? (page 103)	Exhibit 3c was removed from the solicitation in Amendment 8.
5623	Since Category B and C focus on services vs product, can the Gov't clarify a number of items related to completing this exhibit?	Exhibit 3b and 3c were removed from the solicitation in Amendment 8.
5624	Page 100. "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." Can the Government clarify what qualifies as work done with respect to Volume 1?	Amendment 8 updated the wording with regard to MPJV REP and Past Performance submissions.
5632	Page 103. "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." Can the Government confirm that relevant experience projects may be submitted by either member of a SBA approved mentor protege joint venture and not required from both members?	Amendment 8 updated the wording with regard to MPJV REP and Past Performance submissions.
5637	RFP A.3.7.1 states: "Only projects with NAICS codes listed as in-scope for SEWP VI are to be submitted." Please confirm the NAICS requirement for A.3.7.1 means NAICS code on contract reference must match a NAICS code listed to the corresponding category in SEWP VI, RFP A.1.34.	Amendment 8 removed the NAICS code wording with regard to REPs
5638	For the "Provider (OEM/Service Provider)" column of Exhibit 3b and 3c, is the data for Service Provider the name of the bidding prime entity?	Amendment 8 removed Exhibit 3b and 3c from the solicitation.
5641	For services for Exhibit 3b and 3c, is the data for "Provider Part Number" not applicable or N/A?	Amendment 8 removed Exhibit 3b and 3c from the solicitation.
5644	For the Description column of Exhibit 3b or 3c, how extensive of a description does the Gov't require for labor.	Amendment 8 removed Exhibit 3b and 3c from the solicitation.
5653	Exhibit 3c - Does each prime offeror have to create and maintain a UNSPSC account?	Amendment 8 removed Exhibit 3c from the solicitation.
5656	For the Labor Category (if Hourly Rate) column of Exhibit 3b or 3c, is the required content the Labor Category Name that aligns with the UNSPSC Description or an Hourly Rate?	Amendment 8 removed Exhibit 3b and 3c from the solicitation.
5657	RFP, page 104 - For Category C, A total of three (3) different REPs from different mandatory experience technical areas shall be submitted. Does "mandatory experience technical area" equate to "mandatory experience Sub-areas"?	The wording was updated in Amendment 8 to Technical Areas.
5659	(3) specifies that "Electronic files of Volumes I, II, and III shall be in separate folders in 1 zip file..." and goes on to describe on the top of page 95 the naming conventions for each volume's folder and its components. However, the last paragraph in this section (3) states that "Each proposal volume shall be submitted in a single searchable Adobe Portable Document Format (PDF) file..." Does this mean that each volume should be one single PDF file with all items for each volume in the "Proposal Submission Table" at the bottom of page 95 should be combined into one PDF file per volume?	Yes, with the exception of Excel spreadsheets as updated in Amendment 8.

5663	<p>A.3.6 PROPOSAL PREPARATION—GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS; (A) PROPOSAL FORMAT AND ORGANIZATION (Page 95).</p> <p>The solicitation states the following:</p> <p>“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 to the section header. Spreadsheets shall also be converted to PDF, in the most readable manner practicable, and submitted as part of a single PDF file.”</p> <p>The solicitation also gives examples of files names for respective documents files names:</p> <p>Examples of how the respective documents within the folder are to be labeled are shown below:</p> <p>“GetItDone_Category#-EXHIBIT#; GetItDone_Category#- LOA#; GetItDone_Category#- PP#” .</p> <p>Please clarify if the Government is expecting only 1 file to be submitted in single searchable Adobe Portable Document Format (PDF) file in the Category Folder (e.g., GetItDone_CategoryA_ Volume1.pdf). Or if the government is expecting the Volume to be folders (e.g., Folder Name: GetItDone_CategoryA_ Volume1) with respective files in the folder (e.g., “GetItDone_Category#- EXHIBIT #.pdf).</p>	Amendment 8 clarified that all PDF documents within each Volume should be combined into a single PDF documents. Other files such as the excel spreadsheet should be added to the Proposal zip file as separate files.
5666	<p>A.3.6 PROPOSAL PREPARATION—GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS; PROPOSAL CONTENT AND PAGE LIMITATIONS</p> <p>(Page 95-96).</p> <p>The solicitation states the following:</p> <p>“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 to the section header. Spreadsheets shall also be converted to PDF, in the most readable manner practicable, and submitted as part of a single PDF file.”</p> <p>The solicitation also gives examples of files names for respective documents files names:</p> <p>Examples of how the respective documents within the folder are to be labeled are shown below:</p> <p>“GetItDone_Category#- EXHIBIT #; GetItDone_Category#- LOA#; GetItDone_Category#- PP #” .</p> <p>Would the government provide Offerors a sample of expected file name submission as part of the table called “Proposal Submission Table”</p>	The proposal - format information was updated in Amendment 8.
5667	<p>RFP, Page 111, Section A.3.7.3.a</p> <p>The 4 Acquisition Objectives are only listed in Attachment A and not in the main RFP. Does the Government desire a response to each of the 4 acquisition objectives in response to Section A.3.7.3.a for each of the sub categories, in addition to the requirements for A.3.7.3.a.1, 2, 3?</p>	Responses should be provided for the 2 sections (A.3.7.3.a.1 and 2 - the third point was removed in amendment 8) based on the offeror's general technical capabilities with regard to the SEWP scope and first three Acquisition Objectives in Attachment A.
5678	<p>Regarding the line for (b) Mandatory Experience Exhibit, can the Gov't clarify the following:</p> <p>a. The Mandatory Experience Exhibit means Exhibit 1 – Relevant Experience Project Table. (If this clarification is not correct, what is the Mandatory Experience Exhibit?)</p> <p>b. Page limitations of no more than 3 pages per Project apply, as cited in the instructions in Exhibit 1.</p>	The Proposal submission table updated in Amendment 8.
5680	<p>Should imaging supplies be using NAICS 339940 for Office supplies rather than 541519 as other contracts have dictated? If so that is not in the Exhibit 4 NAICS Size Standard Crosswalk.</p>	NAICS 339940 was added in Amendment 8.

5682	Exhibit 2 provides a performance rating scale from Very Low to Very High. A.4.1 states you have to have a Phase 2 score of "Neutral or Satisfactory" to pass. How does this scoring align to the Exhibit 2 ratings? Is Moderate and Above considered "Satisfactory"? Is Satisfactory an average rating within a Past Performance Reference or an Average or above rating across all presented Past Performance questionnaires? Since each questionnaire has 13 rated parameters please clarify how this works to determine an overall Phase II performance rating.	Past Performance information was updated in Amendment 8.
5687	In Exhibits 3b and 3c for Categories B&C, we are requested to provide the UNSPSC codes for each line item. In reviewing both A.1.22 and referring to ATTACHMENT C- SEWP Contractor Holder User Manual.pdf, both these areas point to a website to download the UNSPSC codes. There is a cost to download from that site and we are wondering if you will provide a spreadsheet with these codes as part of the solicitation. We did notice that the NASA SEWP program office maintain this on the CHOP site so we are hoping we can get the data without cost from you.	Amendment 8 removed Exhibit 3b and 3c from the solicitation.
5689	A.3.7.3 states offerors shall demonstrate "experience regarding the technical requirements of the RFP." A.4.4 for evaluation of Phase III focuses on "understanding" and "approach" for Technical Approach and Management Approach components of Phase III. Please clarify if, and how, offeror's must explicitly demonstrate experience throughout Phase Three to be rated "High Confidence."	The Government will evaluate if the Offeror's response indicate they understand the requirements and demonstrate an ability to be successful in performing the contract with little or no Government intervention.
5692	Statement: The offeror shall describe how their current corporate infrastructure and future enhancements will support the responsibilities laid out in Attachment A: SEWP Statement of Work; Section A.5. Contractor Responsibilities. Question: If the offeror within our organization is a subsidiary supported by all back-office support (contracts, accounting, recruiting, pricing, HR, etc) at the corporate level, do we need to identify this support within an MRCL and submit with the proposal?	No.
5700	Exhibits 3b and 3c, do not provide fields for rate escalation over the life of the contract. Given this structure of information how do offerors include reasonable rate escalations in their submissions?	Amendment 8 removed Exhibit 3b and 3c from the solicitation.
5702	The evaluation of the Technical Approach in the Mission Suitability volume is stated to have several evaluation factors: "demonstrated understanding", "approach for accomplishing those requirements", "the appropriateness of the offeror's proposed resources", and "effectiveness, reasonableness, and efficiency". However, the instructions for the summary provided in the Technical Approach (pg. 111 Section A.3.7.3 ff) provide no definitions for measures of effectiveness, efficiency or reasonableness. Would the government confirm that to be rated High Confidence the assessment of effectiveness, efficiency and reasonableness is based on a coherent approach that is judged by the government to be low risk with a high probability of success and there is not an objective standard for effectiveness, efficiency and reasonableness?	Amendment 8 updated the instructions for the Technical Approach evaluation factor.
5708	Can you explain how offerors are to complete Exhibits 3b and 3c? Do we list and price LCATS that we desire to receive on the SEWP VI contract?	Amendment 8 removed Exhibit 3b and 3c from the solicitation.
5711	Can the Govt. provide further information on how offerors are to setup the response for this section? It is unclear with the section being labeled as "Technical Approach", yet the information in the section appears to be asking for experience citations and not approaches. With this section needing to achieve a High Confidence assessment, it is critical for offerors to understand how to respond appropriately.	Amendment 8 updated the instructions for the Technical Approach evaluation factor.
5714	The RFP states: "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. The information shall match the past performance information with the relevant experience identified in paragraph (a)(12) of this section." Is the reference to "relevant experience project" meant to say "Content Representative Areas" listed in paragraph (a)(12) for each category? Please clarify.	Amendment 8 changed the phrase "relevant experience project" to clarify that the relevant information provided in the Past Performance section has no relationship to the Relevant Experience Projects in Phase I.

5723	Regarding Commitment to Sustainability, the evaluation of the 7 questions asked in Section A.3.7.3(b)(2) says that the responses to these questions will be evaluated for effectiveness, reasonableness, and efficiency. Many small businesses who are value added resellers and/or professional services organizations do not have a documented environmental management system. Additionally, many small businesses employ a remote workforce and has no ability to use renewable resources from a corporate level as it would apply to employees' homes. Small businesses using remote workforces also do not monitor carbon emissions or set reduction targets. Small businesses do not generally have the purchasing power to force direct suppliers to make any changes within their organizations regarding environmental compliance, employment practices, and/or product/ingredient safety. It is not reasonable for small businesses to have many of the systems in place to answer "yes" to all of the 7 questions asked in Section A.3.7.3(b)(2). It seems these requirements are geared towards OEMs and large distributors, and we feel it is reasonable for small businesses to answer "no" to some of the 7 questions. Will the Government please define what "reasonableness" means as it relates to the evaluation of Section A.3.7.3(b)(2)? Is it "reasonable" for a small business, with a remote workforce, to answer "no" to any of the seven questions asked in Section A.3.7.3(b)(2)?	Amendment 8 updated the Commitment to Sustainability section.
5728	SEWP VI Exhibit 5 - C-SCRM Attestation Form: The form is locked for editing and has no field for electronic signature. Where and how does the signer complete? Should we print, sign, scan, and return?	Amendment 8 updated Exhibit 5 to be an Excel file.
5734	ISO 9001:2015 certification is often held at the parent level and identifies ,with detail, individual entities that meet the detailed certification standards. Please confirm that the government will accept Offerors with an official ISO 9001:2015 Certification of Conformity/Conformance held at the parent level, as long as the certification specifically identifies the Offeror by name, as compliant evidence of meeting this requirement or CMMI certification if documented evidence of this in an MRCL is provided?	Amendment 8 update the certification requirements with regards to businesses with a Meaningful Relationship Commitment Letter.
5736	Regarding Prime and Joint Venture participation, the Government states you can duplicate portions of the response, but not technical approach. While there are multiple ways to approach the tasks, if the Prime and Joint Venture would be utilizing the same approach, can the technical content be used in duplicate for the subcategories that share processes?	Amendment 8 updated the wording in the section to include the technical approach in the sentence "Offerors proposing as a prime and as part of a joint venture may submit the same management approach..".
5739	A.3.7.1, bullet 3: The RFP instructs offerors to "provide information addressing all the elements under FAR 9.104 to demonstrate responsibility (address all the elements under this section that are not addressed in another proposal volume)." FAR 9.104 has 7 components, each with their own subparts. Very extensive list that is typically evidenced by additional documents. Can the Government be more specific and narrow the focus to what is needed to include?	The wording with regard to 9.104 was updated in Amendment 8.
5751	Will the SEWP PMO consider updating the Column H of the Exhibit 3a Category A Solutions Spreadsheet to have 3 unique columns (1 each for TAA, EPEAT, and 508) rather than including all 3 compliances in a single column? If the government does not use three unique columns, please advise on how offerors are supposed to complete the Column H. For example, do offerors insert "yes" if only one of the 3 categories is applicable, or should they denote which of the 3 are "yes" and which are "no"? To obtain consistent responses from industry we recommend using 3 separate columns.	Amendment 8 removed Column H.

5754	<p>A.1.47 "For any small businesses that were awarded a contract while still in the process of obtaining either a CMMI or ISO 9001-2015 Certification will have to obtain a certification within 12 months of contract award. Until a certification is obtained, the contractor will be ineligible to compete on acquisitions requiring a certification that the offeror does not possess and while the certification is in process."</p> <p>A.3.7.1 "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."</p> <p>During the formation of our Mentor/Protégé (MP) 8(a) WOSB JV, our SB Advisor validated that the mentor's certificates flowed directly into the Joint Venture, in line with Section A.3.7.1. Will the Government please confirm that SEWP VI will accept the mentor's CMMI certificate as valid for the JV, and that the JV is not required to seek CMMI certification in its name?</p>	Amendment 8 update the certification requirements with regards to businesses with a Meaningful Relationship Commitment Letter.
5761	For Column H of Exhibit 3a Category A Solutions Spreadsheet, does the Government want the actual COO or just a yes/no as to whether the item is TAA compliant?	Amendment 8 removed Column H.
5766	Section A.3.6 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 to the section header. Spreadsheets shall also be converted to PDF, in the most readable manner practicable, and submitted as part of a single PDF file." May we submit files that originate in Excel in their original format?	Amendment 8 clarified that Exhibits 3a, 4 and 5 should be submitted as MS Office Excel format with working cell formulas.
5779	To which Volume(s) and Subfactor(s) is/are the requirement for "converting spreadsheets to PDF and submitting them as part of a single PDF file" applicable?	Amendment 8 clarified that Exhibits 3a, 4 and 5 should be submitted as MS Office Excel format with working cell formulas. Exhibit 3a and 4 are submitted with Volume I and exhibit 5 in Volume III.
5795	<p>"The 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).""</p> <p>As FAR 9.104 defines standards for assessing contractor responsibility, emphasizing financial stability, timely performance, satisfactory history, organizational capability, ethical conduct, adequate resources, and legal eligibility, which of these FAR 9.104 elements are to be addressed in other proposal volumes that do not need to be repeated in Volume I?"</p>	The wording with regard to 9.104 was updated in Amendment 8.
5803	The RFP states that offerors should "Provide information addressing all the elements under FAR 9.104...under this section (Volume I) that are not addressed in another proposal volume...." Can the Government please provide additional details around how Offerors should prove their compliance with FAR 9.104? Especially given the page limitations, what specific documentation should be provided?	The wording with regard to 9.104 was updated in Amendment 8.
5810	The solicitation requires offerors proposing to category b and/or c to complete exhibit 3b. The instructions on how to complete exhibit 3b is unclear. Will the government please provide clear instructions on how to complete exhibit 3b.	Amendment 8 removed Exhibit 3b and 3c from the solicitation.
5813	Since exhibit 3b/c will neither be reviewed nor evaluated, can the SB offerors be exempt from submitting exhibit 3b/c?	Amendment 8 removed Exhibit 3b and 3c from the solicitation.

5814	<p>A.3.7.3(a): RFP Mission Suitability Volume Technical Approach instructions state "The offeror must provide a summary description of their offerings and capabilities as it relates to the scope of the proposed Category as provided in A.1.2 GSFC 52.211-91 SCOPE OF WORK (FEB 2016). The summary shall provide detail as to how the offeror will support the four Acquisition Objectives including information in the following areas" without identifying the four Acquisition Objectives or referencing where in the RFP they are specified.</p> <p>Four Acquisition Objectives are identified in Attachment A Section A.1. In the interest of clear, simple evaluation of offeror responses, please clarify confirm these are the four Acquisition Objectives intended in the Mission Suitability Volume Technical Approach and recommend including a reference to Attachment A Section A.1 in the Section A.3.7.3(a)</p>	Amendment 8 clarified that the Acquisition Objectives are provided in Attachment A-SEWP Scope, Section A.1. ACQUISITION OBJECTIVES.
5818	Given there is a requirement for a Subcontracting Plan in Volume I -Offer Volume, it would seem that also addressing FAR 9.104 in the same volume is duplicative. Will the Government please consider removing the FAR 9.104 requirement since its repetitive of the Subcontracting Plan?	The wording with regard to 9.104 was updated in Amendment 8.
5819	Exhibit 3b/Proposed Offering tab; column B "Provider (OEM/Service Provider)" - Can VAR/resellers bid sku'd OEM services here in addition to their own Labor Cats/service offerings? Is this within scope?	Amendment 8 removed Exhibit 3b and 3c from the solicitation.
5820	The requirement in this section of the RFP states that "Spreadsheets shall also be converted to PDF...and submitted as part of a single PDF file." Can the Government please confirm that offerors should convert all spreadsheets to PDF, including those spreadsheet templates provided by the Government for offerors' use (i.e. Exhibit 3)?	Amendment 8 clarified that Exhibits 3a, 4 and 5 should be submitted as MS Office Excel format with working cell formulas.
5821	Under Category B, the Exhibit 3B spreadsheet contains columns that do not apply to labor categories (i.e., Provider (OEM/Service Provider), Provider Part Number, and UNSPSC Code). With Category B Services-based, should Offerors provide information for labor categories and indicate these columns as "not applicable"?	Amendment 8 removed Exhibit 3b and 3c from the solicitation.
5822	When completing the information tab on exhibit 3b, 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 541512 on page 32 of the RFP?	Amendment 8 removed Exhibit 3b and 3c from the solicitation.
5824	We understand Category B Unrestricted Offerors cannot reference team members in their Relevant Experience (Volume I) and Past Performance (Volume II) responses. However, nothing explicitly prevents this in Mission Suitability (Volume III). Can Offerors propose solutions from others within the SEWP Team in the Technical and Management Approach sections?	Amendment 8 clarified the wording in A.3.7.3 MISSION SUITABILITY VOLUME in terms of teaming partners, subcontractors, and other business to business relationships.
5829	Will the Government provide the criteria for determining effectiveness, reasonableness, and efficiency in evaluating an offeror's technical and management approaches as identified in A.4.4 (a) and (b).	Amendment 8 updated the instructions for the Technical Approach evaluation factor.
5836	The following is an excerpt of the evaluation criteria pertaining to Phase One-Offer Volume (Certifications, Mandatory Experience/Offerings, and NAICS Crosswalk), "These contracts (if any) must meet the above "recent" and minimum average annual cost/fee expenditures criteria to be evaluated." The recency and cost/fee expenditure requirements should be listed as the evaluation criteria critical for Phase Two-Past Performance. Will the Government please confirm this statement should be applied to Phase Two-Past Performance not Phase One-Offer Volume?	Amendment 8 updated Phase one to include the noted recency requirements.

5844	<p>A.3.7.1 Offer Volume (b) Mandatory Experience/Offerings, Category C, Paragraph 2 For ... WOSB ... (Pg 104) - The RFP states, "A total of 2 different REPs from different mandatory experience technical areas shall be submitted."</p> <p>Q1: Does this mean that each of the 2 submitted REPs needs to only show relevant work in 1 of the 10 Mandatory Experience Sub-Areas?</p> <p>Q2: If each REP only needs to show relevant work in 1 Mandatory Experience Sub-Area, is it allowable for each REP to show relevant work in more than 1 of the Mandatory Experience Sub-Areas?</p> <p>Q3: If a bidder submits 2 REPs and qualifies for 2 Mandatory Experience Sub-Areas, does that mean that during IDIQ performance the contractor will be limited to bidding only task orders that fall within those 2 Mandatory Experience Sub-Areas that were specified in the REPs—or will the contractor be eligible to bid on task orders that fall within any of the 10 Mandatory Experience Sub-Areas?</p>	The solicitation was updated on Amendment 8 to clarify that, in this example, only a total of 2 REPs are required.
5848	<p>"Ordering agencies may request a size-standard re-certification at the order level, at their discretion." Is this re-certification at the Master Contract NAICS level (the one we choose to submit our bid under) or at the sub-NAICS level for the Task Order they issue? If re-certification determines that the contractor has exceeded the size standard, does that need to be immediately updated or done so within our normal SAM update schedule?</p>	Amendment 8 updated A.1.49 POST AWARD SIZE STANDARD REPRESENTATIONS to clarify the recertification process.
5849	<p>The Table of Contents and a few of the Section Headings within Attachment A, do not match. For instance, "A.3 Scope of Categories" and its subsection, "Definitions," are listed within the Attachment A Table of Contents, however, when one clicks on that it directs to a section named something entirely different.</p>	This was updated in Amendment 8.
5857	<p>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?</p>	The referenced section was removed in Amendment 8.
5877	<p>Could Government please clarify the reference to Attachment D in the Section A.4.1 SEWP PMO Services (Attachment A) "The database will be populated via electronic processes as defined in Attachment D-Communication Requirements. Attachment D is the CONTRACT DATA REQUIREMENTS LIST.</p>	Amendment 8 updated the reference to Attachment D to read Contract Data Requirements.
5879	<p>Section # A.3.7.3 (a) Pge # 111 Que: If we don't have relevance to some of the technical areas through our projects/past performance, do we still need to respond to those technical areas?</p>	Amendment 8 updated the instructions for the Technical Approach to clarify it is based on the offeror's general technical capabilities with regard to the SEWP scope and Acquisition Objectives and not on the sample Technical Areas.
5883	<p>For Mentor/Protégé SB 8a JV, can all REPs and Past Performance from a 49% member (non-8a member) of the JV?</p>	Amendment 8 updated the wording with regard to MPJV REP and Past Performance submissions.
5885	<p>Could Government please clarify the reference to Section C.1.3.3 for ordering guide specifications in the A.5.1.1 of Attachment A sentence "A soft copy ordering guide (see section C.1.3.3 for ordering guide specifications) suitable for downloading and printing by SEWP customers. Does this sentence reference Attachment C, page 22.</p>	The reference was corrected in Amendment 8.
5897	<p>Reference Section A.1.34 NAICS Codes within Scope pages 61-63 and Exhibit 4 NAICS Size Standard Crosswalk. If a contractor has NAICS codes on SAM that are not listed here but should be within scope, can those be added to Exhibit 4? For example, NAICS 532420 for Office Machinery and Equipment Rental and Leasing, and NAICS code 339940 Office Supplies Manufacturing are not listed, but should be considered within scope.</p>	NAICS 532420 and NAICS code 339940 were added in Amendment 8
5898	<p>Is the team's mission suitability/technical rating lower if a subcontractor is proposed compared to if the offeror covered the same capabilities independently?</p>	The Mission Suitability Volume must be responded to in terms of the Offeror. Subcontractors may be referenced as support of the Offeror's core capabilities
5907	<p>· If using a commercial contract (where the end client is a government agency) for past performance, do we provide the prime contract's NAICS, or determine the relevant NAICS for our specific work segment?</p>	Provide the prime contract's NAICS code and if different from the NAICS code being used for competition then the Offeror should describe how the work relates to the NAICS code being used for competition.
5911	<p>If a commercial contract is used for past performance, do we provide the prime contract's NAICS or determine the relevant NAICS for our work segment?</p>	Provide the prime contract's NAICS code and if different from the NAICS code being used for competition then the Offeror should describe how the work relates to the NAICS code being used for competition.

5912	· Can you elaborate on how NASA will determine mission suitability (technical and management), mainly what "the breadth and depth beyond those areas within the scope of the given category" means?	The Government will evaluate if the Offeror's response indicate they understand the requirements and demonstrate an ability to be successful in performing the contract with little or no Government intervention.
5913	We understand the requirement for submitting one proposal as a prime and one proposal as either a member of a JV or CTA, and the requirements for proving participation in a JV or CTA are clear when it comes to small business requirements in Volume 1 Minimum Experience and Volume 2 Past Performance. Volume 3 requires offerors to provide information related to "The scalability and extensibility of the offeror's capabilities that demonstrates the offeror's ability to deliver the fullest range of ITC/AV Solutions and/or Services for the proposed category..." Generally, small businesses team with other businesses to scale and cover the full scope of a GWAC like SEWP VI. Would including the full range of capabilities from our partners, who are not included in our bid as part of a JV or CTA, in our Technical Approach in order to "demonstrate" our ability to meet all scope requirements conflict the requirements in A.3.5?	Amendment 8 was updated to indicate that "The proposal may refer to teaming partners, subcontractors, and other business to business relationships as support of the Offeror's core capabilities."
5916	The instructions in A.3.7.1 (b) Mandatory Experience/ Offerings state that "Offerors proposing to category B and/ or C shall complete Exhibit 3b- Category B Solutions Spreadsheet and Exhibit 3c- Category C Solutions Spreadsheet." The Proposal Submission Table in A.3.6 does not include Exhibit 3b/3c within the Offer Volume. Please revise the Proposal Submission table/instructions to clarify where the Exhibit 3b/3c should be submitted within the proposal response.	Amendment 8 removed Exhibit 3b and 3c from the solicitation.
5919	A.3.7.3(a)1 - Will the Government please define "breadth and depth beyond technical areas" in this paragraph. Will the Government please explain how will a response to "breadth and depth beyond technical areas" be evaluated in this section for "High Confidence"?	The Government will evaluate if the Offeror's response indicate they understand the requirements and demonstrate an ability to be successful in performing the contract with little or no Government intervention.
5923	If the Contractor has business with strong past performance spread across multiple NAICS Codes, when the Contractor chooses the most relevant/appropriate NAICS code, can the Government deem the NAICS selection unacceptable? If so, will the Contractor have the opportunity to update its response since Government is only allowing one response?	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.
5931	· In the context of the requirement for relevant experience, what specific "NAICS code being used for competition" is being referred to?	Amendment 8 removed the NAICS code wording with regard to REPs
5932	A.3.7.3(b)(2) - Commitment to Sustainability: The RFP lists 1-7 areas the Government would like bidders to respond to. Some of these areas are applicable only to OEMs (i.e., manufacturers), not VARs. Should non-OEM bidders address that certain areas are N/A or can they write to sustainable areas that aren't listed in the 1-7 bulleted list?	Amendment 8 updated the Commitment to Sustainability section.
5933	FILE: 80TECH24R0001 Final RFP Cover Letter.pdf REFERENCE TEXT: "The Offeror's proposal shall include completed exhibits in Microsoft Office Excel format with working cell formulas." & FILE: 80TECH24R0001 SEWP VI Final RFP.pdf REFERENCE TEXT: "Spreadsheets shall also be converted to PDF, in the most readable manner practicable, and submitted as part of a single PDF file." QUESTION: Please clarify if RFP Exhibits published in MS Excel format should be submitted in MS Excel format or if all spreadsheets shall also be converted to PDF and submitted as part of a single PDF file.	Amendment 8 clarified that Exhibits 3a, 4 and 5 should be submitted as MS Office Excel format with working cell formulas.
5936	In Exhibit+3c+Category+C+Solutions+Spreadsheet, Column C, what information will the Government require in lieu of "Provider Part Number" when proposing on services-based items & LCATs, as opposed to product sales?	Exhibit 3c was removed from the solicitation in Amendment 8.
5937	The government has checked "(48)(i) 52.225-1, Buy American—Supplies (OCT 2022)) (41 U.S.C. chapter 83)." rather than "(50) 52.225-5, Trade Agreements (NOV 2023) (19 U.S.C. 2501, et seq., 19 U.S.C. 3301 note)." Please confirm SEWP VI is a TAA contract and not BAA, and revise the RFP accordingly.	This was updated in Amendment 8.

5965	II. FAR 52.212-5 CONTRACT TERMS AND CONDITIONS REQUIRED TO IMPLEMENT STATUTES OR EXECUTIVE ORDERS—COMMERCIAL PRODUCTS AND COMMERCIAL SERVICES. (FEB 2024): The government has checked "(48)(i) 52.225–1, Buy American—Supplies (OCT 2022)) (41 U.S.C. chapter 83)." rather than "(50) 52.225–5, Trade Agreements (NOV 2023) (19 U.S.C. 2501, et seq., 19 U.S.C. 3301 note)". Please confirm SEWP VI is a TAA contract and not BAA, and revise the RFP accordingly.	This was updated in Amendment 8.
5978	· Is an awardee's size standard certified at the task order level or at the time of the initial award?	Amendment 8 updated A.1.49 POST AWARD SIZE STANDARD REPRESENTATIONS to clarify the recertification process.
5984	· Does the NAICS code requirement also apply to commercial work?	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.
5989	Section A.3.7.3 Mission Suitability Volume - (a) Technical Approach Subfactor A - for all categories states...TECHNICAL APPROACH (SUBFACTOR A) For All Categories 80TECH24R0001- SEWP VI RFP Page 111 The offeror must provide a summary description of their offerings and capabilities as it relates to the scope of the proposed Category as provided in A.1.2 GSFC 52.211-91 SCOPE OF WORK (FEB 2016). The summary shall provide detail as to how the offeror will support the four Acquisition Objectives including information in the following areas: 1. The scalability and extensibility of the offeror's capabilities that demonstrates the offeror's ability to deliver the fullest range of ITC/AV Solutions and/or Services for the proposed category, both inclusive of the listed technical areas and the breadth and depth beyond those Areas within the scope of the given Category. 2. The offeror shall describe their ITC/AV-based solutions and/or services and how the proposed features provide technological leadership in allowing for the next generation of technology in terms of both solutions and services. 3. The offeror shall describe their ITC/AV-based solutions and services and how the proposed architectural features provide technological leadership in allowing for the next generation of technology. Question 1: What are the 4 acquisition objectives that are referenced in this requirement? Do the 3 areas that are to be included in the 4 Acquisition Objectives intended to be included as part of the services offering? These seem to be more related to the hardware and software (Category A) requirements.	Amendment 8 updated the instructions for the Technical Approach to clarify it is based on the offeror's general technical capabilities with regard to the SEWP scope and Acquisition Objectives and not on the sample Technical Areas.
5993	To be considered a qualifying offeror, the Government will evaluate offerors' responses to determine the offeror is "a responsible source IAW FAR 9.104". Can the Government please provide additional clarity around the documentation needed and thresholds to meet for Government to determine offerors are responsible?	The wording with regard to 9.104 was updated in Amendment 8.
5995	What goes in 3b and 3c exhibits for categories B and C?	Amendment 8 removed Exhibit 3b and 3c from the solicitation.
6004	· Does an awardee confirm their size standard at the task order level, or at the time of the initial award?	Amendment 8 updated A.1.49 POST AWARD SIZE STANDARD REPRESENTATIONS to clarify the recertification process.
6005	During the period of performance, if a Small Business moves out of this socio-economic status, how will this scenario be handled?	Amendment 8 updated A.1.49 POST AWARD SIZE STANDARD REPRESENTATIONS to clarify the recertification process.
6009	It states, 'spreadsheets shall also be converted to PDF, in the most readable manner practicable, and submitted as a part of a single PDF file'. Does this apply to Exhibit 3a, 3b, 3c, and 4?	Amendment 8 clarified that Exhibits 3a, 4 and 5 should be submitted as MS Office Excel format with working cell formulas.
6013	The Excel exhibits provided are formatted using 9-12-point type Times New Roman font. If we need to convert them to the PDF format, do we need to change the font to Times New Roman font 12?	Amendment 8 clarified that Exhibits 3a, 4 and 5 should be submitted as MS Office Excel format with working cell formulas.
6014	The RFP states "Offerors shall denote in column 'H' under compliance if a technology solution is TAA, EPEAT, and/or 508 Compliant." Looking for clarification on how to denote this. If an Offeror enters "TAA" under column H, will the government interpret this to mean the corresponding product meets TAA?	Amendment 8 removed column H from Exhibit 3a.
6034	Exhibit 3a/Technical Area 1 tab: If there is no entry under column H for TAA, EPEAT, and/or 508 Compliance, will the government consider the product non-compliant and remove it from the product count for the category?	Amendment 8 removed Column H.

6036	How many CLINs are required in Exhibit B? For services, is the Government looking for a proposed list of initial labor categories and hourly rates?	Exhibit 3b was removed from the solicitation in Amendment 8.
6052	Are the question items in Commitment to Sustainability applicable to small business?	Amendment 8 updated the Commitment to Sustainability section.
6053	Are the question items in Commitment to Sustainability applicable to offerors that only provide services and not products?	Amendment 8 updated the Commitment to Sustainability section.
6054	If an offeror that only provides services responds to the Commitment to Sustainability questions as "No" to questions 1-6 and "None" to question 7, will this have an adverse impact on the Government's evaluation of an Offeror's Management Approach?	Amendment 8 updated the Commitment to Sustainability section.
6055	If an offeror that only provides services responds to the Commitment to Sustainability questions as "Not Applicable" to questions 1-7, will this have an adverse impact on the Government's evaluation of an Offeror's Management Approach?	Amendment 8 updated the Commitment to Sustainability section.
6063	Would the Government please permit captions to be included in the items permissible to use 10-point font?	Amendment 8 added captions to the list permissible to use 10-point font.
6071	The RFP states that "Only projects with NAICS codes listed as in-scope for SEWP VI are to be submitted." Is there a way to validate the relevance to in scope NAICS codes for SEWP VI if the contract NAICS is not automatically relevant? How are commercial projects and subcontracts supposed to validate in-scope NAICS Codes?	The referenced sentence was removed in Amendment 8.
6078	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?	Amendment 8 clarified that each REP must address one and only one Mandatory Experience Area, and that each REP must address a different Mandatory Experience Area, for a total of 3 such areas for Small Businesses.
6086	The RFP states that: "The offeror must provide a summary description of their offerings and capabilities as it relates to the scope of the proposed Category" - While developing the Technical Approach, the offeror must describe its offerings and capabilities for all of the Technical Areas (e.g., for category C, we should address an approach for all 10 Technical Areas) - or can it be developed for only some of them? Is the government looking for a specific approach for every area or only the areas that the offeror currently offers services and has capabilities and experience in??	Amendment 8 updated the instructions for the Technical Approach to clarify it is based on the offeror's general technical capabilities with regard to the SEWP scope and Acquisition Objectives and not on the sample Technical Areas.
6087	The RFP states that: "In accordance with FAR Subpart 15.3 and NFS 1815.3, the Government will evaluate the offeror's demonstrated understanding of the Mission Suitability subfactor requirements and approach for accomplishing those requirements, the appropriateness of the offeror's proposed resources, and associated programmatic risk." - Is there a minimum number of areas needed to demonstrate capabilities in order to be rated high confidence? Additionally, does the offeror need to present an approach for all of the technical areas, or is it sufficient to focus on the ones in which it has experience?	Amendment 8 updated the instructions for the Technical Approach to clarify it is based on the offeror's general technical capabilities with regard to the SEWP scope and Acquisition Objectives and not on the sample Technical Areas.
6088	The RFP states that: "Offerors proposing to category B and/ or C shall complete Exhibit 3b- Category B Solutions Spreadsheet and Exhibit 3c- Category C Solutions Spreadsheet." - We note that Exhibits 3b and 3c require the inclusion of SEWP Catalog Price. Could you please confirm whether it is necessary to include these prices, and if so, where can we access them??	Amendment 8 removed Exhibit 3b and 3c from the solicitation.

6096	<p>1. A.3.7.1 (b) Category B: Within the Category B, for HUBZone, VOSB, WOSB, EDWOSB, 8a Offerors the solicitation states:</p> <p>"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."</p> <p>Could you clarify whether the offeror is required to provide two distinct projects for each of the ten Category B mandatory technical areas, resulting in a total of twenty REPs?</p> <p>2. A.3.7.1 (b) Category B Within the Category B, for HUBZone, VOSB, WOSB, EDWOSB, 8a Offerors the solicitation states:</p> <p>"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."</p> <p>Could you clarify whether the offeror can use two distinct projects that meet the ten mandatory technical areas across those two contracts, resulting in a total of only two REPs?</p> <p>3. A.3.7.1 (b) Category C Within the Category C, for HUBZone, VOSB, WOSB, EDWOSB, 8a Offerors</p>	The solicitation was updated on Amendment 8 to clarify that, in this example, only a total of 2 REPs are required.
6102	Should the Offerors include the Administrative Handling Fee within the Exhibit 3b- Category B and Exhibit 3c- Category C Solution Spreadsheets Pricing?	Amendment 8 removed Exhibit 3b and 3c from the solicitation.
6127	A.3.7.1 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." Does this mean each member of the JV must have qualifications such as ISO and CMMI, or just one member?	No, Amendment 8 updated the wording regarding JVs and Certification requirements.
6130	Phase 3 - Technical Approach (Subfactor A) - what is the evaluation criteria for meeting the High confidence level for this part of the proposal. Do you have a list of the main technical capabilities that you would like us to address?	Amendment 8 updated the instructions for the Technical Approach to clarify it is based on the offeror's general technical capabilities with regard to the SEWP scope and Acquisition Objectives and not on the sample Technical Areas.
6131	The Commitment to Sustainability section appears to be geared towards OEM suppliers and manufacturing companies, i.e., Category A bidders. Would the government consider making Service providers bidding in Category B and Category C exempt from these requirements? Re: RFP, Mission Suitability Volume III.b.2, Commitment to Sustainability	Amendment 8 updated the Commitment to Sustainability section.
6134	Is the Commitment to Sustainability policy required at time of proposal submission or proposal award? Re: RFP, Mission Suitability Volume III.b.2, Commitment to Sustainability	Amendment 8 updated the Commitment to Sustainability section.
6135	A.3.7.1 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." Does this mean each member of the JV must individually meet mandatory experience and past performance requirements?	No, Amendment 8 updated the wording regarding JVs and REP and Past Performance requirements.
6137	Please confirm if the purpose of this Spreadsheet is to include this information in the Offeror's award and be published as their catalog pricing.	Amendment 8 removed Exhibit 3b and 3c from the solicitation.
6145	The RFP states that offerors should "Provide information addressing all the elements under FAR 9.104...under this section (Volume I) that are not addressed in another proposal volume...." Does the Government want us to specifically addresses the requirements at FAR 9.104-1 or all subparts 1-7?	The wording with regard to 9.104 was updated in Amendment 8.

6149	<p>A.3.6(B):Proposal Content and Page Limitations specifies a 15-page limitation for the Category B-IT Enterprise-Wide Solutions Technical Approach Volume. The RFP instructions require a discussion of approach for each of the 11 technical areas with multiple evaluation criteria.</p> <p>Recommend increasing the page limit from 15 pages to 20 pages to better align with the draft RFP limit of 30 pages and to allow offerors to more fully describe their approach to each of the Technical Areas and provide the Government adequate information to fully evaluate.</p>	The solicitation will remain as stated. Note that Amendment 8 updated the instructions for the Technical Approach to clarify it is based on the offeror's general technical capabilities with regard to the SEWP scope and Acquisition Objectives and not on the sample Technical Areas.
6151	"Spreadsheets shall also be converted to PDF, in the most readable manner practicable, and submitted as part of a single PDF file." Please confirm this means that for Volume 1, Offerors are required to convert all required spreadsheets into PDF and submit with the other required parts of the volume in a single PDF file.	Amendment 8 clarified that Exhibits 3a, 4 and 5 should be submitted as MS Office Excel format with working cell formulas.
6164	Is the Commitment to Sustainability policy required at time of proposal submission or proposal award?	Amendment 8 updated the Commitment to Sustainability section.
6178	As NAICS designation can be a subjective decision made by a contracting officer, there may be cases where relevant experience projects have NAICS other than those listed while still meeting the defined requirements (e.g. over \$30 Million of relevant work). Would the Government please clarify what offerors who have relevant experience under NAICS other than those listed should do for Phase I?	Amendment 8 removed the reference to NAICS code with regard to REPs.
6180	The Government states, "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 subcontractor must be only that work specifically defined in the subcontract." As commercial, subcontractor, and state and local government contracts do not typically have NAICS. Could, the Government please confirm that for these contracts offerors can use the Project Description to demonstrate relevance to required NAICS?	Amendment 8 removed the reference to NAICS code with regard to REPs.
6185	For Category C REPs (Relevant Experience Projects) and PPQs (Past Performances), can we use the NAICS code from our Prime? Since teaming agreements and subcontracts may not list the NAICS code.	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.
6187	In alignment with RFP Section A.1.34 - can the government confirm that additional NAICS codes, such as 541611, are able to be utilized for REPs and past performance examples provided in response to Categories B and C? Many Enterprise-Wide Information Technology contracts leverage NAICS Code 541611 to procure services, and the services required in such contracts appear to be within-scope of SEWP VI program requirements.	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.
6189	The Certificate of Competency (COC) is a new request and our local SBA branch not clear on a timeline of creating and sending a COC and our concern is we won't get this before the July 11th Deadline. Is there a possibility for SEWP to waive this COC requirement from the proposal?	Amendment 8 removed the Certificate of Competency requirement.
6191	For Category B - How many mandatory technical areas need to be covered out of the 10 for each REP? Does each REP have to cover a minimum of 4 areas or any one of the technical areas?	Amendment 8 clarified that each REP must address one and only one Mandatory Experience Area, and that each REP must address a different Mandatory Experience Area, for a total of 4 such areas for OTSBs.
6192	Mission Suitability Technical Approach - is a small business offeror expected to address all Technical Areas in their proposal or is their a minimum number to align with the 3 REPs for Category B and the 3 (or 2 based on socio economic standing) for Category C?	Amendment 8 updated the instructions for the Technical Approach to clarify it is based on the offeror's general technical capabilities with regard to the SEWP scope and Acquisition Objectives and not on the sample Technical Areas.

6208	<p>"Page 111, Section A.3.7.3, Mission Suitability Volume, Technical Approach (subfactor A) offerors are asked to provide information on "The scalability and extensibility of the offeror's capabilities that demonstrates the offeror's ability to deliver the fullest range of ITC/AV Solutions and/or Services for the proposed category, both inclusive of the listed technical areas and the breadth and depth beyond those Areas within the scope of the given Category".</p> <p>On page 106, Past Performance, Information from the Offeror, the solicitation notes, "A Small Business Prime Offeror may provide past performance references for first tier subcontractors to the extent the small business prime offeror does not independently demonstrate capabilities and past performance."</p> <p>However, small businesses face the unique challenge of potentially needing to use subcontractors to help scale up operations that they already have technical capabilities in.</p> <p>a. Does this mean that small businesses need to discuss and plan for scaling up to meet all sub-areas listed in each of the categories?</p> <p>b. Will the government penalize small businesses for citing projects and past performance with other businesses that they could potentially subcontract to, especially to demonstrate the ability to scale up operations across all technical areas? As currently written in the solicitation, small businesses have to demonstrate the ability to scale up on all technical areas BUT they cannot use partners that extend capabilities that the small business already has at a small scale."</p>	<p>a. No. Amendment 8 updated the instructions for the Technical Approach to clarify it is based on the offeror's general technical capabilities with regard to the SEWP scope and Acquisition Objectives and not on the sample Technical Areas.</p> <p>b. There is no requirement for Offerors to demonstrate the ability to scale up on all technical area.</p>
6217	The cover letter of this opportunity says "The Offeror's proposal shall include completed exhibits in Microsoft Office Excel format with working cell formulas. This section of the solicitation also states the spreadsheets must be submitted as a PDF. Should we submit both formats with our response?	Amendment 8 clarified that Exhibits 3a, 4 and 5 should be submitted as MS Office Excel format with working cell formulas.
6221	For Category B, do we need to submit total Three (3) different REPs for any of the Mandatory Experience Technical Areas or we need to submit Three (3) different REPs for each of the Mandatory Experience Technical area?	Amendment 8 clarified that each REP must address one and only one Mandatory Experience Area, and that each REP must address a different Mandatory Experience Area, for a total of 3 such areas for Small Businesses.
6224	<p>"Page 112, Section A.3.7.3, Mission Suitability Volume, Management Approach (subfactor B), (2) Commitment to Sustainability, offerors are asked to provide information on "" documented environmental management system"", ""formal sustainability/environmental policy"", ""sustainability purchasing guidelines"" etc. On page 119, the government also notes that they will ""will evaluate the Offeror's management approach for commitment to Sustainability, specified in Section A.3.7.3(b)(2) for effectiveness, reasonableness, and efficiency"".</p> <p>a. Can small business respond ""not applicable"" and still be evaluated as effective, reasonable, and efficient, especially if the have a remote work force?"</p>	Amendment 8 updated the Commitment to Sustainability section.
6225	For Category C, do we need to submit total Three (3) different REPs for any of the Mandatory Experience Technical Areas or we need to submit Three (3) different REPs for each of the Mandatory Experience Technical area?	Amendment 8 clarified that each REP must address one and only one Mandatory Experience Area, and that each REP must address a different Mandatory Experience Area, for a total of 3 such areas for Small Businesses.
6234	In alignment with RFP Section A.1.34, if an offeror possesses State experience relevant in scope to the SEWP VI procurement, is it possible to leverage such contracts for the Past Performance Volume or as a Relevant Experience Project?	Yes, as long as all Past Performance and/or Relevant Experience Project requirements are met. For Past Performance requirements the Offeror should describe how the work relates to the NAICS code being used for competition.
6247	For State / local/ Commercial Contracts, we do not have NAICS Codes, how will Government Validate this information? If the NAICS are listed on our SAM. Gov will that suffice the requirement?	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.
6249	"An Offeror may submit a single award IDIQ/ BPA at the contract/ agreement level for as a single past performance reference." Will the Government also accept a single award IDIQ/BPA as a REP?	Yes.

6255	<p>A.3.7.1 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)."</p> <p>A.4.5 states: "The procedures for determining whether prospective contractors and subcontractors are responsible are set forth in Federal Acquisition Regulation (FAR) Subpart 9.1 and NASA FAR Subpart 1809.1. Failure by the offeror to affirmatively demonstrate adequate compliance with the general standards of 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 nonresponsibility. As with all aspects of prospective contractor responsibility, a finding of non-responsibility can be made at any time prior to contract award. 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."</p> <p>Could the Government please clarify if the Offeror needs to submit a Certificate of Competency with the offer?</p>	Amendment 8 removed the Certificate of Competency requirement.
6257	<p>The RFP p. 103 requirement for Relevant Experience Project for the Offer Volume states "An REP must be based on a single specific contract or task order and not based on a single IDIQ contract." but p. 105 requirements for the Past Performance Volume state "An Offeror may submit a single award IDIQ/ BPA at the contract/ agreement level for as a single past performance reference."</p> <p>Would Government confirm that a Single Award IDIQ can be used as a Relevant Experience Project (REP) for the Offer Volume?</p>	Yes. The wording in amendment 8 was updated.
6265	(a) Technical Approach (Subfactor A) states "The offeror must provide a summary description of their offerings and capabilities as it relates to the scope of the proposed Category as provided in A.1.2 GSFC 52.211-91 SCOPE OF WORK (FEB 2016). The summary shall provide detail as to how the offeror will support the four Acquisition Objectives including information in the following areas:" Is it the government's intention to have offerors describe the solutions and services for each Technical Area within each proposed Category for each of the 3 separate directions provided in the proposal instructions?	Amendment 8 updated the instructions for the Technical Approach to clarify it is based on the offeror's general technical capabilities with regard to the SEWP scope and Acquisition Objectives and not on the sample Technical Areas.
6266	Referring to attachment "Exhibit 3b- Category B Solutions Spreadsheet", Can Government Explain what need to put under Contract Line Item Number (CLIN)?	Amendment 8 removed Exhibit 3b from the solicitation.
6268	The Commitment to Sustainability requirements (RFP page 112) appear to be more applicable to manufacturers. What is considered effective, reasonable, and efficient for organizations who are primarily services providers?	Amendment 8 updated the Commitment to Sustainability section.
6269	Referring to attachment "Exhibit 3b- Category B Solutions Spreadsheet", Can Government Explain what need to put under Provider (OEM/Service Provider)?	Amendment 8 removed Exhibit 3b from the solicitation.
6271	Referring to attachment "Exhibit 3b- Category B Solutions Spreadsheet", Can Government Explain what need to put under Provider Part Number?	Amendment 8 removed Exhibit 3b from the solicitation.
6272	Referring to attachment "Exhibit 3b- Category B Solutions Spreadsheet", Can Government Explain what need to put under SEWP Catalog Price?	Amendment 8 removed Exhibit 3b from the solicitation.
6277	Referring to attachment "Exhibit 3c- Category C Solutions Spreadsheet", Can Government Explain what need to put under Provider (OEM/Service Provider)?	Amendment 8 removed Exhibit 3c from the solicitation.
6278	Referring to attachment "Exhibit 3c- Category C Solutions Spreadsheet", Can Government Explain what need to put under Contract Line-Item Number (CLIN)?	Amendment 8 removed Exhibit 3c from the solicitation.
6280	Referring to attachment "Exhibit 3c- Category C Solutions Spreadsheet", Can Government Explain what need to put under Provider Part Number?	Amendment 8 removed Exhibit 3c from the solicitation.
6284	A.3.7.2 Past Performance. Does the Past Performance submitted need to be under our contract level NAICS only, or can it be under any NAICS as listed under A.1.34?	The Past Performance references must relate to the NAICS code being used for competition. 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.

6318	During the industry day, while discussing the proposal response submission, it sounded like the vendor can only select one NAICS code for the submission under the drop down. If we are leveraging multiple NAICS codes for our response (REP's and Past Performances fall under various NAICS codes), which one should we use for the proposal submission?	Only one NAICS code may be utilized for Past Performance references - The NAICS code and business size selected by the Offeror at the time of submission as their Proposal level NAICS code and as entered in the SF1449. Note that Amendment 8 removed the NAICS code reference for REPs.
6325	The RFP states: "An Offeror may submit a single award IDIQ/ BPA at the contract/ agreement level for as a single past performance reference" in regards to Past Performance. Will the government also allow a single award IDIQ/BPA to be used for the REPs?	Yes. The wording in amendment 8 was updated.
6328	The RFP states: "Information from subcontractors, affiliates, and predecessor companies will be evaluated or taken into consideration for first-tier subcontractors to small businesses in accordance with 13 CFR 125.2(g) only when the Small Business prime offeror does not independently demonstrate capabilities and/ or past performance necessary for award. Small business offerors may submit the experience of such other business entities for consideration, but such experience shall only be considered to the extent that the 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" - What is the minimum number of REPs and PP projects that the prime offeror is required to submit? Is an offeror able to submit only projects from its teammates?	This was updated in amendment 08.
6339	Section A.3.7.1 states: "The offeror must provide relevant experience as it relates to the NAICS code being used for competition." Does this statement refer to the required Relevant Experience Projects (REPs) for Category B and Category C?	Amendment 8 removed the NAICS code wording with regard to REPs
6343	In Volume I, Offerors are required to address all elements under FAR 9.104 to demonstrate responsibility. What should Offerors provide to address FAR 9.104-1(a): "Have adequate financial resources to perform the contract, or the ability to obtain them"?	The wording with regard to 9.104 was updated in Amendment 8.
6347	A.3.7.2 Past Performance. Does the Past Performance submitted need to be under our contract level NAICS only, or can it be under any NAICS as listed under A.1.34?	The Past Performance references must relate to the NAICS code being used for competition. 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.
6364	Under A.3.7.1, (b) Mandatory Experience/ Offerings, Can the Government clarify if there is a minimum number of CLINS to provide in Exhibit 3b- Category B Solutions Spreadsheet?	Amendment 8 removed Exhibit 3b from the solicitation.
6366	Under A.3.7.1, (b) Mandatory Experience/ Offerings, Can the Government clarify if there is a minimum number of CLINS to provide in Exhibit 3c- Category C Solutions Spreadsheet?	Amendment 8 removed Exhibit 3c from the solicitation.
6373	Please confirm that Offerors are permitted to modify the Exhibit 3a spreadsheet for things such as text wrapping and column width in order for all data to be viewable when the spreadsheet is converted to pdf for submission.	Amendment 8 clarified that Exhibits 3a, 4 and 5 should be submitted as MS Office Excel format with working cell formulas.
6374	Exhibit 3: Is it acceptable to change page orientation to better save the Excel files to pdf?	Amendment 8 clarified that Exhibits 3a, 4 and 5 should be submitted as MS Office Excel format with working cell formulas.
6381	Referring to section: "Offerors will be evaluated based on providing the requirements as specified in Section A.3.7.1(a) that includes a valid ISO 9001 and CMMI certification, and if an Offeror has the relevant experience provided on Exhibit 1- REP Template as specified in Section A.3.7.1(b) for submissions to Category B and C, and/or provided for Category A Exhibit 3- Category A CLINS. Section A.3.7.1(c) will be evaluated for accuracy in the provided information matching what is provided in SAM.gov." Our question is will Government evaluate Exhibit 3a and Exhibit 3b?	Exhibit 3a is only evaluated on a Pass/Fail basis in Phase 1. Exhibit 3a is not evaluated during Phase 3. Exhibit 3b and 3c were removed from the solicitation in Amendment 8.
6382	A. 4. 5 Prospective Contractor Responsibility. Please identify which subsections under FAR 9.104 we are required to respond to. FAR 9.1.04-2 is mentioned in A.4.5, however we could not locate any special standards in the solicitation that we are to meet and affirm.	The wording with regard to 9.104 was updated in Amendment 8.

6412	Section A.3.7.1, pg 98, indicates “The offeror must provide relevant experience as it relates to the NAICS code being used for competition.”, additionally, Section A.3.7.2, pg 105, indicates “The offeror must provide past performance submissions as it relates to the NAICS code being used for competition.” Can an offeror choose NAICS 541511 to use for competition, and use Mandatory Experience/Offerings from contracts with NAICS codes 541512 and 541330 to address the requisite number of Technical Areas required by the Category and group, and then use Past Performance References from NAICS 541513, which covers all the required content representative areas for the category grouping, as long as all NAICS are in-scope for the Category under which an offeror is bidding?	If the Offeror selects NAICS 541511 to use for competition than the Past Performance references must relate to NAICS 541511. Note that the NAICS code reference was removed from REPs in Amendment 8.
6419	Regarding Exhibit 3b, is this intended to be the pricing spreadsheet?	Amendment 8 removed Exhibit 3b from the solicitation.
6420	Regarding Exhibit 3b, for IT service providers, what would be the part number for a particular labor category?	Exhibit 3b was removed from the solicitation in Amendment 8.
6424	A.3.7.3(a) Page 111. Mission Suitability Technical Approach. Please clarify if the Offeror must address all Technical Areas or only the Technical Areas of the Offeror's capabilities.	Amendment 8 updated the instructions for the Technical Approach to clarify it is based on the offeror's general technical capabilities with regard to the SEWP scope and Acquisition Objectives and not on the sample Technical Areas.
6425	Regarding Reference 1 SEWP providers, A.3.7.1b section does not exist.	The reference in Enclosure 1 was updated in Amendment 8.
6438	Please confirm that for commercial contracts being leveraged for Mandatory Experience and REPs, offerors should list the most applicable NAICS code in Exhibit 1 - REP Table and Exhibit 4 - NAICS Size Standard Crosswalk.	Amendment 8 removed the reference to NAICS code with regard to REPs. Exhibit 4 should be filled in based on the Offeror's sam.gov representation.
6445	For larger contacts (both USG and commercial), the work performed could fall under multiple NAICS codes even though it may only be listed under one primary NAICS code in the contract. Please confirm that offerors may identify multiple applicable NAICS codes as long as they confirm/justify a sufficient level of work associated with it in Exhibit 1 - REP Table.	The comment is no longer valid - Amendment 8 removed the reference to NAICS code with regard to REPs.
6446	Request for Clarification Conflict between Sections RFP Section A.3.3(b) states that there shall be no hidden formulas which indicates an Excel document. A.3.6(A)(3) states all documents must be submitted in PDF format. Exhibits 3a, 3b, 3c, and 4 are all Excel documents. Does the Government want all proposal Excel files submitted in PDF format or should we submit the Exhibit 3's in their original Excel format?	Amendment 8 clarified that Exhibits 3a, 4 and 5 should be submitted as MS Office Excel format with working cell formulas.
6447	Exhibit 3b and 3c for Categories B & C. The requirement to use UNSPSC codes. The Excel Code Download cost is \$275.00, Will the Government provide this file?	Exhibit 3b and 3c were removed from the solicitation in Amendment 8.
6468	Pg 96 - under Proposal Component (b) Mandatory Experience Exhibit - please confirm this is referring to the Exhibit 3a/3b/3c Solutions Spreadsheet.	Yes, the Exhibit 3a Solutions Spreadsheet is what is being referenced. This was updated in Amendment 8.
6469	Section A.1.2 – Category A – Technical Area 1a: “Technology within this Technical Area have an NMR class waiver utilizing NAICS 33411 for commercial off-the-shelf laptops and tablets”. Please confirm if this NAICS code is correct, or if it was meant to be 334111.	The correct NAICS code is 334111. This was corrected in Amendment 8.
6472	A.3.7.1 (b) Mandatory Experience/ Offerings; 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.” This language is not consistent with that of the other categories. Will the Government consider revising this to state: “A total of 2 different REPs from different mandatory experience technical areas shall be submitted.”?	The solicitation was updated on Amendment 8 to clarify that, in this example, only a total of 2 REPs are required.
6485	Section A.3.7.2 Past Performance Volume P. 105 Does the Past Performance submitted have to have the in-scope assigned NAICS?	The Past Performance references must relate to the NAICS code being used for competition. 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.

6490	Page 103 of RFP, Category B requirements for HUBzone, VOSB, SDVOSB, WOSB, EDWOSB, 8a offerors: Would the government please clarify if 2 relevant experience projects are required for each of the mandatory experience technical areas? Currently, the RFP states 2 REPs for each Technical Area are required, which would equate to 20 total REPs.	The solicitation was updated on Amendment 8 to clarify that, in this example, only a total of 2 REPs are required.
6491	Must the description be no more than 2500 characters AND no more than 500 words, or is it acceptable for the description to be no more than 2500 characters OR no more than 500 words?	Amendment 8 updated the wording to "no more than 2500 characters, and no more than 500 words"
6498	Section A.3.7.1 Page 103; Exhibits 3b/3c; If CLIN is for labor, is populating Part Number column not applicable?	Amendment 8 removed Exhibit 3b and 3c from the solicitation.
6502	Section A.3.7.1 Page 103; Exhibits 3b/3c; For information on Column F, is that solely derived from the SEWP Catalog Price?	Amendment 8 removed Exhibit 3b and 3c from the solicitation.
6509	Section A.3.7.1 Page 103; Exhibits 3b/3c; If a CLIN has multiple labor rates, how are those to be quoted in Exhibits 3b/3c?	Amendment 8 removed Exhibit 3b and 3c from the solicitation.
6517	Is it ok if products listed on the solutions spreadsheet are not TAA compliant (made in China)?	If products listed on the solutions spreadsheet are not TAA compliant, then the Items must be marked as non-TAA during the post award Technology Refreshment process.
6521	Is the pricing information in Exhibits 3B and 3C the only pricing information required for a compliant offer?	Amendment 8 removed Exhibit 3b and 3c from the solicitation.
6523	How do offerors provide labor category pricing for Categories B and C?	Amendment 8 removed Exhibit 3b and 3c from the solicitation. Labor category pricing will be uploaded post-award using the Technology Refreshment process.
6526	The following Technical Areas Enterprise-wide Innovation Services, Enterprise-wide Information and Data Analytics Services, as well as mission-based Innovation Services Information and Data Analytics Services call for new ideas, break-through solutions, rapid prototyping and modification of hardware, software, artificial intelligence, and machine learning. Will the government consider adding Research and Development (R&D) NAICS 541715 which is usually associated with these services and solution needs?	NAICS 541715 was added in Amendment 8.
6530	RFP Section A.3.7.1(a), Page 100: The instructions state "Offerors may not use the ISO 9001:2015 and/or CMMI certifications of a Parent Company, Affiliate, Division, and/or Subsidiary within a corporate structure." This significantly limits an offeror's abilities to submit a response to this solicitation. We respectfully request that the Government change this requirement to allow the use of certifications from of a Parent Company, Affiliate, Division, and/or Subsidiary within a corporate structure where the offeror is operating under the same quality management system of the parent company, affiliate, or subsidiary named on the certification.	Amendment 8 update the certification requirements with regards to businesses with a Meaningful Relationship Commitment Letter.
6538	For Exhibit 3, If the offerors are to propose their own CLINS & their descriptions alongwith the LCAT, how is the evaluation going to be done in consistent form across bidders for this sheet?	Exhibit 3b and 3c were removed from the solicitation in Amendment 8.
6539	Within certain corporate structures, it is common for an ISO 9001:2015 certification to be held at the parent level but explicitly identify individual entities having met the rigorous standards for certification. Confirm the government will allow Offerors with official ISO 9001:2015 Certification of Conformity/Conformance held at the parent level but specifically identifies the Offeror by name, as sufficient and compliant evidence of meeting this requirement.	Amendment 8 update the certification requirements with regards to businesses with a Meaningful Relationship Commitment Letter.
6541	<p>"The scalability and extensibility of the Offeror's Capabilities that demonstrates the offeror's ability to deliver the fullest range of ITC/AV Solutions and/or Services for the proposed category, both inclusive of the listed technical areas and the breadth and depth beyond those Areas within the scope of the given Category."</p> <p>Please provide clarification of "breadth and depth beyond the Technical Areas" - is the Government asking for emerging technologies?</p> <p>How will the Government evaluate capabilities beyond the defined scope of work and technical areas?</p>	Amendment 8 updated the instructions for the Technical Approach to clarify it is based on the offeror's general technical capabilities with regard to the SEWP scope and Acquisition Objectives and not on the sample Technical Areas.

6543	<p>The summary shall provide detail as to how the offeror will support the four Acquisition Objectives including information in the following areas:</p> <p>Acquisition Objective 4 - "To embrace and facilitate innovative procurement transactions and processes that will place a minimal administrative burden on the customer, contractor, and the Gov't while minimizing incompatibilities and maximizing strategic decision-making across the ITC/AV infrastructure." "The fourth objective relates to the Procurement expertise that NASA SEWP brings to any size acquisition in combination with the ITC/AV technical expertise needed to develop, test, and utilize new processes for automating the entire procurement process."</p> <p>Can the Gov't provide clarification that this narrative is more aligned with SubFactor B, Management Approach? Or, is the Gov't referring to a capability to provide ITC/AV infrastructure technology support services?</p>	Amendment 8 clarifies that first three of the four Acquisition Objectives should be addressed in the Technical Approach.
6547	As part of Volume III, SubFactor A, are offerors required to address all Technical Mandatory Sub-Areas as part of their 15-page responses to Categories B & C?	Amendment 8 updated the instructions for the Technical Approach to clarify it is based on the offeror's general technical capabilities with regard to the SEWP scope and Acquisition Objectives and not on the sample Technical Areas.
6549	Which phase does the Exhibit 3b get evaluated in?	Amendment 8 removed Exhibit 3b from the solicitation.
6550	<p>The Gov't will evaluate the Offeror's technical approach, specified in Section A.3.7.3(a)(1), Section A.3.7.3(a)(2), Section A.3.7.3(a)(3), for effectiveness, reasonableness, and efficiency. Section A.3.7.1(b) Category A states: Offerors shall complete Exhibit 3a - Category A Solutions Spreadsheet and propose technology solutions for any four (4) of the eight (8) Mandatory Technical Areas 1. thru 9.</p> <p>How many Technical Areas must be addressed in the Mission Suitability Technical Approach for Category A</p> <p>How many Technical Areas for Category B? and Category C?</p>	Amendment 8 updated the instructions for the Technical Approach to clarify it is based on the offeror's general technical capabilities with regard to the SEWP scope and Acquisition Objectives and not on the sample Technical Areas.
6551	Which phase do we submit the Exhibit 3b under?	Amendment 8 removed Exhibit 3b from the solicitation.
6552	A.3.7.1 page 104 under Category B "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." Will the Government please consider removing the word each and rewording to say 2 different REPs for different mandatory experience technical areas?	The solicitation was updated on Amendment 8 to clarify that, in this example, only a total of 2 REPs are required.
6554	Do we have to provide services information in the spreadsheet as part of the response at this time?	Amendment 8 removed Exhibit 3b and 3c from the solicitation.
6577	<p>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</p>	The Solicitation was updated in this regard in Amendment 8.
6581	RFP Section A.3.7.1(a), Page 100: The instructions state "Offerors may not use the ISO 9001:2015 and/or CMMI certifications of a Parent Company, Affiliate, Division, and/or Subsidiary within a corporate structure." This significantly limits an offeror's abilities to submit a response to this solicitation. We respectfully request that the Government change this requirement to allow the use of certifications from of a Parent Company, Affiliate, Division, and/or Subsidiary within a corporate structure where the offeror is operating under the same quality management system of the parent company, affiliate, or subsidiary named on the certification.	Amendment 8 updated the wording to allow for certificates to be used from entities with a Meaningful Relationship Commitment Letter.
6588	What is required and meant by responsible source IAW FAR 9.104	The wording with regard to 9.104 was updated in Amendment 8.
6592	Regarding the Compliance Columns for the Technical Area tabs of Exhibit 3a. Are offerings required to be TAA, EPEAT, and/or 508 compliant, or do we simply need to list if a CLIN is one of these three categories?	Amendment 8 removed column H from Exhibit 3a.
6594	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.	The wording in this section was updated in Amendment 8.

6607	For small businesses and businesses who operation remotely, the sustainability commitment requirements may be either not relevant or not achievable. Will the government consider altering or lessening these requirements for small businesses?	Amendment 8 updated the Commitment to Sustainability section.
6629	For a services company, will the government clarify which "specific tasks" and "corporate risks" associated with SCRM best represent NASA's concern with this requirement, and are there specific corporate resources or security measures you are particularly concerned about that we should address?	Amendment 8 updated the SCRM section including the wording being referred to.
6635	<p>p. 98 - A.3.7.1 OFFER VOLUME: Offerors may not use the ISO 9001:2015 and/or CMMI certifications of a Parent Company, Affiliate, Division, and/or Subsidiary within a corporate structure.</p> <p>Due to the expense in certifying the number of subsidiaries (30+), our ANC company currently has ISO and CMMI certification at the parent company level, as it was deemed too expensive to ISO- and CMMI-certify each company at the subsidiary level. Would the govt consider parent company level ISO certification in lieu of ISO certification at the subsidiary level?</p>	Amendment 8 update the certification requirements with regards to businesses with a Meaningful Relationship Commitment Letter.
6646	For Exhibits 3b and 3c, if we do not have any products to offer in Categories B and C at this time, should we just not enter anything for products and the UNSPSC information?	Exhibit 3b and 3c were removed from the solicitation in Amendment 8.
6649	The RFP states that an REP can be work that was performed as a subcontractor. The RFP also states that only projects with NAICS codes listed as in-scope for SEWP VI are to be submitted. For work that was performed as a subcontractor, contract documentation often does not specify a NAICS code characterization for the subcontract work - would the Government permit Offerors to characterize subcontract work with the NAICS code that was assigned to the Prime Contract as it was reported in FPDS?	The comment is no longer valid - Amendment 8 removed the reference to NAICS code with regard to REPs.
6652	The RFP states that an REP can be commercial work or work that was performed as a subcontractor. The RFP also states that only projects with NAICS codes listed as in-scope for SEWP VI are to be submitted. For commercial work or work that was performed as a subcontractor, contract documentation often does not specify a NAICS code characterization for the work - would the Government permit Offerors to elect an appropriate NAICS characterization when submitting REPs that concern commercial work or work that was performed as a subcontractor?	The comment is no longer valid - Amendment 8 removed the reference to NAICS code with regard to REPs.
6681	Reference Category B, "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." Could the Government clarify whether the requirement is for a total of two different Relevant Experience Projects (REPs) from different mandatory technical areas combined, rather than requiring two REPs for each mandatory technical area?	Amendment 8 clarified that each REP must address one and only one Mandatory Experience Area, and that each REP must address a different Mandatory Experience Area, for a total of 2 such areas for the referenced example.
6686	For the required REPs, will the government accept contracts that are relevant to each technical category scope area but may have a different NAICS code than the one defined on the table on pages 61 - 63 of the solicitation?	The comment is no longer valid - Amendment 8 removed the reference to NAICS code with regard to REPs.
6690	Section A.3.7.1, (b) Mandatory Experience/Offerings, Category B For HUBZone, VOSB, SDVOSB, WOSB, EDWOSB, 8a Offerors. Page 104. States that "A total of 2 different REPs for each of the mandatory experience technical areas shall be submitted." This would bring the total REP requirements for small disadvantaged businesses up to 20, which may be difficult for SDBs to meet. Would the Government consider adjusting this requirement, or allowing REPs to cover multiple Technical Areas?	The solicitation was updated on Amendment 8 to clarify that, in this example, only a total of 2 REPs are required.

6705	<p>Offerors proposing to category B and/ or C shall complete Exhibit 3b- Category B Solutions Spreadsheet and Exhibit 3c- Category C Solutions Spreadsheet. The UNSPSC codes must accurately match the proposed services/technology in each row and must be the full 8-digit UNSPSC code. If the CLIN is for an hourly labor rate, then the associated labor category shall be provided in Column G (Labor Category if Hourly Rate). The information including pricing in these spreadsheets will not be reviewed or evaluated and will only be utilized to establish the initial Contract Database of Record upon Contract award.</p> <p>Question: Question: If a SB Category C Offeror is not selling products, how/what should the offeror add to the attachment Exhibit C Solutions Spreadsheet in order to be compliant?</p>	Amendment 8 removed Exhibit 3b and 3c from the solicitation.
6709	"(2) Commitment to Sustainability" - The requirement to provide/have a sustainability management policy management system to control sustainability issues seems excessive for a small business, non manufacturer. Can a response to this area be optional for small businesses?	Amendment 8 updated the Commitment to Sustainability section.
6724	<p>(2) Commitment to Sustainability</p> <p>The offeror shall provide detail of sustainability management policy management system to control sustainability issues (e.g., environmental management system and corporate commitment to sustainability). At a minimum, the offeror shall address the following areas:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Does your company have in place a documented environmental management system? 2. Does your company have a formal sustainability/environmental policy? 3. Does your company use or intend to use renewable energy sources? 4. Does your company have a recycling program? 5. Has your company established sustainability purchasing guidelines for your direct suppliers that address issues such as environmental compliance, employment practices, and product/ingredient safety? 6. Does your company monitor its carbon emissions to set reductions targets or objectives? 7. Describe other ways in which your company mitigates the environmental impact of its services, such as greenhouse gas emissions, amount of waste generated, water and energy use, or other areas related to your services and how application of your company sustainability policies benefit the environment. <p>Question: Would the Government clarify what is required to satisfy, "the offeror shall address the following areas: Is a "Yes" acceptable? Does the offer have to describe how the topic of the question addressed?</p>	Amendment 8 updated the Commitment to Sustainability section.
6730	Exhibit 4 - Would the government consider allowing NAICS code 611710 for relevant experience and past performance in Categories B and C – that clearly relates to Computer Training.	NAICS 611710 was added in Amendment 8.
6733	What is the SEWP catalog compliance in Exhibit 3b and 3c?	Amendment 8 removed Exhibit 3b and 3c from the solicitation.
6734	For the required REPs, will the government accept contracts that are relevant to each technical category scope area but may have a different NAICS code than the one defined on the table on pages 61 - 63 of the solicitation?	The comment is no longer valid - Amendment 8 removed the reference to NAICS code with regard to REPs.
6753	Reference A.3.7.3 (Page 110-111). Within a subcategory of Category B Content Areas required, please clarify on how to respond to specific sub elements or subcategories within a Content or Technical Area in the Mission Suitability volume Technical Approach (Subfactor A), especially with regard to the expansive requirement "both inclusive of the listed technical areas and the breadth and depth beyond those Areas within the scope of the given Category" and given that offerors do not need to offer every element?	Amendment 8 updated the instructions for the Technical Approach to clarify it is based on the offeror's general technical capabilities with regard to the SEWP scope and Acquisition Objectives and not on the sample Technical Areas.
6764	Is it the Government's intention for Category C Offerors to submit Exhibit 3c Solutions Spreadsheet for other than products offerings? Can the Government provide an example of how a Category C Offeror would fill in the spreadsheet?	Amendment 8 removed Exhibit 3c from the solicitation.

6778	<p>(b) MANAGEMENT APPROACH (SUBFACTOR B)</p> <p>(1) Commitment to Supply Chain Management</p> <p>ii. FOR CATEGORY B and C - The Offeror shall describe ancillary products required for performance of specific tasks and corporate risks associated with SCRM (e.g., availability and security of corporate resources).</p> <p>Can the Government please define "specific tasks"? For example, is the Government referring to specific tasks for the administration of the master contract or is the Government referring to specific tasks to be performed at the task order level?</p>	Amendment 8 updated the SCRM section including the wording being referred to.
6789	<p>Is there a distinction made by NASA between standard Joint Ventures (JVs) and those formed under the 8(a) Mentor-Protégé Program (MPP JV)? Additionally, does NASA intend to evaluate MPPJV proposals with different criteria?</p>	This was updated in amendment 08.
6796	<p>Please clarify if 2 separate REP's are required for ALL 11 of the mandatory experience technical areas in Cat C</p>	The solicitation was updated on Amendment 8 to clarify that, in this example, only a total of 2 REPs are required.