

The Final EC2 RFP will be posted at a later date. The Government is not bound by the below Q&As in relation to the EC2 Final RFP. The Final RFP will be a sovereign, stand-alone document not related to the Draft RFP, the below Q&As, previous RFIs, or any other previous postings or communications issued by the Government. The purpose of the below Q&As (and all previous correspondence) is to collect suggestions, areas of improvement, and industry's best practices so it may incorporate those best practices into the EC2 Final RFP. The purpose of these communications is to maximize the accuracy and succinctness of the Government's requirement so interested parties may have the best opportunity to participate and receive an IDIQ award. Please refer to the provisions of the Final RFP for the Government's official RFP terms, conditions, instructions, and evaluation criteria before submitting a proposal. The anticipated date for the Final RFP release is not known at this time. 20 Jul 2022

Q#	Document	Pg #	Par. #	Comment/Question	Response
1		Page 2 (Section L); Page 12 (Ordering Guide)	L.2.1 (Section L); 2nd Para titled FOPR (Ordering Guide)	In paragraph L.2.1, the Gov't invokes FAR Subpart 19.502-4 and indicates this acquisition will be "set-aside for Small Business and a portion of the requirement may be set-aside for other socio-economic small business set-asides in accordance with agency procedures and the EC2 Ordering Guide". This appears to indicate there will be no opportunity for Other Than Small Businesses (aka Large Businesses) to participate in this acquisition at the basic contract level (ID/IQ). If this acquisition is intended to restrict Large Businesses from submitting offers at the basic contract level (ID/IQ), this is contradicted in the EC2 Ordering Guide, under the Fair Opportunity Ordering Procedures (FOPR) paragraph shown on page 12, 2nd paragraph, in which the FOPR states "Pools will not be established for this contract. It's in the Government's best interest to award the IDIQ's on an unrestricted basis and conduct SB set-asides at the TO-level, to the maximum extent practicable." Please clarify whether or not Large Businesses (per NAICS Code 541330; Revenue Size Standard \$41.5M) shall be considered eligible or ineligible from submitting offers as a Prime Contractor in response to the Solicitation at the basic contract level (IDIQ).	The acquisition, to include the ordering guide does not restrict other than small businesses from receiving IDIQ awards. Large businesses will be eligible for submitting offers as a prime contractor and receive IDIQ awards. The ordering guide is used to support the ordering activity at the task order level.
2	A Solicitation	9 (Sec. F)	1	Does the Government intend for Line Item 0002 to be the Option Period? If so, does the PoP need to be adjusted to reflect the dates 9 May 2028 - 8 May 2033?	The Government will be updating the line items on the Final RFP. There will be an option period Line Item and the PoPs will be adjusted.
3	Work Sample Cover Sheet	3	1	Can the Government please clarify the primary scope of work areas that should be mapped into this section? Is it the Government's intention that this should map to the Specialty Area?	Yes
4	Work Sample Cover Sheet	3	1	Can the Government please clarify what is required to be entered with regard to the Percentage of SOC-E Program Areas Covered under work sample, should this reflect the Percentage of Specialty Areas covered?	This will be corrected in the Final RFP. Should read EC2, not SOC-E.
5	L-M	10	L.6.8.2	Can work samples include IPR slides or MSRs?	<p>Section L.8.6.2 will be revised to provide further clarification of work sample submissions. The work samples shall consist of only official contract documentation. "Official contract documentation" includes key documents integral to contract performance, including contracts, orders, modifications, PWS/SOW/SOO, CDRLs, subcontracting plans, invoices, meeting minutes, progress reports, monthly status reports, or other reports. The contractor may submit other documentation it regards to be integral to the contract (i.e., CPARS, FPDS, memos from COs/government official/prime contractor), but offerors are cautioned that the documentation is validated for past experience (not past performance) and that authenticity (contract-contemporaneous documents) and level of detail are critical considerations of any work sample.</p> <p>The Government cautions offerors to ensure detailed information (through the work sample and attachments (Atch 6). Do not presume that the government will necessarily extrapolate details that are not clearly presented. Submission of relevant excerpts (vice submitting an entire document) is recommended. In Atch 6 and the work sample, spelling out critical acronyms, providing "lay person" explanations, and marking/highlighting (or otherwise distinguishing) key excerpts may also ensure that the Government may consider the work sample and its nexus to the SAs under the IDIQ. The markings/highlighting should be evident that the marking/highlighting were newly-added by the offeror and not part of the original document.</p>
6	L-M	8	L.7.6	Does a JV need to be registered in SAM? Or can the managing member be the one in SAM?	Yes, the JV must be registered in SAM. See FAR 52.204-7.
7	L-M	10	L.8.7.1	Can a company use the same work samples on multiple teams/bids?	Yes.
8	PWS	4	1.3	What will be the approximate total FTE count for EC2 contract? In addition, what are the priority key fills at the time of contract award?	Cannot be determined at the IDIQ level, all service delivery requirements exist at the TO level. Average AMIC cyber contract FTEs are 20-50, there can be more or less as determined by the requirement at the TO level.
9	PWS	4	1.3	Who are considered key personnel (Program Manager, Cyber/Information Technology (IT) Project Manager, etc.)?	Cannot be determined at the IDIQ level, albeit the positions you've mentioned are typically "key" on most cyber-related contracts.
10	PWS	4	1.3	What will be the approximate total FTE count for EC2 contract? In addition, what are the priority key fills at the time of contract award?	Cannot be determined at the IDIQ level, all service delivery requirements exist at the TO level. Average AMIC cyber contract FTEs are 20-50, there can be more or less as determined by the requirement at the TO level.
11	PWS	4	1.3	Who are considered key personnel (Program Manager, Cyber/Information Technology (IT) Project Manager, etc.)?	Cannot be determined at the IDIQ level, all service delivery requirements exist at the TO level. Average AMIC cyber contract FTEs are 20-50, there can be more or less as determined by the requirement at the TO level.
12	PWS	4	1.4	Is there an annual Award Term Plan to award each additional Option Year? How are the 5-Option Years going to be awarded?	5-Year Base Period + One 5-Year Option Period
13	PWS	4	1.4	Is there an annual Award Term Plan to award each additional Option Year? How are the 5-Option Years going to be awarded?	5-Year Base Period + One 5-Year Option Period
14	PWS	5	2.1	What are the classifications of the networks to be serviced (e.g. Unclassified, Secret, Top Secret, NSAnet, etc.)?	Cannot be determined at the IDIQ level, all service delivery requirements exist at the TO level.
15	PWS	5	2.1	What are the classifications of the networks to be serviced (e.g. Unclassified, Secret, Top Secret, NSAnet, etc.)?	Cannot be determined at the IDIQ level, all service delivery requirements exist at the TO level.
16	PWS	8	2.7	The current Draft RFP in the PWS section 2.7, it was noticed that Cyber Modeling, Simulation and Ranges were left out from the previous Pre Solicitation Draft RFP. Was this intentional and/or an Administrative error? (Of note this verbiage is in the Solicitation Document on page 5)	Intentionally removed. Modelling work nests under PWS 2.1.1 and can be performed by a Data Analyst, and the other positions all nest under other SAs as applicable.
17	PWS	8	2.7	The current Draft RFP in the PWS section 2.7, it was noticed that verbiage from the previous Solicitation Draft RFP referenced full-spectrum cyberoperations (old section 2.8). In the current version of the Draft RFP is the Governments intent to cover Full-Spectrum Operations across the section (e.g. cyber network exploitation, cyber operations?)	Intentionally removed. Full Spectrum Cyber Operations falls under any or all of the Categories/SA.
18	Subcontractor Teaming Partner Consent Letter	1	3	The third paragraph in this attachment refers to DUNS, which was replaced on 4 April 2022 by Unique Entity Identifier (UEI) as the primary means of entity identification. Q: Does the Government intend to revise this document, replacing DUNS with UEI?	The DUNS is no longer used. The UEI is now required. This form will be updated in the Final RFP.
19	L-M	20	4	Will there be different HTRO requirements for small and large businesses?	Methodology will be revised (no longer referred to as HRT0), and there will not be unique methodology applied to small businesses vice large businesses.
20	Ordering Guide	9	5	Contract Type lists Firm Fixed Price (FFP), Firm Fixed Price level of Effort (FFP-LOE), and Cost Reimbursable (CR). However the Draft Solicitation document (attachment A) in Section B on Page 3 indicates that there will also be Cost type Contracts as well (CPFF, CPIF, and CPAF). Can the government confirm that there will be Cost type contracts under the IDIQ as stated in the solicitation?	There may be any type of contract/task order issued under the EC2 program. This has been updated to Fixed Price and Cost Reimbursement from which all other types of contracts may be awarded.
21	L-M	20	5	"To advance past Step 2, the Government-validated Past Experience Score must demonstrate qualifying experience in at least 90% overall of the EC2 Specialty Areas (SA), which equates to at least twenty-eight (28) of the thirty one (31) SA as defined in Section L. ", Will the Government consider amending this language for Small Businesses "For Small Businesses to advance past Step 2, the Government-validated Past Experience Score must demonstrate qualifying experience in at least 90% in only the EC2 Specialty Areas (SA) Past Experience is being submitted."	This requirement/language will remain unchanged in the Final RFP.
22	PWS	10	5.1	Will the Prime Contractor be required to lease SCIF spaces or will all work be performed in Government facilities? If so, will the SCIF agreement be finalized at the time of EC2 contract proposal submission?	Likely no, however, this cannot be determined at the IDIQ level. All service delivery requirements exist at the TO level.
23	PWS	13	5.1	How many Task Orders (TO) will there be time of award? Will there only be just the IDIQ base award?	There will be one TO issued to each awardee.
24	PWS	11	5.5	Performance overseas requires unique tax accounting, import of equipment, and employee benefits such as COLA and requires significant lead time to set up. Can the government identify the anticipated number of Task Orders to be issued for each Locations of Work identified, and specify the anticipated OCONUS locations? Primary: JBSA-Lackland, Port San Antonio, and San Antonio, TX Alternate: - Nellis AFB NV and the Nevada Test and Training Range (NTTR). - Norfolk NAS, VA. - Ft Kit Carson, CO. Joint Electric Power Range (JEPR) - Playas, NM. IW Combat Range - Additional locations, including OCONUS areas, may be required and will be identified in subordinate TOs created under this contract.	The Government can't provide the anticipated number of task orders to be issued to each location at this time.
25	PWS	11	5.5	Is work out of the primary or alternate sites currently being done remotely? If so, when is it expected for work to return on site?	Likely no, however, this cannot be determined at the IDIQ level. All service delivery requirements exist at the TO level.

26	PWS	11	5.5	What is the government's anticipated remote capabilities across task orders?	We acknowledge that COVID has changed the work environment significantly; however, this cannot be determined at the IDIQ level. All service delivery requirements exist at the TO level.
27	PWS	11	5.5	The Performance Work Statement states that locations are subject to change. Are locations still subject to change following award?	The locations will be based on the task order requirements stated in the task order PWS.
28	PWS	11	5.5	Are the CONUS Places of Performance locations final as stated in the PWS or will there be more added with follow-on TTOS?	The locations will be based on the task order requirements stated in the task order PWS.
29	PWS	11	5.5	Will all work under subsequent task orders be performed in the work locations identified in Attachment 14 EC2 Ordering Guide, or is remote work anticipated?	We acknowledge that COVID has changed the work environment significantly; however, this cannot be determined at the IDIQ level. All service delivery requirements exist at the TO level. The Ordering Guide will be corrected in the Final RFP.
30	PWS	11	5.5	Is there any way to get a list of OCONUS locations as we will all need to get insurance to support our personnel in AOR? We are going to have to be able to identify the scope of travel for us to get a quote. This may be a heavy reach for a small business if they do not help us provide the information that would be cost-effective to get the proper insurance to protect our companies and personnel while over in operations over seas. Are there going to be other locations outside of Germany? The document reads one-way one and but the requirements are broad.	OCONUS locations are not limited to Germany. At the task order level, offerors will be provided more information
31	PWS	16	7	Could the Government please advise if post-differential and danger pay maybe applicable under this IDIQ based on the specific OCONUS location(s)? If yes, will the guidelines of this pricing be stated within the task order and/or EC2 ordering guide?	This will be defined at the task order level if applicable.
32	PWS	16	8	Should the Prime Contractor have policies and procedures in place for OCONUS travel requirements at the time of the base IDIQ contract award?	This is a TO driven requirement and is not required at IDIQ award.
33	dd	1	9	Block 9 of the solicitation states bids will be accepted until 12:00pm on 5 October 2022. Is this the anticipated due dates of RFPs, if so what is the anticipated date of the RFP release?	This will be corrected/updated upon final RFP release. The anticipated date of the RFP Release is 6 July 2022.
34	L-M	-	-	When will the Government provide the conformed RFP that includes all Q&A updates?	The conformed RFP will be provided in the form of the Final RFP.
35	L-M	-	-	Does the Government anticipate providing industry with a forward-looking forecast of future planned task orders?	The Government does not anticipate providing forward-looking forecasts of future planned task orders at this time.
36	A Solicitation	-	-	Does the Government intend to globally change areas in its RFP documentation in which an Offeror's DUNS# is requested, to the Unique Entity Identifier (UEI) since SAM.gov states that DUNS# are being removed from the system?	The DUNS is no longer used. The UEI is now required. This will be updated in the Final RFP.
37	L-M	1	L.1.2.1	Please clarify the contents required in Volume I. L.1.2.1 is not consistent with L.5 Table 1 list of sections/contents.	This will be corrected in the Final RFP.
38	L-M	11	L.8.7.1.1	According to the draft RFP, in mentor-protégé JVs, protégés must demonstrate experience in 6 SAs. Would the Government please confirm that for a given SA, the protégé can provide one work sample and the mentor may provide another to result in the maximum of two work samples per SA?	Confirmed. From the thirty-one defined categories/specialty areas, the JV must demonstrate the contributions/experience of the protégé member in a minimum of six of the defined categories/specialty areas (SAs). For the 6 SA, the protégé partner could provide one work sample and the mentor partner could provide another work sample (maximum of two work samples per SA).
39	L-M	17	M.4.2	Reference: In order to demonstrate relevant past experience, the offeror should deliver a proposal, either expressly or inherently, having performed the performance and task level objectives stated in the PWS and PWS Supplement. Q: Can the Government specify if in Attachment 2, PWS Supplement, all "tasks" must have been performed to show adequate relevancy? For example if 10 tasks were met out of 14 sited?	The PWS provides the relevant categories and specialty areas. The PWS supplement integrates those SAs (with the task IDs, KSAs, and more). The solicitation does not prescribe that the work sample must explicitly state each and every task ID or task (or KSA). However, where an offeror cites a work sample that is vague, does not address the tasks, or provides little nexus to the SA under the IDIQ, then the government cannot extrapolate and simply may not be able to validate that work sample.
40	L-M			Is a cover letter required in any volume?	Each volume is required to include a cover page per L.4.2.2
41	L-M			Should offerors add "Attachment" to the respective files for submission? Or use the listed naming format for Volume files for Attachment files?	Please use the listed naming format provided.
42	L-M			In many instances the Attachment number in the file name does not match the number listed in the document. For example, this document file name is "12" but 15 is listed in the document name above.	This will be corrected in the Final RFP.
43	Team Structure			Attachment 4 Column G requires information on the "Verification of Prime Status (i.e. prime contract references for Team Member)" Question: What does the verification of "Prime Status" include or what RFP requirement does it address?	This column has been deleted.
44	A Solicitation	83-85		Question 1: Will clauses 252.234-7001 & 252.234-7002 (Earned Value System) be applied at the task orders level if it's over \$100M? Question 2: If a SB or LB does not have an EVMS in place will the Government allow a suitable substitution or will the SB/LB not qualify for an award if EVMS is not established? Question 3: If the order is below \$100M will the Government require for the contractor to have EVMS?	These clauses will not be included in the Final RFP. Ordering Contracting Officers (OCO) will determine whether these clauses will be included in Task Orders based on FAR & DFARS prescription language.
45	L-M			Please confirm that the word "Offeror" as used throughout Sections L & M includes the proposed prime contractor's corporate parents, subsidiaries, and affiliates for the purposes of submitting relevant experience references? Case law from the U.S. Government Accountability Office ("GAO") indicates that the response should be "Yes," but we wanted to confirm. Contractor can provide the case law upon request.	The offeror is the prime contractor with its respective Tax ID, Unique Entity Identifier (UIE), and cage code. The offeror may be a joint venture (with its own Tax ID, UIE, cage code). An offeror may have other companies/entities which support the prime contractor in performance under the IDIQ. A subsidiary, parent, or affiliate company may also support the prime contractor in performance under the IDIQ. However, for government consideration of the capabilities of the supporting company's past experience or past performance, it's incumbent upon the offeror to demonstrate that the company will be supporting the offeror and describe how they will be supporting the offeror under this IDIQ. See Attachment 3.
46	Team Structure			Attachment 4 Teaming Structure Column G states "Verification of Prime Status (i.e. prime contract references for Team Member)". What is the method of verification required to be entered into this cell? For example on the GSA Services MAC multiple award IDIQ competition, they are requiring offerors to provide an FPDS-NS report of their prime contracts. Recommend AF EC2 require FPDS-NS report as the verification of at least one prime contract for each teaming partner / subcontractor listed on attachment 4. This report can be included in an appendix within Vol 2.	Attachment 4 and other provisions will be revised to eliminate requirement of the agreement (teaming agreement or joint venture agreement). However, the Offeror must identify the teaming partners (companies) which will support the Offeror in the performance of the IDIQ (Atch 3) The "verification of prime status" provision will be deleted.
47	Team Structure			Attachment 4 Teaming Structure Column G states "Verification of Prime Status (i.e. prime contract references for Team Member)". Work samples and past performances recency is 3 years as of the date of the final RFP. What is the recency requirement for prime experience?	Column G has been removed. Past experiences and work sample qualifications at L.8.7.5 provide work must be no older than 3 years.
48	Misc			The numbering of the attachment files often conflicts with the Attachment Number within the file. Would the Government please make sure that the numbering of files aligns with the Attachment Numbers?	The numbering mistakes will be corrected in the Final RFP.
49	Misc			Due to the nature of the work described in the RFP, the description of past performance of many relevant programs are contained within classified statements of work. Will there be any way to cite this type of work either by reference or through submission via classified channels?	Classified proposal information shall not be submitted and will not be evaluated. The burden of proof is defined at L.8.5. The Government will evaluate unclassified proposal information only and determine if the past experience is relevant IAW M.4.1.
50	Offeror Company Information	1		Remove reference to "DUNS" and replace with "UEI"	The DUNS is no longer used. The UEI is now required. This has been updated.
51	PWS Supplement			Regarding PWS Supplement Task Descriptions and the Self-Scoring Matrix: PWS Supplement Task Descriptions, Labor Category tab: Has AN-LNG-001, Multi-Disciplined Language Analyst aligned with PWS Task 2.4.4, Targets and has AN-TGT-002, Target Network Analyst aligned with PWS task 2.5.4, but there is no PWS task 2.5.4. Likewise, the Self Scoring Matrix has 2.4.5, Language Targets, but there are no Labor Categories listed for 2.4.5 in the PWS Supplement Task Descriptions (i.e., 2.4.5 is missing from the Labor Categories tab). Please confirm that either: 1) AN-TGT-002 should be aligned with PWS 2.4.4, Targets and that AN-LNG-001 should be aligned with PWS 2.4.5, Language Analysis on the PWS Supplement Task Descriptions document; or 2) AN-LNG-001 will remain aligned with PWS 2.44, Targets and that AN-TGT-002 will be aligned with PWS 2.4.5, Language Analysis.	This will be corrected in the Final RFP.
52	A Solicitation	1		What is the projected date for Final RFP Release? What is the anticipated due date?	Anticipated: 6 July 2022 RFP issuance date and 9 September 2022 proposal due date.
53	Ordering Guide			Can the government provide an estimate on the percentage of value or task orders that will be set aside for small business and other socioeconomic small business set asides?	The intent of stating "partial small business set-aside" by the Government was to indicate to industry that the rule of 2 will be applied at the task order (TO) level allowing for 100% and/or socio-economic small business set-asides. The attempt by using "partial set-aside" vice "Full and Open" was to emphasis that small business set-asides are allowed and anticipated for many requirements at the TO level. There is not an estimate at this point of how many TOs will be set-aside or a specific "type of work" that will be set-aside. The SB set-aside will be determined on every task order based on results of market research (IAW the ordering guide).
54	A Solicitation	24	DFARS 252.239-7018	Regarding DFAR 252.239-7018 Supply Chain Risk. Feb 2019, is a Supply Chain Risk Management Plan required at the IDIQ level? And will it be based on NIST SP 800-161r1?	A Supply Chain Risk Management Plan will not be required at the IDIQ level.
55	A Solicitation	103	DFARS 252.239-7017	Regarding DFAR 252.239-7017 Notice of Supply Chain Risk. Feb 2019, is a Supply Chain Risk Management Plan required at the IDIQ level? And will it be based on NIST SP 800-161r1? NOTE: DFAR clause is incorrectly cited on this page.	A Supply Chain Risk Management Plan will not be required at the IDIQ level.

56	Question and Answer Matrix	1		The Note indicates that " <i>If Prime is checked above, offerors must submit all completed CPARS reports ...</i> " but the Answers to Questions 17, 18, 118 indicate that " <i>the Government does not expect to require Offerors to submit CPARS</i> ". Please clarify the instructions and if we should assume that the Answers to the Questions is OBE since the Section L also calls for the submission of CPARS.	1) Offerors must provide either a PPQ or CPAR IAW M.5.2. 2) If offerors have CPARS within the last 3 years they must be provided IAW L.9.5.4. 3) Attachment 12 will be updated in the Final RFP.
57	Work Sample Cover Sheet	1		Row 11 of the Work Sample Cover Sheet asks for the " <i>PERCENTAGE OF SOC-E PROGRAM AREAS COVERED UNDER WORK SAMPLE</i> ". Is this Security Operations Center-Enterprise? If not, please clarify what is meant by " <i>SOC-E</i> ".	This was an error and will be corrected in the Final RFP.
58	PWS Supplement	2.2.3 and MP-SPP-002	7. Self-Scoring Matrix.xlsx and 2. PWS SupplementTask_Descriptions.xlsx	The Subtasks for 2.2 Management and Policy are listed on Tab MP-SPP-002 on the attached spreadsheet. Cyber Policy and Strategy Planner (MP-SPP-002) relates to developing and maintaining cybersecurity plans, strategy, and policy to support and align with organizational cybersecurity initiatives and regulatory compliance. Could the Government please provide guidance regarding self-scoring for 2.2.3, management, administration, financial and acquisition?	MP-PMA-001 through MP-PMA-005 provide the requested KSAs and Tasks.
59	Scoring Sheet Directions	NA		Significant changes were made to the scoring and self-assessment spreadsheets but a revised scoring sheet directions document was not provided as part of Update 11. Could the government provide a revised directions sheet as part of this pre-solicitation process?	Revised direction sheet will be provided in the final RFP.
60	Work Sample Cover Sheet	1		"PERCENTAGE OF SOC-E PROGRAM AREAS COVERED UNDER WORK SAMPLE" - Please clarify if this is asking for the percent of the 31 specialty areas covered by the work sample?	This was an error an will be corrected in the Final RFP.
61	Work Sample Cover Sheet	1		"Was this work sample performed as the Prime Contractor?" The response for this question is prime or subcontractor. If the work sample was performed by a member of a joint venture who is proposing as an individual offeror not as that joint venture, should this question be answered "prime" and is a explanation required so that the government understands that the offeror was a joint venture member?	The offeror (Joint Venture) includes the JV partners. The offeror may rely on the capabilities, past performance, experience, business systems, and certifications of its partners. Atch 6, Part I seeks information on the past contract (work sample). When asked "Was this work sample performed as the Prime Contractor?", the answer should be in the affirmative if the JV or any of its partners was the prime contractor. If the JV and all its partners was not the prime contractor, then the answer should be in the negative.
62	MISC			Work products aligned to some of the specialty areas might require redacting the classified version of the PWS to be able to submit. Will the government have the ability to assess classified PWS documents and if not, will the burden of proof be with the offeror or the contracting officer to determine if the work sample demonstrates the specialty area?	No. Classified proposal information shall not be submitted and will not be evaluated. The burden of proof is defined at L.8.5. The Government will evaluate unclassified proposal information only and determine if the past experience is relevant IAW M.4.1.
63	L-M		L.1.2.4 L.9	L.1.2.4 lists Subcontractor/Teaming Member Consent Letter as part of the Vol IV Past Performance but it is not listed in L.9. Volume IV Organization. Is a Subcontractor/Teaming Member Consent Letter requested in both Vol II and Vol IV?	This will be corrected in the Final RFP. The Subcontractor/Teaming Member Consent Letter is required in Volume II only.
64	L-M			To receive credit in a Specialty Area, does an offeror's Work Sample need to show that experience for the associated performance objectives as identified in the PWS and all tasks identified in the associated LCATS within the PWS Supplement. For example, for 2.1.1 Data Administration, do offerors have to show experience performing PWS task 2.1.1.1, all 14 tasks in LCAT OM-DTA-001, and all 23 tasks in LCAT OM-DTA-002?	The offeror should demonstrate, to the maximum extent practicable, their past experience matches the size, scope, and nature of the work described in the PWS and PWS Supplement.
65	Work Sample			How do you want the offeror's Work Samples to be marked for scoring? For example, is it acceptable to use highlighting and annotations?	Use of Attachment 8 - Cross-Reference Matrix is key. Markings on the work sample are acceptable at the discretion of the offeror.
66	Work Sample Cover Sheet	3		In Attachment 6 the Primary Scope of Work (within the instructions on page 3) identifies Program Management, Operations & Maintenance, Install/Warehouse, SOC-Enterprise Services/Helpdesk as the only choices to select on the Work Sample Cover Sheet. Please confirm these scope areas are for EC2.	This was an error and will be corrected in the Final RFP.
67	Team Structure			Column G of Attachment 4 requires us to indicate whether or not a team member is a Prime Contractor for the purpose of supporting reference qualifications. Can the government confirm if this information is still required or is this hold over from the Draft RFP from Update 8 (Nov 2021)? The current DRFP does not require team members to have conducted work as prime contractors to participate or submit work samples; thus the column appears to conflict with the RFP.	This column has been deleted.
68	Team Structure			Column D requires an update from DUNS to UEI.	The DUNS is no longer used. The UEI is now required. This form will be updated in the Final RFP.
69	Team Structure			Recommend adding columns for e-mail address and telephone number to Attachment 4 to efficiently meet the requirements in M.2.3(h).	Phone number and email address columns have been added to attachment 4.
70	A Solicitation			How many Small Business awards are anticipated?	The intent of stating "partial small business set-aside" by the Government was to indicate to industry that the rule of 2 will be applied at the task order (TO) level allowing for 100% and/or socio-economic small business set-asides. The attempt by using "partial set-aside" vice "Full and Open" was to emphasis that small business set-asides are allowed and anticipated for many requirements at the TO level. There is not an estimate at this point of how many TOs will be set-aside or a specific "type of work" that will be set-aside. The SB set-aside will be determined on every task order based on results of market research (IAW the ordering guide).
71	A Solicitation			How many awardees will there be for the IDIQ vehicle?	The Government is unable to estimate how many awardees will be selected at this time.
72	A Solicitation			How many Small Business task orders are anticipated to be released per year?	The intent of stating "partial small business set-aside" by the Government was to indicate to industry that the rule of 2 will be applied at the task order (TO) level allowing for 100% and/or socio-economic small business set-asides. The attempt by using "partial set-aside" vice "Full and Open" was to emphasis that small business set-asides are allowed and anticipated for many requirements at the TO level. There is not an estimate at this point of how many TOs will be set-aside or a specific "type of work" that will be set-aside. The SB set-aside will be determined on every task order based on results of market research (IAW the ordering guide).
73	A Solicitation			How many Large Business task orders are anticipated to be released per year?	The intent of stating "partial small business set-aside" by the Government was to indicate to industry that the rule of 2 will be applied at the task order (TO) level allowing for 100% and/or socio-economic small business set-asides. The attempt by using "partial set-aside" vice "Full and Open" was to emphasis that small business set-asides are allowed and anticipated for many requirements at the TO level. There is not an estimate at this point of how many TOs will be set-aside or a specific "type of work" that will be set-aside. The SB set-aside will be determined on every task order based on results of market research (IAW the ordering guide).
74	Ordering Guide	37 / 20		The solicitation states that the contractor is required to comply with the Limitations on Subcontracting "[b]y the end of the base term of the contract and then by the end of each subsequent option period." However, the Ordering Guide states that the contractor is required to "comply with the limitations on subcontracting by the end of the performance period for each order issued under the contract." Is it intended that the first requirement applies on the IDIQ level and the second on the TO level?	Large Business Prime Contractors will submit a Small Business Subcontracting Plan as part of the EC2 IDIQ proposal. Subcontracting Goals will be provided in the Final RFP IAW FAR 19.705-2 (e) A contract may not have more than one subcontracting plan. However, an Ordering Contracting Officer may establish separate subcontracting goals for each order under an IDIQ contract The Ordering Guide will be updated to reflect this in the Final RFP.
75	PWS Supplement			Are the listed knowledge, skills and abilities requirements or suggested guidance?	Suggested/informational only. To be used as assistance in the self-scoring and by the Government to develop TOs.
76	PWS Supplement			Is the list of skills and knowledge comprehensive or is it foreseeable that additional skills and knowledge may be required on specific task orders beyond what is included for each LCAT?	Suggested/informational only. To be used as assistance in the self-scoring and by the Government to develop TOs.
77	Offeror Company Information			This document requests the offeror's DUNS. Should this request be for the offeror's UEI instead?	The DUNS is no longer used. The UEI is now required. This form has been updated.
78	Team Structure			This document requests the DUNS for each team member. This request should be for the team member's UEI as required in RFP L.7.4.	The DUNS is no longer used. The UEI is now required. This form will be updated in the Final RFP.
79	Subcontractor Teaming Partner Consent Letter			This document requests the subcontractor's DUNS. Should this request be for the subcontractor's UEI instead?	The DUNS is no longer used. The UEI is now required. This form will be updated in the Final RFP.
80	Misc			When is the final RFP anticipated to be released?	5 July 2022 is our current estimated Final RFP release date
81	Misc			Can teaming partners be added after award? If not, how should bidders provide comprehensive documentation of teaming partners, given that some may not be providing work samples?	The government does not on- or off-ramp subcontractors, team members of a prime contractor. IDIQ awardees (prime contractors) will not be precluded in proposing new teammates/subcontractors at the task order level. The Prime may add or remove Team Members as needed to fulfill requirements in Fair Opportunity Proposal Requests. The Prime has discretion as to how to structure its Team to meet Small Business goals, etc. The Prime may be a Large or Small Business. At the task order level, the government may consider the Prime contractor's team change and may require additional information (for example, past experience and past performance).
82	Misc			Would the Government please confirm that a large business can submit a prime bid, and also participate in a JV bid for the small business portion?	Confirmed.
83	Misc			Will there be separate tracks for Unrestricted and Small Business?	Small or Large Businesses do not have separate proposal instructions to be awarded an IDIQ.
84	Past Performance Information Sheet			Form contains fields for DUNS numbers but should be Unique Entity Identifier. Would the Government clarify which one should be used?	The DUNS is no longer used. The UEI is now required. This form will be updated in the Final RFP.
85	Team Structure			Would the Government provide instructions on how to complete Column G?	This column has been deleted.
86	Past Performance Questionnaire	3		In the Past Performance Questionnaire, the contract POC is asked to "Please discuss all ratings except 'Satisfactory' or 'Neutral'. Would the Government consider adding a fillable field to help the POC enter their answers? Also, if the POC declines to answer this request for the additional discussion and only provide the basic ratings, how will that affect the Government's assessment of Performance Quality?	Yes. This will be corrected/added in Final RFP.

87	Work Sample Cover Sheet	2		WORK SAMPLE COVER SHEET: What exactly does 500-characters mean exactly? Do narrative responses include spaces as well as letters or just letters?	Yes, 500 characters includes spaces.
88	Past Performance Info Sheet	2-Jan		PAST PERFORMANCE INFORMATION (PPI): How exactly should PP be annotated and provided and integrated into the overall proposal? A combination of references with the self scoring matrix and documents 6, 9, and 10? (#6 Work Sample Cover Sheet, PP info sheet, PP Questionnaire).	Following the instructions provided at L.9.
89	MISC			Will the Government consider excluding spaces from the 500 character limit imposed upon Form 6 Past performance?	The 500 character limit includes spaces. The Government is confident 500 characters is enough to describe an individual work sample.
90	Work Sample Cover Sheet			Will the Government send out a revised Form 6 that allows bidders to enter data into the form?	This will be corrected in the Final RFP.
91	A Solicitation	1	Section J	3. Offeror Company Information, Pages Column, should read 1	This will be corrected in the Final RFP.
92	A Solicitation	1	Section J	10. Past Performance Questionnaire, Pages Column should read 4	This will be corrected in the Final RFP.
93	A Solicitation	1	Section J	11. DCAA Contractor Accounting System Pre-Award Survey, Pages Column should read 10	This will be corrected in the Final RFP.
94	L-M	5		L.5. Table 1 - Proposal Organization does not list SF33 and SF30 required by L-6.4 and L-6.5 respectively	This will be corrected in the Final RFP.
95	L-M	6		Is L.6.6. Insurance Certificate required? It was struck under L.1.2.1.	This provision will be deleted. The government may require evidence of compliance (FAR clause 52.228-5, Insurance – Work on Government Installations in task order evaluations and contract administration.
96	L-M	16		M.2.6. Insurance Certificate. Will this be evaluated? It was struck under L.1.2.1.	This provision will be deleted. The government may require evidence of compliance (FAR clause 52.228-5, Insurance – Work on Government Installations in task order evaluations and contract administration.
97	Misc	Atch 3, 5, 9		Reference: DUNS # Q: Should the offeror provide the UEI Number instead of the DUNS Number?	The DUNS is no longer used. The UEI is now required. This will be updated in the Final RFP.
98	Misc			Please confirm that offerors will be able to address potential OCIs on a “task order-by-task order basis” depending on the specific tasks required in situations where it is currently unclear at the IDIQ level whether a potential OCI may exist or would be created by the task order scope.	Confirmed. Identification of an actual or potential OCI for the IDIQ source selection is required, with mitigation plan as applicable. As services are required at the task order level, there may be other OCI issues, which will be addressed in the FOPR.
99	Misc			When does the government expect to release the final RFP?	5 July 2022 is our current estimated Final RFP release date
100	L-M			What will the anticipated turnaround time be for Task Order proposals?	The dollar value of the task order, number of tasks, complexity of task, and locations of performance, will directly impact the time it takes for an Ordering Contracting Officer to award. The Government is unable to estimate a turnaround time at this time.
101	Misc			Past Performance - when forming a team, does the teaming member or subcontractor past performance count towards the self scoring matrix and overall past performance to be submitted in the proposal?	Yes.
102	Misc			When will the final acquisition schedule be available? The final RFP? Final Proposal submission date?	At the time the Final RFP is posted on SAM.gov we will provide the final proposal submission date.
103	Misc			Will this be a mandatory use contract vehicle for the USAF?	It's not anticipated at this time.
104	Subcontractor Teaming Partner Consent Letter			Subcontractor Teaming Partner Consent Letters referred to as Attachment 5 within Section L-M and Section J but Attachment 14 within the actual document	This will be corrected in the Final RFP.
105	Work Sample Cover Sheet			Work Sample Coversheet is referred to as Attachment 6 within Section L-M and Section J but Attachment 8 within the actual document	This was an error and will be corrected in the Final RFP.
106	Cross Reference Matrix	Column E - Reference		Please verify that Column E mapping is only to the Specialty area and not to the Individual Tasks in the PWS Supplement?	Confirmed, it maps to the Specialty Area.
107	Cross Reference Matrix			Will approved/signed PMRs or Status Reports be acceptable as supporting documentation for Work Samples?	Section L.8.6.2 will be revised to provide further clarification of work sample submissions. The work samples shall consist of only official contract documentation. "Official contract documentation" includes key documents integral to contract performance, including contracts, orders, modifications, PWS/SOW/SOO, CDRLs, subcontracting plans, invoices, meeting minutes, progress reports, monthly status reports, or other reports. The contractor may submit other documentation it regards to be integral to the contract (i.e., CPARS, FPDS, memos from COs/government official/prime contractor), but offerors are cautioned that the documentation is validated for past experience (not past performance) and that authenticity (contract-contemporaneous documents) and level of detail are critical considerations of any work sample. The Government cautions offerors to ensure detailed information (through the work sample and attachments (Atch 6). Do not presume that the government will necessarily extrapolate details that are not clearly presented. Submission of relevant excerpts (vice submitting an entire document) is recommended. In Atch 6 and the work sample, spelling out critical acronyms, providing "lay person" explanations, and marking/highlighting (or otherwise distinguishing) key excerpts may also ensure that the Government may consider the work sample and its nexus to the SAs under the IDIQ. The markings/highlighting should be evident that the marking/highlighting were newly-added by the offeror and not part of the original document.
108	Cross Reference Matrix			Cross Reference Matrix is referred to as Attachment 8 within Section L-M and Section J but Attachment 10 within the actual document	This will be corrected in the Final RFP.
109	Past Performance Information Sheet			For the Past Performance Information Sheet shall the description show the mapping to all Tasks in Attachment 2, PWS Supplement	The PWS provides the relevant categories and specialty areas. The PWS supplement integrates those SAs (with the task IDs, KSAs, and more). The solicitation does not prescribe that the work sample must explicitly state each and every task ID or task (or KSA). However, where an offeror cites a work sample that is vague, does not address the tasks, or provides little nexus to the SA under the IDIQ, then the government cannot extrapolate and simply may not be able to validate that work sample.
110	Past Performance Information Sheet			Past Performance Information Sheet is referred to as Attachment 9 within Section L-M and Section J but Attachment 12 within the actual document	This will be corrected in the Final RFP.
111	Past Performance Questionnaire			Past Performance Questionnaire is referred to as Attachment 10 within Section L-M and Section J but Attachment 13 within the actual document	This will be corrected in the Final RFP.
112	Ordering Guide			In the post award contract phase does the EC2 contract and program office envision providing a Task Order (TO) tracking Data Base so EC 2 contract holders can have a repository to identify and track TO's? (A number of other IDIQ's include such a repository to contract holders to help in opportunity ID and tracking. It also helps maximizing competition and use of the EC2 IDIQ contract vehicle.	Thank you for your suggestion. The Government will consider this while creating after award admin procedures.
113	Work Sample Cover Sheet and Slide 31 (Work Sample Example from 17 May 2022 Pre RFP Conference and Section L Proposal Instructions			Instructions provided for Attachment 8, Page 3, Part III: Work Sample Description states that Offerors shall provide a brief description of the work sample. The information provided will not be evaluated by the Past Experience Evaluation Team. Can the Government please clarify how they want to see the Work Samples and if Offerors should reference the specific Labor Category - as Slide 31 is citing two LCATs for a "Good" Work Sample example.	This has been corrected. The work sample description <i>will be</i> evaluated by the evaluation team. The organization and content of the work samples are described in Section L.8.7.
114	Misc			Is there a dollar limit on the small business orders?	No.
115	Past Performance Information	RFP Attachment 12 Past Performance Information (PPI) B. Brief Description of Effort	*NOTE:	For references included from offeror subcontractors of which the subcontractor performed in a prime capacity, can the company send their CPARS directly to the EC2 CO/CS as long as all requirements are met (e.g., each CPARS page includes the Work Sample (WS) identifier)?	Offerors must submit proposal information in accordance with the proposal submission instructions included in Section L.
116	Ordering Guide	2	1. Introduction	EC2 Ordering Guide Introduction section states the IDIQ is a "contract vehicle with a ten (10)-year ordering period (five (5) year base, with five (5) single year options)." This does not agree with PWS Section 1.4 that states that "the period of performance shall be for five (5) Base Year with one five-year option ." Can the Government confirm which period of performance is correct?	The period of performance shall be for five (5) Base Year with one five-year option. The Ordering Guide will be corrected in the Final RFP.
117	L-M	10	1.8.6.3	Work samples are limited to 2 per Specialty area. Is there a maximum number of Work samples for the entire submission?	Yes. The maximum number of work samples is: 31 Specialty Areas (SA) x 2 Work Samples per SA = 62.
118	PWS	15	15.14.1	Would the contractor be required to maintain and monitor the training records, or will this be digitally monitored by the DWCA? Justification would be needed as a part of the fully burdened rate; will this require a resource for the vendor to monitor or monitor and maintain the training. This could be a way to squeeze in getting Cyber resources training for entry-level.	The Contractor company is required to delivered certified individuals as the time of TO award and IAW the IATO requirements for each FTE within that applicable TO. Moreover, the Contractor company is required to track all Contractor employee training and to maintain the continuous learning requirements for Contractor employees.
119	PWS	15	15.14.3	So only the personnel performing these tasks on the contract technically must have the 8570 certifications? We will have other cyber support analysis support functions that may not be supporting the requirements directly since there is an R&D task that could be a component of this. This supports ups with the ability to staff.	IAM/IAT 8570 compliance is only required as specified in the TO.
120	PWS	15	15.4.3	Will the prime contractor be responsible for DOD 8570 verification of its subcontractors' personnel? Or is this the responsibility for the subcontractor for its own personnel?	Ultimately it is the Prime that is held accountable, but this is dependent on the agreement between the two companies. Subcontractors should be able to provide valid IAT or IAM certification to the Prime and the Government prior to placing Contractor employees on a TA.
121	A Solicitation	108	16 (FAR 15.404-3(e))	Would the Government consider the removal of Subcontractor sealed bid proposals? If no, then would the Government limit the Subcontractor sealed bids to only Subcontractors who are performing at a minimum 20% of the workshare?	Sealed bid proposals are not included in this RFP.

122	PWS	5	2.1.3.1	This section states that the customer service rep "Typically provides initial incident information to the Incident Response (IR) Specialty." Is this the government's preferred approach?	No, it's informational only and based strictly on the NIST/NICE Cyber Framework. The approach will be defined at the TO level.
123	PWS	5	2.1.5.1	Both section 2.1.4.1 and 2.1.5.1 have Firewall Management listed. Is this to allow for certain TOs to have FW management fall to sysadmins if there isn't a network services component to the work or is the expectation that both the system administrators and the network services team jointly manage firewalls?	There is overlap between this and many other Cyber positions defined by the NIST/NICE Cyber Framework. It's informational only, and it does not mean that all KSAs and Tasks listed will be expected by the Government. Specific tasks will be defined at the TO level.
124	MISC	2.2.3 Prog/Proj Management, Admin, Fin. & Acq.	2.2.2.1-2.2.4	Would the contractor be able to propose changes, alternatives, or additions and negotiate Service Level Agreements (SLAs) after the contract is awarded?	The resultant IDIQ contracts will not be awarded subject to changes. The Task Order RFPs will contain their own terms and conditions which may/may not allow negotiation of those terms and conditions. The answer to this question is not at this time.
125	PWS	6	2.2.4	What specific non-negotiable certifications and training are required at time of award?	No IAT or IAM 8570 compliance certifications are required at the IDIQ level, because there is no work defined at that level. 8570 compliance certifications are entirely defined at the TO level.
126	PWS	6	2.3.1.1	Are there any sources which may be used to identify, analyze, and report events that the government would prefer to not use? For example, the use of social media or external vendor publications as a means for threat intel?	Cannot be answered at the IDIQ level, will be defined at the TO level.
127	PWS	7	2.4.4, 2.4.4.1	Could the Government provide additional detail and context around PWS 2.4.4 Targets. The description, per PWS 2.4.4.1, is vague. It is the context of the term "Targets" here with respect to the description. This will assist Offerors in identifying the most appropriate work sample to use in the Self-Scoring Matrix.	The PWS Supplement attachment contains KSAs and Tasks associated with this SA
128	PWS	2.4.5 Language Analysis	2.4.5.1	Section on language analysis requires the contractor to use language and cultural expertise in addition to technical expertise to support information collection, analysis, and cybersecurity activities; could you please clarify what other languages, besides English, the contractor must be fluent in? Please clarify if you're referring to programming languages instead, for collection and analysis.	There is no specific language required at the IDIQ level, this will be determined at the TO level. To satisfy the SA for self scoring purposes, any language other than English performing the associated KSAs and Tasks provided in the PWS Supplement attachment are acceptable.
129	PWS	8	2.6.2.1	Is there any expectation for the work under digital forensics to also "appropriately balance the benefits of prosecution versus intelligence gathering" similar to 2.6.1.1?	The PWS Supplement attachment contains KSAs and Tasks associated with this SA
130	A Solicitation	106	252.215-7009	Do applicants have to submit the Adequacy Checklist?	No. DFARS 252.215-7009 will be removed from the Final RFP.
131	A Solicitation	106	252.215-7009	Is the Proposal Adequacy Checklist required to be submitted with proposal submission at the IDIQ level or will that be required on the Task Order level?	No. The Proposal Adequacy Checklist is not required as part of the submission of the IDIQ Proposal. When a TO solicitation requires the submission of certified cost or pricing data, the Ordering Contracting Officer should include DFARS 252.215-7009, Proposal Adequacy Checklist.
132	A Solicitation	106	252-215-7008	The solicitation does not identify in which volume we should include the Proposal Adequacy checklist referenced in RFP Section 52.215-7009. Is it correct to assume we should include this response in Volume 1 - Contract & Responsibility Documentation and that there is no page limit for this part of our response?	The Proposal Adequacy Checklist is not required in a proposal for the EC2 IDIQ contract. DFARS 252.215-7009 will be deleted in the final RFP.
133	DCAA Pre-award Survey	3	2c	Since price evaluation is not part of the EC2 proposal, should the answer to this question be N/A?	The answer of N/A is the offeror is not subject to CAS or if you have no active proposals being considered. Albeit a inconsistency between the purpose of the DCAA Contractor Accounting System Pre-award Survey and an unpriced RFP, the offeror should answer the question as accurately as possible.
134	Pre-RFP Conference Slide Deck	19	2nd Bullet, 2nd Sub Bullet, "Certified" Accounting System	Please replace the word "Certified" with "Suitable or Adequate" Accounting System. DCAA does not Certify Contractor Accounting Systems.	Noted.
135	Pre-RFP Conference Slide Deck	6	2nd Bullet, Vendor Benefits, Sub Bullet Starting with "Ordering Contracting Officers (OCO) can restrict...."	Reference the sub bullet starting with "Ordering Contracting Officer (OCO) can restrict..."based on results of Market Research. " FAR Subpart 19.502-2(b)(2) states..." <i>there must also be a reasonable expectation of obtaining from small businesses the best scientific and technological sources consistent with the demands of the proposed acquisition for the best mix, cost, performance and schedules.</i> " Please confirm the preceding italicized portion of FAR 19.502-2(b)(2) will be complied with in making total small business set aside determinations at the FOPR level.	Confirmed.
136	Certification Regarding Responsibility Matters.docx	1 2	3, 4, 5 & 6 4	The check boxes in paragraphs on page 1, paragraphs 3, 4, 5 and 6; and page 2, paragraph 4 cannot be checked due to the manner in which the document is formatted. Will the Government provide an updated template or will the Government allow Offerors to modify the template?	Offerors may edit the word document to input their responses.
137	WORK SAMPLE COVER SHEET	3	3, Instructions to Work Sample Cover Sheet	Primary Scope of Work: Enter one or more of the following: Program Management, Operations & Maintenance, Install/Warehouse, SOC-Enterprise Services/Helpdesk. Comment: These entries do not appear to be relevant to the EC2 RFP.	This was an error and will be corrected in the Final RFP.
138	Pre-RFP Conference Slide Deck	4	3rd Bullet	Please confirm that all USAF Military and Civil Service Warranted Contracting Officers at all Air Force Contracting Organizations shall be authorized to issue Fair Opportunity Proposal Requests (FOPRs).	Confirmed.
139	Pre-RFP Conference Slide Deck	13	3rd Bullet	Please confirm Offerors may cross team (e.g., occupy a subcontractor role on an unlimited number of other Prime Contractor Offers).	Confirmed.
140	PWS	4	4 (1.4)	The PWS lists the Period of Performance shall be for Five (5) Base Year with one five-year option. The EC2 Ordering Guide indicates in the Introduction on Page 1 that the Period of Performance will for Five (5) year base with five (5) single year options. Can the Government please clarify the option periods for the Period of Performance?	The period of performance shall be for five (5) Base Year with one five-year option.
141	Offeror Company Information	1	4th line	Will the SAMS Unique Entity ID be added to the form replacing the DUNS #?	The DUNS is no longer used. The UEI is now required. This has been updated.
142	L-M	6 and 8	5, 7.5	Table 1 in L.5 limits the Teaming Agreements response to 30 pages. If full teaming agreements are provided in response to L 7.5 the page limitation could limit teaming options for bidders. Is it the Government's intent that full teaming agreements be provided, and if so, can the page limit be removed?	The solicitation will be revised to remove the requirement for providing the teaming agreement (and Joint Venture agreement). However, the offeror must list the companies/entities that (commitment by agreement or other legal obligation) will be supporting the offeror in the IDIQ (Atch 3).
143	PWS	14	5.10.3	This section states that " <i>The Government reserves the right to utilize off-ramps when it determines a Contractor's performance is less than Satisfactory, the Contractor is unable to provide adequate support or there is a lack of participation</i> ". We would recommend that the government revise the definition of "lack of participation" to what is included in the EC2 Ordering Guide (Off-Boarding, page 15). The existing "Lack of participation" requirement may result in an excessive number of task order submissions by offerors that have neither the ability nor the capacity to perform the work but are merely submitting task order proposals to prevent being ramped-off the contract. Request that "lack of participation" be more narrowly defined in order to meet the intent without secondary consequences.	The criteria for off-ramping will be updated in Ordering Guide and PWS in the Final RFP.
144	PWS	14-Jan	5.10.3	Lack of participation is defined within the PWS as "...failure to bid on more than one order within each ordering period. Page 15 of the ordering guide further clarifies lack of participation as: If a Contractor fails to submit at least one (1) responsive proposal within the first three years of the ordering period, the Government reserves the right to the unilateral Off-Ramp of that Contractor. Please advise which criteria will be used.	The criteria for off-ramping will be updated in Ordering Guide and PWS in the Final RFP.
145	PWS	15	5.14.3.1	Would the Government please revise the link to the working link?	Links will be hardcoded and in PDF format in the final RFP
146	PWS	15	5.14.3.3	How many SMEs with 8140/8570 certifications must be on staff? Is this determined on a Task Order basis?	This will be defined at the task order level if applicable.
147	PWS	10	5.2.1 (Industrial Security)	The PWS makes reference to the DD Form 254. Will this Government provide a draft version of the DD 254? Moreover, can the Gov't confirm that the individual personnel security clearance requirements will be established at the TO level based on the clearance requirements subject to that TO?	No, the Government will not provide a DD254 as an attachment to the IDIQ contract. The PWS will be updated to indicate that DD254 requirements will be addressed in Task Orders.
148	PWS	10	5.2.1 (Industrial Security)	Can the government confirm that Information Safeguarding requirements will be included at the Task Order level and not the ID/IQ level? If so, can the government confirm whether Secret, Top Secret, or both will be required at the Task Order level?	All are applicable only at the TO level.
149	PWS	11	5.6.1	Was Juneteenth intentionally left off as a Federal Holiday?	Juneteenth was inadvertently left off but will be added to the list of Federal Holidays in the Final RFP.
150	PWS	12	5.9.2.1	Will the Prime Contractor be responsible for logistics purchases of equipment (HW, SW, spares, etc)? If so, will the Prime Contractor be required to have a logistics based system established at time of award or up to 60-days post award?	EC2 is a services contract and HW/SW procurements are not envisioned as requirements satisfied by the EC2.
151	PWS	12	5.9.2.2	Will warehouse storage be required of purchased equipment? If so, will the logistics agreements for the required logistics warehouse storage be finalized at the time of contractor proposal submission?	EC2 is a services contract and warehousing is not envisioned as a requirement satisfied by the EC2.
152	PWS	12	5.9.4	This sections states: 5.9.4 Contractor shall be an entity registered in SAM, an individual SAM user account with the Entity Administrator, Entity Registration Representative, or Reporter role for that entity, and one or more contracts awarded to that entity which meet the SCR reporting thresholds. Whereas we assume this section defines a requirement post award, the text implies that Contractors must have contracts meeting the SCR reporting thresholds. Please advise if we are misinterpreting the requirement.	Service contract reporting is not required for the basic contract or agreement IAW DFARS PGI 204.1703(S-70). Reporting will be required at the Task Order level. The PWS will be corrected in the Final RFP.

153	PWS	13	5.9.5.5.1	Is SAM.gov the enduring system of record for all fiscal expenditures for total dollars invoiced throughout execution of the contract?	No. SAM is not used for invoice payments by the DoD.
154	PWS	13	5.9.5.5.2	Will all hours worked by contractors be recorded in the SAM.gov platform?	The Government does not plan on this happening at this time.
155	A Solicitation	90	52.204-8	The solicitation does not identify in which volume we should include our responses to RFP Section K - Representations and Certifications. Is it correct to assume we should include this response in Volume I - Contract & Responsibility Documentation and that there is no page limit for this part of our response?	Section K - Reqs and Certs section added in L.5 Table 1 and L.6.6.4
156	Pre-RFP Conference Slide Deck	28	5th Bullet, Qualifications, 2nd Sub Bullet	The second sub bullet refers to "Performed the work for a minimum of six months (Recency)." Many contracts/task orders are awarded with "effective dates" and period of performance "start dates" that are not identical. In scenarios where an effective date, SF1449, Block 3, is different than the period of performance date as specified in the contract/task order, what would be the starting point in calculating the minimum of six months as specified on slide #28 (e.g., the contract/task order award/effective date or the period of performance start date?).	Period of Performance Start Date would be the starting point in calculating the minimum of six months.
157	PWS	17	8.1.1	Will an overseas contractor liaison (organization) need to be established as part of the scope of the contract?	Only if required at the TO level.
158	L-M	11 of 21	8.7.1.1	This section states "From the thirty-one defined categories/specialty areas, the JV must demonstrate the contributions/experience of the protégé member in a minimum of six of the defined categories/specialty areas. " Question: Will the Government confirm that the protégé providing one of the two Work Samples demonstrating experience in a minimum of six defined specialty areas meets this requirement?	Confirmed. From the thirty-one defined categories/specialty areas, the JV must demonstrate the contributions/experience of the protégé member in a minimum of six of the defined categories/specialty areas (SAs). For the 6 SA, the protégé partner could provide one work sample and the mentor partner could provide another work sample (maximum of two work samples per SA).
159	Past Performance Info Sheet.docx	1	A	In the Past Performance Information (PPI) template (Attachment 12) A. In the General Information section, the third piece of required information is the DUNS Number. On April 4, 2022, the federal government stopped using the DUNS Number to uniquely identify entities. Now, entities doing business with the federal government use the Unique Entity ID created in SAM.gov. Will the Government update the PPI template to change DUNS Number to Unique Entity ID or will the Government allow us to modify the template?	The DUNS is no longer used. The UEI is now required. This form will be updated in the Final RFP.
160	Past Performance Info Sheet		A	This section requests the DUNS. Should this request be for the UEI instead?	The DUNS is no longer used. The UEI is now required. This has been updated.
161	Misc	Attachment 12 (PPI)	A	Is the total contract value (second to last line of the table within Section A) meant to cover the ceiling or the funded value?	Funded Value. This has been updated.
162	Past Performance Information (PPI) D. Primary Customer Points of Contact	1	A. General Information.; Attachment 12	The SAM Unique Entity Identifier (UEI) has not been included on Attachment 12 form "Past Performance Information." Will the Government be updating the form to include the UEI field that became effective on 4 April 2022?	The DUNS is no longer used. The UEI is now required. This form will be updated in the Final RFP.
163	RFI Questions and Answers	15	A71	Please confirm that the same work sample can be used on multiple bids i.e.: once as a Prime from the Offeror and multiple bids as a subcontractor on other Offerors' Prime bids?	IAW M.1.7. Teaming arrangements are not restricted. Offerors submitting a proposal as the Prime Offeror in response to this solicitation are permitted to submit a separate proposal under which they would be a Subcontractor, or team member to another prime. Subcontractors are permitted to support multiple primes.
164	PWS, 2. PWS Supplement - Task Descriptions 7. Self Scoring Matrix	All	All	The self-scoring matrix released on 5/2/22 does not contain instructions to score each Category/Specialty Area based on the Tasks associated with Attachment 2. PWS Supplement - Task Descriptions. Question Are those instructions still applicable to Attachment 7. Self-Scoring Matrix?	This will be corrected in the Final RFP.
165	Self Scoring Matrix	All	All	The Self-Scoring Matrix provides one row for each Specialty Area but also instructs offerors to note the EC2 Specialty Area in Column E. This seems to be redundant and does not provide a means to note the specific PWS or PWS Supplement reference that the offeror is claiming for credit. Question: Will the Government clarify the instructions on how the offeror is to note the specific PWS and/or PWS Supplemental task(s) on Cross Reference Matrix?	Column E has been updated and no longer requests the SA to be input. This question seems to be addressing 2 separate things but answering the question: The Cross-Reference Matrix column E, "Reference..." includes an example nomenclature to be followed to reference a work sample against any specialty area.
166	Past Performance Info Sheet	All	All	Describe the nature and portion (percentage) of the work to be performed on the EC2 effort by the company referenced on this PPI and whether performing as the Prime, subcontractor, or a corporate division related to the prime (define relationship)." Question: How are primes to determine nature percentage of work to be performed on EC2 effort by the company referenced if we have no indication of the type of work that will be issued in task orders?	This section will be removed in the Final RFP. There are no restrictions regarding the number of team members or percentage.
167	Work Sample Cover Sheet	All	All	The fields inserted into this document do not appear to be editable. Does the Government intend to circulate a version of this document with editable fields?	The document is editable and the Government does not intend to publish a new version.
168	Ordering Guide	10	Amplifying Information	The Amplifying Information paragraph references a RFP Attachment 17 - EC2_Labor_Cats. Will the Government provide this document as it will better inform an Offeror's completion of 4. Team Structure and 7. Self-Scoring Matrix? Or is this 2. PWS Supplement – Task Descriptions?	Will be corrected in the Final RFP.
169	Ordering Guide	1	Attachment 14 EC2 Ordering Guide	Recommend the Government include the number in the title of attachments (e.g., Attachment 14 EC2 Ordering Guide) to align with Section J of the RFP List of Documents, Exhibits and Other Attachments.	This will be corrected in the Final RFP.
170	Offeror Company Information	1	Attachment 3 Offeror Company Information	The SAM Unique Entity Identifier (UEI), has not been included on Attachment 12 form "Past Performance Information." Will the Government be updating the form to include the UEI field that became effective on 4 April 2022?	The DUNS is no longer used. The UEI is now required. This form has been updated.
171	Ordering Guide	10	Award Pools	Ordering guide states "Pools will not be established for this contract. It's in the Government's best interest to award the IDIQ's on an unrestricted basis and conduct SB set-asides at the TO-level, to the maximum extent practicable". However SAM and the draft RFP section 2.1 says this acquisition will be a partial small business set aside. Please clarify throughout all RFP documents whether or not this is a partial small business set aside or unrestricted procurement.	The intent of stating "partial small business set-aside" by the Government was to indicate to industry that the rule of 2 will be applied at the task order (TO) level allowing for 100% and/or socio-economic small business set-asides. The attempt by using "partial set-aside" vice "Full and Open" was to emphasize that small business set-asides are allowed and anticipated for many requirements at the TO level. There is not an estimate at this point of how many TOs will be set-aside or a specific "type of work" that will be set-aside. The SB set-aside will be determined on every task order based on results of market research (IAW the ordering guide). All documents within the Final RFP will be corrected.
172	Ordering Guide	10	Award Pools	With the Government opting to have unrestricted competition, can the Government provide what percentage of task orders/dollars are intended to be set-aside for Small Business competition?	The intent of stating "partial small business set-aside" by the Government was to indicate to industry that the rule of 2 will be applied at the task order (TO) level allowing for 100% and/or socio-economic small business set-asides. The attempt by using "partial set-aside" vice "Full and Open" was to emphasize that small business set-asides are allowed and anticipated for many requirements at the TO level. There is not an estimate at this point of how many TOs will be set-aside or a specific "type of work" that will be set-aside. The SB set-aside will be determined on every task order based on results of market research (IAW the ordering guide).
173	Ordering Guide	Page 10	AWARD POOLS	"Pools will not be established for this contract. It's in the Government's best interest to award the IDIQ's on an unrestricted basis and conduct SB set-asides at the TO-level, to the maximum extent practicable." Will the government allow non-small businesses to have visibility into SB set-aside TO's when released?	The Fair Opportunity Proposal Requests will be released to all EC2 IDIQ awardees no matter Large or Small Business. However, each FOPR will identify if it is a small business set-aside or unrestricted.
174	Past Performance Info Sheet	1	B	Section B of PPI requires that the Offeror "include information on FTE count, site locations, and labor categories employed under the referenced PPI." Is the Government expecting the Offeror to provide the labor categories used on the past performance contract or is the Government looking for the Offeror to provide the equivalent EC2 labor categories?	The past performance contract details are requested.
175	Past Performance Info Sheet	1	B	In Section B of the Past Performance Information (PPI) template (Attachment 12), all of the check boxes for Brief Description cannot be checked due to the manner in which the document is formatted. Will the Government provide an updated template or will the Government allow Offerors to modify the template?	The offeror may edit the document to input their responses.
176	Misc	Attachment 12 (PPI)	B	If a PPI is provided as a Subcontractor, how would the requested information at Item B, which requests the percentage of work performed based on the total contract value, be completed?	The offeror may derive the total award from the prime contractor or from SAM or other sources.

177	Past Performance Info Sheet	1	B	<p>Can the government please clarify if CPARS are only required for work performed in the prior three years from the date of RFP (C Section L - M, p. 12, L.9.5.4.) or for "all completed CPARS reports related to the effort " (9. Past Performance Info Sheet, p.1, B)?</p> <p>Referenced context: - C Section L - M, p. 12: "L.9.5.4. Contractor Performance Assessment Reports (CPARS). For each work sample, the Offeror shall provide all CPARS reports that were completed within the last three years, as of the date of this RFP. Offerors shall clearly mark each evaluation report with the associated work sample identifier (i.e. WS1-WS62)." - 9. Past Performance Info Sheet, p.1, B: "If Prime is checked above, offerors must submit all completed CPARS reports related to the effort listed above, to include interim and final reports."</p>	CPARS are only required for work performed in the prior three years from the date of RFP. Contractor Performance Assessment Reports (CPARS). For each work sample, the Offeror shall provide the most recent CPARS completed within the last three years, as of the date of this RFP's issuance. The PPI sheet will be updated in the Final RFP.
178	Past Performance Info Sheet.docx	1	B.	Will the Government please clarify the difference between a Subcontractor and a Teaming Partner in this form?	The government refers to FAR 9.6, 13 CFR 125.8, 13 CFR 125.9. The offeror may have a legal agreement (teaming partnership) with another company. A subcontractor or other company may not necessarily have an agreement with the offeror. Through this solicitation, the government does not dictate the arrangements between companies. But where the offeror is relying on a company's past experience, work sample, then government requires that the offeror cite the company in Atch 3, noting a commitment to serve on the IDIQ.
179	A Solicitation	1	Block 9	The SF 33 includes a proposal due date of noon on 5 Oct 2020.	This will be corrected/updated upon final RFP release.
180	A Solicitation	1 of 111	Block 9	<p>The draft SF33 indicates proposals will be due on 5 October 2022.</p> <p>Will the Government confirm this is the expected proposal due date or confirm an anticipated final RFP release in 3QTR Calendar Year?</p> <p>What is the expected number of calendar days between the release of the final solicitation and the proposal due date?</p>	This will be corrected/updated upon final RFP release. Approximately 45 days subject to change.
181	Past Performance Info Sheet	1	C	<p>Section C states "Describe the nature and portion (percentage) of the work to be performed on the EC2 effort by the company referenced on this PPI and whether performing as the Prime, subcontractor, or a corporate division related to the prime (define relationship)."</p> <p>How are offerors to determine work percentages to be performed on EC2 when no Task Orders have been issued?</p> <p>Recommend rewording this requirement to: "Describe the relevancy of the work and percentage of work to be performed as it relates to the seven (7) Specialty Areas for EC2.</p>	This will be updated in the Final RFP. It's the offerors responsibility to derive the percentage of work performed.
182	Past Performance Information (PPI)	2	C.	Section C of the PPI form requires us to submit "the nature and portion (percentage) of the work to be performed on the EC2 effort by the company referenced on this PPI and whether performing as the Prime, subcontractor, or a corporate division related to the prime (define relationship)". However, as Offerors are submitting for an award on the MA-IDIQ contract without any pricing or Task Orders associated with the submission, it will be difficult to provide a meaningful answer for what Percentage of work the company will perform on EC2. Request that the Government refine the PPI form to be focused only on the Past Performance Information and exclude questions regarding future work to be performed on EC2 Task Orders.	This section will be removed in the Final RFP.
183	A Solicitation	22	Clauses	The government has indicated this is a Partial Small Business Set-Aside under FAR 19.5 in SAM and in the draft RFP. We recommend updating the Clause to 52.219-7 Notice of Partial Small Business Set-Aside. Clarify if RFP is a Partial Set-Aside to 19.502-4 Partial set-asides of multiple-award contracts, or 19.502-5 Insufficient reasons for not setting aside an acquisition.	The intent of stating "partial small business set-aside" by the Government was to indicate to industry that the rule of 2 will be applied at the task order (TO) level allowing for 100% and/or socio-economic small business set-asides. The attempt by using "partial set-aside" vice "Full and Open" was to emphasize that small business set-asides are allowed and anticipated for many requirements at the TO level. There is not an estimate at this point of how many TOs will be set-aside or a specific "type of work" that will be set-aside. The SB set-aside will be determined on every task order based on results of market research (IAW the ordering guide). FAR 52.219-7 will be included and FAR 19.502-4 drives the partial set-aside being established."
184	A Solicitation	22	Clauses	252.219-7004 is not applicable as this type of Subcontracting Plan is limited to a restricted pool of Prime Contractors. Recommend removal or change to 252.219-7003 Small Business Subcontracting Plan (DoD Contracts).	Clauses will be corrected in the Final RFP.
185	Cross Reference Matrix	1	Column 4	Please clarify whether contract documentation referenced on the Cross Reference Matrix must correlate with the Past Performance examples provided (with a past performance info sheet) or if these can each entail different past performance examples.	Offerors shall only submit Past Performance Submissions that match Work Samples submitted as part of their Past Experience proposal. Offerors shall not submit new contract references for the Past Performance Submission.
186	Team Structure	1	Column C	Would the Government also like the Security Management Office (SMO) code for each teaming partner along with their CAGE code?	This is not required.
187	Team Structure	1	Column D	Since the Government replaced the DUNS number with the Unique Entity Identifier (UEI) in April, please consider changing the label for Column D from "DUNS" to something like "DUNS or UEI".	The DUNS is no longer used. The UEI is now required. This form will be updated in the Final RFP.
188	Team Structure	1	Column E	Please clarify what the Government expects offerors to enter in Column E - "Relationship to Prime". For example, are you expecting a word -- such as "Partner", "Subcontractor", or "Protégé" -- or something else?	Correct. What is the relationship to the prime contractor in relation to the proposal submitted?
189	Team Structure	1	Column F	Please clarify what the Government expects offerors to enter in Column F - "EC2 Category or Specialty Area". Based on the instructions for other parts of the submission, we suspect you might want a list of all specialty areas (SAs) in which we expect each team member to perform. However, since the column label is singular ("category or specialty area"), we are not certain. Also, would just the 3-digit PWS number for each SA be sufficient (e.g., "2.1.5") or would you prefer the whole name (e.g., "2.1.5 Systems Administration")?	PWS Category or SA alignment. Prefer the full description vs just the number, makes it easier for the Government reviewer.
190	Team Structure	1	Column G	Column G seems to indicate the offeror must provide verification of prime contract for team members. DCS understood this requirement was to be deleted. Is it included as advisory information or has this requirement been reinstated?	This column has been deleted.
191	Team Structure	1	Column G	Please clarify what the Government expects offerors to enter in Column G - "Verification of Prime Status (i.e. prime contract references for Team Member). For example, is the government expecting the partner to have past prime contracts? Do you expect a Yes/No answer? Are we to attach supporting documentation?	This column has been deleted.
192	Cross-Reference Matrix	"Cross Reference Matrix" tab	Columns D and E	<p>In many cases an Offeror will have two (2) work samples for each Specialty Area in order to maximize overall scoring. Can the Government clarify/confirm that the want both work samples entered into a given cell? We point this out as it may be confusing to the Government to see it in this manner.</p> <p>As an example, in Cell D5, per Specialty Area 2.1.1, if an Offeror has two work samples, then they would put both "Document Types" into cell D5, and similarly provide two items in cell E5 for the "Reference".</p> <p>A solution to consider would be for the Government to modify the worksheet on tab "Cross Reference Matrix" to provide 2 separate cells for each Specialty Areas for columns D and E (i.e., split cell D5 and E5 in the example provided). This may make it easier int eh Government's evaluation.</p>	This cross reference matrix will be updated to provide 1 cell for each work sample reference in the Final RFP.
193	Ordering Guide	6	Contract Type	Can the government please amend this section to include Time and Materials (T&M) contract type on EC2. Reference Text: "The awarded TOs are predominantly Firm Fixed Price (FFP) due to the type of work required; however there may be requirements that result in Cost Plus Fixed Fee (CPFF) or Firm Fixed Price Level-of-Effort (FFP LOE) TOs."	This will be corrected in the Final RFP.
194	Ordering Guide	18	Contractor's FOPR Package Requirements	The EC2 Ordering Guide states "contractors may be required to submit past performance information in response to a FOPR, if the CO has determined that past performance data will be evaluated." Can the government confirm that past performance references can be different from the references submitted in response to the EC2 IDIQ?	The instructions to offerors, evaluation factors, criteria, procedures for task order Fair Opportunity Proposal Requests (FOPRs) will be identified at the task order level. The Government does not have any information about future requirements at this time.
195	Past Performance Info Sheet	1	D	D. Primary Customer Points of Contact. For Government contracts, provide current information on Program Manager, Contracting Officer and Administrative Contracting Officer. Comment: Recommend replacing "Program Manager" with "Contracting Officer's Representative" as the primary customer POC or allowing Offerors to provide a COR if there is no PM.	COR will be added to this list of primary POCs in the Final RFP..
196	A Solicitation	106	DFAR 252.215-7009	Proposal Adequacy Checklist: Are any aspects of the Proposal Adequacy checklist due with the IDIQ proposal submission or will this be deferred to proposals in response to FOPRs?	No. The Proposal Adequacy Checklist is not required as part of the submission of the IDIQ Proposal. When a TO solicitation requires the submission of certified cost or pricing data, the Ordering Contracting Officer should include DFARS 252.215-7009, Proposal Adequacy Checklist and require this in the Fair Opportunity Proposal Request.
197	A Solicitation	23	DFAR 252.219-7004	When, during the term of the Program, will a Small Business Subcontracting Plan be required from Large Business Prime Contractors? Since there is no pricing as part of the proposal, our assumption is that the Plan will be deferred to the Task Order level. Please advise if that is a correct assumption. If a Small Business Subcontracting Plan is required, will the Government provide the goals to be used in the development of the Plan?	Large Business Prime Contractors will submit a Small Business Subcontracting Plan as part of the EC2 IDIQ proposal. Subcontracting Goals will be provided in the Final RFP IAW FAR 19.705-2 (e) A contract <u>may not have</u> more than one subcontracting plan. However, an Ordering Contracting Officer may establish separate subcontracting goals for each order under an IDIQ contract

198	A Solicitation	78	DFAR 252.227-7018	Please confirm that all data rights assertions are not expected in response to the IDIQ solicitation and will only be required in response to FOPRs under the EC2 program.	Confirmed.
199	Cross reference Matrix		Document Type	Can LCATS, Monthly Status Reports, PMRs, Meeting Minutes or other deliverable be submitted to substantiate the relevance of the work performed? Many contracts do not provide the details to accurately describe the full scope of work performed.	Section L.8.6.2 will be revised to provide further clarification of work sample submissions. The work samples shall consist of only official contract documentation. "Official contract documentation" includes key documents integral to contract performance, including contracts, orders, modifications, PWS/SOW/SOO, CDRLs, subcontracting plans, invoices, meeting minutes, progress reports, monthly status reports, or other reports. The contractor may submit other documentation it regards to be integral to the contract (i.e., CPARS, FPDS, memos from COs/government official/prime contractor), but offerors are cautioned that the documentation is validated for past experience (not past performance) and that authenticity (contract-contemporaneous documents) and level of detail are critical considerations of any work sample. The Government cautions offerors to ensure detailed information (through the work sample and attachments (Atch 6). Do not presume that the government will necessarily extrapolate details that are not clearly presented. Submission of relevant excerpts (vice submitting an entire document) is recommended. In Atch 6 and the work sample, spelling out critical acronyms, providing "lay person" explanations, and marking/highlighting (or otherwise distinguishing) key excerpts may also ensure that the Government may consider the work sample and its nexus to the SAs under the IDIQ. The markings/highlighting should be evident that the marking/highlighting were newly-added by the offeror and not part of the original document.
200	Work Sample Cover Sheet	1	End of Part 1	Can the government please clarify if "Percentage of SOC-E Program Areas Covered Under Work Sample" should read "Percentage of EC2 Specialty Areas Covered Under Work Sample"?	This was an error and will be corrected in the Final RFP.
201	Work Sample Cover Sheet	3	End of Part 1	Can the government please clarify if "Primary Scope of Work: Enter one or more of the following: Program Management, Operations & Maintenance, Install/Warehouse, SOC-Enterprise Services/Helpdesk" should read "Primary Scope of Work: Enter one or more of the following: Operations & Maintenance, Management and Policy, Protect and Defend, Analyze. Collect and Operate, Investigate, and Securely Provision"?	This was an error and will be corrected in the Final RFP.
202	Ordering Guide	21	Exhibit A	Exhibit A (TASK ORDER AWARD PROCESS) makes reference to the IAC MAC contract, which is a R&D vehicle. Please confirm whether this process will be replaced to reflect the TO Award Process for the EC2 vehicle?	The ordering guide will be corrected to refer to EC2 IDIQ.
203	Ordering Guide	13	Fair Opportunity Ordering Procedures	Can the government provide additional information on whether certain IDIQ PWS areas are contemplated as small business set asides? Will the government release a Long Range Acquisition Forecast for the EC2 IDIQ?	The Government does not have any information to release about future requirements at this time.
204	Ordering Guide	13	Fair Opportunity Ordering Procedures	Can the government provide additional information on the Small Business requirements for EC2 task orders that are competed on an Unrestricted basis (i.e. those task orders that are not expressly small business set-asides)?	The Government does not have any information to release about future requirements at this time.
205	Ordering Guide	12	Fair Opportunity Ordering Procedures	Will the Government issue RFIs to EC2 contract holders to support their market research and set-aside determinations?	Yes.
206	Ordering Guide	12 of 22	Fair Opportunity Ordering Procedures (FOPR)	This section states, "The Government will perform market research and shall set aside the requirement for SB if the contracting officer determines there is a reasonable expectation of obtaining offers from two or more responsible small business concerns that are competitive in terms of fair market prices, quality, and delivery IAW FAR 19.502-2, 19.504(a) & 19.504(c)(1)(ii)." Given the large number of task orders expected on EC2 and the recent elimination of large and small business pools, can the Government consider requiring greater than 2 small business offers be required to determine small business set aside? Or, will the Government consider utilizing technical task order (TTO) RFI responses that require ONLY small business primes validate ability to support the capability areas associated with the anticipated task order?	The small business set-aside requirements are established by law in the Small Business Procurement Act as implemented at FAR Part 19, and it's supplements. Q2. The Government will perform market research and utilize RFIs as able to determine SB set-aside preferences.
207	A Solicitation	108	FAR 15.408	Would the Government consider providing an plug number for other direct costs and travel?	These costs will be addressed and specified within each Task Order.
208	Ordering Guide	12	FOPR	Please clarify its intent regarding small business set aside opportunities and the phrase " <i>conduct SB set-asides at the TO-level, to the maximum extent practicable</i> ". Does the Government prefer to make awards to small businesses rather than large businesses when sufficient small business competition exists following the rule of two as much as possible? We recommend that the Government address criteria beyond technical capability (e.g. scale, experience, complexity, etc.) that are often times the true delineation between large and small businesses.	The small business set-aside requirements are established by law in the Small Business Procurement Act as implemented at FAR Part 19, and its supplements.
209	Ordering Guide	12	FOPR	Is competition for the IDIQ contract unrestricted?	The intent of stating "partial small business set-aside" by the Government was to indicate to industry that the rule of 2 will be applied at the task order (TO) level allowing for 100% and/or socio-economic small business set-asides. The attempt by using "partial set-aside" vice "Full and Open" was to emphasis that small business set-asides are allowed and anticipated for many requirements at the TO level. There is not an estimate at this point of how many TOs will be set-aside or a specific "type of work" that will be set-aside. The SB set-aside will be determined on every task order based on results of market research (IAW the ordering guide).
210	Ordering Guide	13	FOPR Content, New or Existing Requirement, Contract Type	Can the government please amend this section to include Time and Materials (T&M) contract type on EC2?	This will be updated for the Final RFP.
211	L-M	General	General	Classified Work Samples. Due to the nature of the EC2 work, we strongly suggest the Government put in place a simple mechanism to provide "substantiation" for how classified contracts/work samples address the various evaluation criteria (assumes the Government wants to keep EC2 proposals at the "Unclassified" level). Recommendation: Suggest using a form similar to what AFLCMC used for EPASS 2 – copy of "sample" form is attached to the comments submittal email. This form provided PCO/COR sign-off that the Offeror performed the stated Evaluation Criterion tasks without getting into specific PWS details. We believe a tailored form like this will work nicely for classified EC2 contracts/work samples.	Thank you but the model created for EC2 has been proven a optimal approach for offerors to submit proposals and for the technical evaluation team to efficiently complete technical evaluations.
212	L-M	General	General	Past Performance. The Past Performance evaluation, in addition to the HTRO scoresheet validation, will require a significant amount of work by Government evaluators. We highly recommend the Factor 1 (Past Experience) section be expanded to include CPAR scoring, similar to what was done on AFLCMC EPASS 2 and AFTC TMAS 2, to replace the Subfactor 2 Past Performance evaluation as currently specified. This will significantly reduce evaluation team work load, allowing faster time to award.	Thank you for your suggestion. The evaluation factors and procedures will remain unchanged in the Final RFP.
213	A Solicitation	83-84	I - 252.234-7001, 252.234-7002	The referenced clause contains price-based conditions that are not applicable to EC2 at the contract level since there is no requirement for Offerors to propose a price. Would the Government confirm that this clause is only applicable at the task order level?	Confirmed.
214	L-M	2	I.2.2	The Contracting Officer listed in this section is different from the one listed on Attachment 13 "Past Performance Questionnaire". Question: Which CO is to receive Attachment 13?	This discrepancy will be corrected in the Final RFP. Additionally, please submit proposals IAW RFP Section L.3.
215	Work Sample Cover Sheet	2	III	The Project Description field is limited to 500 characters. Will the Government consider increasing this limit?	The Government has considered this and is confident 500 characters is enough to describe an individual work sample.
216	Pre-RFP Conference - EC2	Slide 22	Image	The image on Slide 22, per Attachment 8 Cross Reference Matrix, in the "#" column (which appears to be used for the "Work Sample Identifier" - but this is not specified in instructions for Attachment 8), uses the coding "WS1A" and "WS1B", whereas the Draft RFP, file "C Section L - M", in the instructions for the Cross Reference Matrix, Section L.8.5 (page 10 of 21), appears to specify that the Work Sample Identifiers must use the coding "WS1 - WS62", which is consistently used through this document. Can the Government please clarify the required coding schema for this "#" column.	This will be corrected in the Final RFP.
217	Work Sample Cover Sheet	3	Instructions for Part 1	Please note that the Part 1 instructions for "Work Sample Identifier" specify that the range of allowable values is "WS1 - WS15". It is our understanding that this is incorrect and the correct range is "WS1 - WS62" (per file Draft RFP: C Section L-M, pg 10 of 21, Section L.8.5). This is per 31 Specialty Areas and up to 2 work samples allowed for both for a total of 62 possible.	Correct. This document will be updated in the Final RFP

218	Work Sample Cover Sheet	3	Instructions for Part 1	Per the instructions for "Percentage of SOC-E Program Areas Covered Under Work Sample", and assuming "SOC-E" means "EC2", can the Government clarify what "Program Areas" are referring to and how this is calculated? We believe this may refer to the 31 Specialty Areas. An example may be that if a Work Sample covers 20 of the 31 Specialty Areas, then the Offeror should use the calculation 20/31, thus 65% would be the appropriate value for the table in Part 1.	This area will be corrected/updated in the Final RFP.
219	Work Sample Cover Sheet	3	Instructions to Attachment	The instructions on page 3 of Attachment 6. Work Sample Cover Sheet do not align to the EC2 solicitation. The Work Sample Identifier states, "Works samples shall be numbered WS1-WS15." Please update this instruction to reflect not-to-exceed 62 work samples (i.e, WS1-WS62). The Primary Scope of Work also needs to be updated to reflect the work scope of EC2 PWS (e.g., Operate and Maintain (O&M), 2.2 Management and Policy, etc.).	This was an error and will be corrected in the Final RFP.
220	Ordering Guide	5	Introduction	The Ordering Guide states the period of performance shall be a ten (10)-year ordering period (five (5) year base, with five (5) single year options) and the PWS states the period of performance shall be for five (5) Base Year with one-five year option . Can the Government please clarify?	The IDIQs will be awarded with a 5-year base AND one, 5- year option period.
221	Ordering Guide	5	Introduction	Please clarify whether the contract will have a five-year base period and one five-year option period, or a five-year base and five one-year option periods. The first bullet in this Ordering Guide section says the vehicle has "a ten (10)-year ordering period (five (5) year base, with five (5) single year options)", which is not aligned with the rest of the solicitation's POP of a five-year base and a single five-year option.	The IDIQs will be awarded with a 5-year base AND one, 5- year option period.
222	L-M	1	L.1	L.1 states the Government intends to award to all offerors who provide a technically acceptable proposal. This statement contradicts M.1.2 which states awards will be made to Highly Qualified offerors. We recommend the government change this to align to L.1 (technically acceptable offerors).	Sections L and M in the Final RFP will be updated to indicate consistent language as follows: Basis for Award. This is a best value source selection conducted in accordance with Federal Acquisition Regulation (FAR) 15.3 and DoD Source Selection Procedures, as supplemented. The Government intends to make an award to each and all qualifying offerors. To be considered a "qualifying offeror", the offeror must fully meet or exceed the delineated requirements of the solicitation, with the Government determining: (1) the Offeror is responsible in accordance with FAR 9.104-1; (2) the Offeror's proposal is technically acceptable (90% or higher score in Factor 1, Past Experience, para M.4.3), receives a "Substantial Confidence" rating in Factor 2, Past Performance (para M.5,3,4,1), and conforms to all other solicitation requirements; and (3) the Contracting Officer has no reason to believe the Offeror would be likely to offer other than fair and reasonable pricing. Price is not, however, an evaluated factor in this solicitation.
223	L-M	1	L.1 L.1.3 M.1.2	Section L.1 states the Government intends to make an award to all technically acceptable proposals. However, L.1.3 states that the Government will select the highest technically rated Offerors while M.1.2 states an award will be made to each and all qualifying offerors that submit a technically acceptable proposal. Please clarify the Basis for Award.	Sections L and M in the Final RFP will be updated to indicate consistent language as follows: Basis for Award. This is a best value source selection conducted in accordance with Federal Acquisition Regulation (FAR) 15.3 and DoD Source Selection Procedures, as supplemented. The Government intends to make an award to each and all qualifying offerors. To be considered a "qualifying offeror", the offeror must fully meet or exceed the delineated requirements of the solicitation, with the Government determining: (1) the Offeror is responsible in accordance with FAR 9.104-1; (2) the Offeror's proposal is technically acceptable (90% or higher score in Factor 1, Past Experience, para M.4.3), receives a "Substantial Confidence" rating in Factor 2, Past Performance (para M.5,3,4,1), and conforms to all other solicitation requirements; and (3) the Contracting Officer has no reason to believe the Offeror would be likely to offer other than fair and reasonable pricing. Price is not, however, an evaluated factor in this solicitation.
224	L-M	1	L.1, L.1.3, M.1.2, M.6.2	Will the Government clarify whether award based on technically acceptable (Paragraph L.1, M.1.2) or highest rated offerors (Paragraph L.1.3)? Does that mean if offeror scores 90% or greater, it does or does not receive an award?	Sections L and M in the Final RFP will be updated to indicate consistent language as follows: Basis for Award. This is a best value source selection conducted in accordance with Federal Acquisition Regulation (FAR) 15.3 and DoD Source Selection Procedures, as supplemented. The Government intends to make an award to each and all qualifying offerors. To be considered a "qualifying offeror", the offeror must fully meet or exceed the delineated requirements of the solicitation, with the Government determining: (1) the Offeror is responsible in accordance with FAR 9.104-1; (2) the Offeror's proposal is technically acceptable (90% or higher score in Factor 1, Past Experience, para M.4.3), receives a "Substantial Confidence" rating in Factor 2, Past Performance (para M.5,3,4,1), and conforms to all other solicitation requirements; and (3) the Contracting Officer has no reason to believe the Offeror would be likely to offer other than fair and reasonable pricing. Price is not, however, an evaluated factor in this solicitation.
225	L-M	1, 2, 13	L.1, L.1.3and M.1.2	Section L.1 states that awards will be provided to all qualifying offerors who submit a technically acceptable response. However later in Section L and in Section M.1.2, there is reference to Highly Rated Technical Offers. If all technically acceptable offers will receive awards, what benefits are given to the Highly Rated offers?	Sections L and M in the Final RFP will be updated to indicate consistent language as follows: Basis for Award. This is a best value source selection conducted in accordance with Federal Acquisition Regulation (FAR) 15.3 and DoD Source Selection Procedures, as supplemented. The Government intends to make an award to each and all qualifying offerors. To be considered a "qualifying offeror", the offeror must fully meet or exceed the delineated requirements of the solicitation, with the Government determining: (1) the Offeror is responsible in accordance with FAR 9.104-1; (2) the Offeror's proposal is technically acceptable (90% or higher score in Factor 1, Past Experience, para M.4.3), receives a "Substantial Confidence" rating in Factor 2, Past Performance (para M.5,3,4,1), and conforms to all other solicitation requirements; and (3) the Contracting Officer has no reason to believe the Offeror would be likely to offer other than fair and reasonable pricing. Price is not, however, an evaluated factor in this solicitation.
226	L-M	1	L.1.1	Please provide a list of SETA contractors	SETA contractors will not be utilized. This will be deleted from Section L in the Final RFP.
227	L-M	1	L.1.1	Would the Government please provide the Companies point of contact in order for offerors to put an NDA in place?	SETA contractors will not be utilized. This will be deleted from Section L in the Final RFP.
228	L-M	1	L.1.2	We recommend removing the sentence, "The following evaluation factors will be used to evaluate each proposal:" and the proposal structure overview that follows the statement. The information that follows is not a list of the evaluation factors provided in Section M. Eliminating redundant instructions reduces the probability of inconsistent or contradictory instructions.	This section is an introduction to the evaluation factors in the Special Notices section of L. It's not redundant or inconsistent. This section remains unchanged.
229	L-M	1 of 22	L.1.2	The word "additional" on the third line should be changed to read "addition."	This will be changed in the Final RFP.
230	L-M	1 of 21	L.1.2	The Government is indicating (via the lists) a requirement to include the Subcontractor/Teaming Member Consent Letter under both Volume II & Volume IV. Does the Government intend for these to be included in both volumes?	No. This has been corrected. Subcontractor/Teaming Member Consent Letters are only required in Volume II.
231	L-M	1-2, 5-6, 8-9	L.1.2, L.5, L.7.7	Section L.1.5 indicates that the Subcontractor/Teaming Member Consent Letters are to be included in Volume II and Volume IV. However, Section L.5 and L.7.7 requires the letters to be placed in Volume II. Would the Government please confirm in which volume(s) these letters should be placed?	No. This has been corrected. Subcontractor/Teaming Member Consent Letters are only required in Volume II.
232	L-M	1	L.1.2.1	Volume I: The edits made here (deleting 'Insurance certificate' and changing 'Responsibility Matters' to 'Responsibility Information') to not align with the Section L.6.6 and L.6.7 headings on Page 7. Please clarify whether the Insurance certificate requirements belong within the Responsibility Matters/Responsibility Information response, or should be deleted.	This provision will be deleted. The government may require evidence of compliance (FAR clause 52.228-5, Insurance – Work on Government Installations in task order evaluations and contract administration.

233	L-M	1, 5, and 6	L.1.2.1, L.5, and L.6.6	Please confirm that an insurance certificate is not required. Rationale: Clarification. In Section L.6.6 reference is made to a requirement to submit an insurance certificate. However, the lists of documents for Volume I, L.1.2.1, does not include the insurance certificate and there no page limit for the insurance certificate in L.5.	This provision will be deleted. The government may require evidence of compliance (FAR clause 52.228-5, Insurance – Work on Government Installations in task order evaluations and contract administration.
234	L-M	1, 7, 15, 16	L.1.2.1, L.6.6, M.2.3, M.2.6	On page 1, the requirement for an Insurance Certificate was deleted. However, elsewhere in Sections L and M there are several references to a required Insurance Certificate. Would the Government please clarify whether or not offerors are required to include an Insurance Certificate in their proposals?	This provision will be deleted. The government may require evidence of compliance (FAR clause 52.228-5, Insurance – Work on Government Installations in task order evaluations and contract administration.
235	L-M	1	L.1.2.2	Does the Government require the entire TA, defined workshare or just a confirmation that the TA has been executed?	Please provide the full teaming agreement. The page limitations have changed to no page limitation.
236	L-M	1, 2, & 5	L.1.2.2, L.1.2.4, L.5 Table 1	Subcontractor Teaming Member Consent Letter is listed as a requirement for L.1.2.2 Volume II Executive Summary and L.1.2.4 Volume IV Past Performance. However, it is only listed as a requirement for Volume II in L.5. Table 1 - Proposal Organization. Should the Subcontractor Teaming Member Consent Letter be included in both Volumes II and IV or just Volume II?	Volume II only.
237	L-M	2	L.1.2.4	Is this duplicative of the requirement at L.1.2.2 within Volume II?	This will be corrected in the Final RFP. The Subcontractor/Teaming Member Consent Letter is required in Volume II only.
238	L-M	2	L.1.2.4 L.9.5	Section L.1.2.4 states that the past performance submissions will be evaluated based on the Subcontractor/Teaming Member Consent Letter, which is included in Volume II - Executive Summary. The instructions in L.9.5 do not require inclusion of a copy of the Subcontractor/Teaming Member Consent Letter. Does the government want us to include a copy of this letter in Volume IV - Past Performance?	This will be corrected in the Final RFP. The Subcontractor/Teaming Member Consent Letter is required in Volume II only.
239	L-M	pg. 2 of 22; pg. 12 of 22	L.1.2.4 Volume IV - Past Performance L.9.5.1 Past Performance Submissions	In L.1.2.4, the Volume IV - Past Performance contents includes the Past Performance Questionnaire (PPQ). 1. Can the Government please confirm that the PPQs are sent by the Past Performance Contracting Officials to the EC2 Contract Manager and Contract Officer and not included in the Offeror's proposal? 2. Is it the Government's intent to list the Past Performance references in Volume IV? 3. To be consistent with L.9.5.1, should Volume IV include the contract's CPARS or PPQ (when CPARS are available)?	1. IAW L.9.5.3. Confirmed. 2. Yes. 3. Yes.
240	L-M	2	L.1.3	The Government states that it intends to award to the Highest Technically Rated Offeror (HTRO), but Section M states that Factor 1 is Past Performance Experience and Factor 2 is Past Performance. Work Sample submissions are used to assess recency, relevancy, and confidence assessment. Offerors must also self-score its past performance (and the Govt may down score the Offeror if it feels the Offeror overstated its PP). Thus, as the evaluation is based heavily on the Offeror's Past Performance (per point matrix), how does the Government intend to rationalize an award on a Technical basis?	Sections L and M in the Final RFP will be updated to indicate consistent language as follows: Basis for Award. This is a best value source selection conducted in accordance with Federal Acquisition Regulation (FAR) 15.3 and DoD Source Selection Procedures, as supplemented. The Government intends to make an award to each and all qualifying offerors. To be considered a "qualifying offeror", the offeror must fully meet or exceed the delineated requirements of the solicitation, with the Government determining: (1) the Offeror is responsible in accordance with FAR 9.104-1; (2) the Offeror's proposal is technically acceptable (90% or higher score in Factor 1, Past Experience, para M.4.3), receives a "Substantial Confidence" rating in Factor 2, Past Performance (para M.5.3.4.1), and conforms to all other solicitation requirements; and (3) the Contracting Officer has no reason to believe the Offeror would be likely to offer other than fair and reasonable pricing. Price is not, however, an evaluated factor in this solicitation.
241	L-M	2	L.2	The second sentence in this paragraph: Partial set-asides of multiple award contracts, where a portion of the requirement will be set-aside for Small Business and a portion of the requirement may be set-aside for other socio-economic small business set-asides in accordance with agency procedures and the EC2 Ordering Guide." appears to be in conflict with Page 10 of the EC2 Ordering Guide which states that pools will not be established for this contract. It's in the Government's best interest to award the IDIQ's on an unrestricted basis and conduct SB set-asides at the TO-level, to the maximum extent practicable." Please advise which is correct.	The intent of stating "partial small business set-aside" by the Government was to indicate to industry that the rule of 2 will be applied at the task order (TO) level allowing for 100% and/or socio-economic small business set-asides. The attempt by using "partial set-aside" vice "Full and Open" was to emphasis that small business set-asides are allowed and anticipated for many requirements at the TO level. There is not an estimate at this point of how many TOs will be set-aside or a specific "type of work" that will be set-aside. The SB set-aside will be determined on every task order based on results of market research (IAW the ordering guide).
242	L-M	2	L.2.1	The SAM posting is listing this acquisition as a partial small business set aside. Also in section L paragraph 2.1, this acquisition is also listed as a partial small business set aside. However the draft RFP section L and M do not specify which portion of the scope are small business set aside and which parts are unrestricted, nor the difference in proposal requirements between small businesses and large businesses. According to FAR 19.5 for Partial set-asides of multiple-award contracts, which states that when the contracting officer determines that a requirement is to be partially set aside, the solicitation shall identify which portion or portions are set aside and not set aside. Per the Mar 2022 Q&A, the Gov't indicated that they were changing this procurement from small business set aside to unrestricted, yet this guidance is not listed in the draft RFP documents. Please clarify if this acquisition will be partial small business set aside or unrestricted. If partial small business set aside, please specific what small businesses are to bid versus large businesses.	The intent of stating "partial small business set-aside" by the Government was to indicate to industry that the rule of 2 will be applied at the task order (TO) level allowing for 100% and/or socio-economic small business set-asides. The attempt by using "partial set-aside" vice "Full and Open" was to emphasis that small business set-asides are allowed and anticipated for many requirements at the TO level. There is not an estimate at this point of how many TOs will be set-aside or a specific "type of work" that will be set-aside. The SB set-aside will be determined on every task order based on results of market research (IAW the ordering guide).
243	L-M	2	L.2.1	Section L.2.1 states "This requirement is solicited as a partial set-aside, under NAICS 541330 Engineering Services, Except Military and Aerospace Equipment and Military Weapons in accordance with FAR 19.502-4 Partial set-asides of multiple award contracts, where a portion of the requirement will be set-aside for Small Business and a portion of the requirement may be set-aside for other socio-economic small business set-asides in accordance with agency procedures and the EC2 Ordering Guide." +E38 Given this draft solicitation is categorized as a partial small business set aside, does the Government see all Task Orders starting out as Small Business awards? Will the Government provide a rough estimate of full and open TOs on this IDIQ?	The intent of stating "partial small business set-aside" by the Government was to indicate to industry that the rule of 2 will be applied at the task order (TO) level allowing for 100% and/or socio-economic small business set-asides. The attempt by using "partial set-aside" vice "Full and Open" was to emphasis that small business set-asides are allowed and anticipated for many requirements at the TO level. There is not an estimate at this point of how many TOs will be set-aside or a specific "type of work" that will be set-aside. The SB set-aside will be determined on every task order based on results of market research (IAW the ordering guide). The Government is unable to provide a rough estimate of full and open TOs on this IDIQ at this time.
244	L-M	2	L.2.1	Can the government provide an estimate on the percentage of value or task orders that will be set aside for small business and other socioeconomic small business set asides?	The intent of stating "partial small business set-aside" by the Government was to indicate to industry that the rule of 2 will be applied at the task order (TO) level allowing for 100% and/or socio-economic small business set-asides. The attempt by using "partial set-aside" vice "Full and Open" was to emphasis that small business set-asides are allowed and anticipated for many requirements at the TO level. There is not an estimate at this point of how many TOs will be set-aside or a specific "type of work" that will be set-aside. The SB set-aside will be determined on every task order based on results of market research (IAW the ordering guide).
245	L-M	2	L.2.1	What criteria will be used to determine when task orders will be released as a set-aside?	The SB set-aside will be determined on every task order (by applying the rule of 2) based on results of market research (IAW the ordering guide).
246	L-M	2 of 21	L.2.1	Can the Government confirm that it intends to issue future Task Orders under the EC2 IDIQ that are Small Business set-asides for the following categories 8(a), HUBZone, service-disabled veteran-owned, economically disadvantaged women-owned, and women-owned small business? (note: these are per Draft RFP file "A Solicitation - FA877322R0005", page 90 of 111, under 52.204-8 Annual Representations and Certifications. Jan 2022, item (1)(iii).)	The rule of 2 will be applied at the task order (TO) level allowing for 100% and/or socio-economic small business set-asides.
247	L-M	2 of 21	L.2.1	Can the Government confirm that future Task Orders under the EC2 IDIQ can be issues as sole source to either a Large Business or small business - or - are all task orders required to be competed, regardless of being either full and open, or a small business set aside?	The intent of stating "partial small business set-aside" by the Government was to indicate to industry that the rule of 2 will be applied at the task order (TO) level allowing for 100% and/or socio-economic small business set-asides. The attempt by using "partial set-aside" vice "Full and Open" was to emphasis that small business set-asides are allowed and anticipated for many requirements at the TO level. If the Government is unable to make this determination, the requirement will be solicited to all EC2 IDIQ contractors. The Ordering Contracting Officer will determine if sufficient justification warrants a sole source award.
248	L-M	2 of 21	L.2.1	Does the Government have, or plan to have, defined Small Business goals for the overarching EC2 IDIQ? If so, can you provide insight to percentages allocated for those goals.	Yes, the EC2 IDIQ will have defined Small Business Goals.
249	L-M	2 of 21	L.2.1	Does the Government plan to require Large Businesses to meet defined Small Business goals for full and open task orders issued under EC2 IDIQ?	Yes.
250	L-M	2 of 21	L.2.1	Can the Government confirm that compete a task order as a Small Business set-asides if the Government confirms that there are at least two qualified Small Business expected to submit an offer for a given task order?	Confirmed.
251	L-M	2 of 21	L.2.1	Can the Government confirm that an EC2 awardee that is a Small Business Prime Offeror can bid on all future full and open EC2 task orders, and it not limited to bidding only on the task orders issued for their applicable Small Business category, e.g. women-owned small business?	Confirmed.

252	L-M	2 of 21	L.2.1	How often do small business Offeror's have to re-certify as a small business to bid on EC2 Small Business TOs?	A contractor is required to rerepresent its size status in accordance with the size standard in effect at the time of its rerepresentation that corresponds to the NAICS code that was initially assigned to the contract.
253		2 of 21 13 of 31	L.2.1 M.1.1	Given that a portion of EC2 work will be set aside for Small Business, we request the Government provide Offerors with information regarding what percentage of work will be slated for Large Businesses and Small Businesses, with the Small Business allocation further parsed out by socio-economic Small Business set-asides.	There is no a specific percentage of work that will be set-aside for small business. The IDIQ's Ordering Guide will establish that the Government will perform market research and shall set aside the requirement for SB if the contracting officer determines there is a reasonable expectation of obtaining offers from two or more responsible small business concerns that are competitive in terms of fair market prices, quality, and delivery IAW FAR 19.502-2, 19.504(a) & 19.504(c)(1)(ii). Additionally, task order RFPs can be further restricted to better support SB Contracting Goals IAW 16.505(b)(2)(i)(F).
254		13-Feb	L.2.1/M.1.1	This paragraph indicates this acquisition is a partial set-aside, this seemingly contradicts that the set-asides will be at the TO level as discussed in other documents. Will the Government confirm there will be no set-asides at the IDIQ level?	Confirmed. There are no set-asides at the IDIQ level.
255		1	L.2.2 Communications	Due to the work sample documentation and contractual requirements, offerors may have files that have hundreds of MBs in size. How large of files can the Procurement Integrated Enterprise Environment (PIEE) system accommodate?	For manually uploading documents, the limit is 1.9GB per document and up to 10 documents can be loaded at once. For displaying those documents once added, there is no limit as to how many that can display.
256		2	L.2.2.	Text: "Source selection information will be transmitted to Offerors electronically (i.e. via email or through the Procurement Integrated Enterprise Environment (PIEE) Solicitation module). If transmitted via email, the transmission shall be sent and received encrypted and must include "Controlled Unclassified Information (CUI) Source Selection Information – See FAR 2.101 & 3.104" in the Subject line." Question: Does Government wish for Offerors to submit their proposal via PIEE, via email, or via both? Recommendation: As this wording allows some interpretation, recommend having only 1 (one) modality for final proposal submission.	All proposals should be submitted via PIEE Solicitation Module. This is corrected in Final RFP Section L.
257		22	L.2.3	The attachment number referenced in L.2.3 and the name of the excel file is Attachment 12 Question-Answer Matrix; however, the header in this Attachment above shows as Attachment 15 - Questions and Answer Matrix. Please confirm correct attachment number.	This has been corrected.
258	L-M	2	L.2.3	This number is attached to two different paragraphs. Recommend the Government update paragraph numbering.	This will be corrected in Final RFP.
259	L-M	2	L.2.3	There are 2 paragraphs numbered L.2.3: L.2.3- Questions Submission and L.2.3- Amendments	This will be corrected in Final RFP.
260	L-M	3	L.2.5	This paragraph indicates that questions are to be submitted in accordance with paragraph 1.10 below -there is no paragraph 1.10, Will the Government clarify its reference? Is this meant to refer to paragraph L.2.3?	Yes. This will be corrected in Final RFP.
261	L-M	3	L.2.5	Should the reference to "Paragraph 1.10" be changed to "Paragraph L.2.3" (Question Submission)?	Yes. This will be corrected in Final RFP.
262	L-M	3	L.3	The draft RFP does not provide an estimate of the amount of time Offerors will have to prepare and submit their proposals. Sufficient time is needed for Offerors to identify ambiguities and other questions, for the Government to respond to questions, for offers to assemble the required contractual documentation, for offerors to prepare and distribute PPQs, and for customers to complete and return PPQs. Based on our experience from other scorecard-based proposals, we recommend that the Government give offerors 90 days from the date of RFP release to prepare and submit their proposals.	Thank you for your suggestion. The Government will consider this when issuing the RFP's proposal due dates.
263	L-M	3 of 21	L.3.1	The Government notes that classified work samples will not be accepted from Offerors. Would the Government accept classified work samples if only unclassified substantiating documents were provided in Offeror proposals? An example would be a signed letter from a program Contracting Officer or Contracting Officer Representative outlining unclassified responsibilities by the Offeror. Allowing this form of substantiation has been standard practice on other self-scoring solicitations such as OASIS and CIO-SP4.	Yes. Offerors may submit unclassified substantiating documents including a signed letter from Government agents proving their contact information/details. This can be used to validate past experience and/or past performance, if necessary.
264	L-M	3 of 21	L.3.1	Will the Government clarify that Offerors may submit completed attachments in support of a proposal section in the attachments' native format (e.g., font type and size and margins)? Examples of such attachments would include the completed Work Sample Cover Sheet, Subcontractor/Teaming Partner Consent Letter, Cross-Reference Matrix, and Self-Scoring Matrix.	Confirmed. Please note all attachments have been updated to be Times New Roman, font size 11. Note, page limitations remain unchanged.
265	L-M	3 of 21	L.3.1	Section L.3.1 states: "Attachments which are provided in support of a section shall be included in the electronic file for that section." Will the Government allow Offerors to submit completed attachments in Excel as separate files, as embedding such artifacts in the proposal section file could make them cumbersome for evaluators to read or print.	No.
266	L-M	3	L.3.1	We recommend that the government define/provide the precise file nomenclature in the PIEE EC2 submissions. This best practice reduces ambiguities regarding quantity and content of the submission files. It will also reduce the need for Questions in response to the final RFP. Please provide a table or list of file names that expands upon the file-naming format already provided ([Offeror Name] FA87322R0005 [Document/File Name]). The latter element of that format (Document/File name) is where our questions usually occur.	The file nomenclature for proposal submissions are provided at L.4.2.1 and following the organization at L.5. Table 1 - Proposal Organization.
267	L-M	3	L.3.1	Does the government require that Work Sample cover sheets and the official contract documentation associated with that Work Sample be combined in one file, or separate files?	The Government requires proposal submissions to be organized IAW the Volume's Format IAW L.4.2.1. All Volumes should be one file to the maximum extent practicable.
268	L-M	3	L.3.1	Will the Government clarify how to send CUI/FOUO documents?	The Procurement Integrated Enterprise Environment (PIEE) is DoD Impact Level 4 (IL4) certified, in accordance with the DoD Cloud Computing Security Requirements Guide (SRG) and NIST SP 800-53 (Revision 5) for security and privacy controls for information systems. At IL4, the PIEE is authorized to retain DoD Controlled Unclassified Information (CUI). There is only a single process for uploading all attachments. Any marking on the uploaded attachment is the responsibility of the author of the file.
269	L-M	3	L.3.1	Does PIEE have a file size limit for document uploads?	There is a 1.9GB file size limit per attachment but no limit on the number of documents.
270	L-M	3	L.3.1 L.3.2	Proposal submission instructions state all proposals are to be submitted as unclassified only. With the current trend of contract documentation being designated Controlled Unclassified Information (CUI), some work sample documentation (SOWs, CDRLs, CPARs, etc.) may be marked CUI. Although FOUO and/or CUI documents are unclassified please clarify that FOUO/CUI documents are allowed for use in the proposal.	The Procurement Integrated Enterprise Environment (PIEE) is DoD Impact Level 4 (IL4) certified, in accordance with the DoD Cloud Computing Security Requirements Guide (SRG) and NIST SP 800-53 (Revision 5) for security and privacy controls for information systems. At IL4, the PIEE is authorized to retain DoD Controlled Unclassified Information (CUI). There is only a single process for uploading all attachments. Any marking on the uploaded attachment is the responsibility of the author of the file.
271	L-M	3	L.3.1 L.3.2	Does PIEE support uploads of data marked FOUO or CUI? Consistent with communications instructions of L.2.2 recommend considering use of other avenues for uploading CUI/FOUO proposal documents such as DoD SAFE or encrypted email.	The Procurement Integrated Enterprise Environment (PIEE) is DoD Impact Level 4 (IL4) certified, in accordance with the DoD Cloud Computing Security Requirements Guide (SRG) and NIST SP 800-53 (Revision 5) for security and privacy controls for information systems. At IL4, the PIEE is authorized to retain DoD Controlled Unclassified Information (CUI). There is only a single process for uploading all attachments. Any marking on the uploaded attachment is the responsibility of the author of the file.
272	L-M	3	L.3.1 L.3.2	Proposal submission instructions state all proposals are to be submitted as unclassified only. With the current trend of contract documentation being designated Controlled Unclassified Information (CUI), some work sample documentation (SOWs, CDRLs, CPARs, etc.) may be marked CUI. Although FOUO and/or CUI documents are unclassified please clarify that FOUO/CUI documents are allowed for use in the proposal.	The Procurement Integrated Enterprise Environment (PIEE) is DoD Impact Level 4 (IL4) certified, in accordance with the DoD Cloud Computing Security Requirements Guide (SRG) and NIST SP 800-53 (Revision 5) for security and privacy controls for information systems. At IL4, the PIEE is authorized to retain DoD Controlled Unclassified Information (CUI). There is only a single process for uploading all attachments. Any marking on the uploaded attachment is the responsibility of the author of the file.
273	L-M	3	L.3.1 L.3.2	Does PIEE support uploads of data marked FOUO or CUI? Consistent with communications instructions of L.2.2 recommend considering use of other avenues for uploading CUI/FOUO proposal documents such as DoD SAFE or encrypted email.	The Procurement Integrated Enterprise Environment (PIEE) is DoD Impact Level 4 (IL4) certified, in accordance with the DoD Cloud Computing Security Requirements Guide (SRG) and NIST SP 800-53 (Revision 5) for security and privacy controls for information systems. At IL4, the PIEE is authorized to retain DoD Controlled Unclassified Information (CUI). There is only a single process for uploading all attachments. Any marking on the uploaded attachment is the responsibility of the author of the file.
274	L-M	3 of 21 6 of 21	L.3.1 L.6.6	Will the Government clarify that required artifacts submitted by Offerors that originate from third parties, such as insurance certificates (required by L.6.6), SOWs, and CPARs, can be provided in their native format and embedded into a standard proposal page?	This provision will be deleted. The government may require evidence of compliance (FAR clause 52.228-5, Insurance – Work on Government Installations in task order evaluations and contract administration.
275	L-M	3	L.3.1.	Text: "Offerors will utilize PIEE and will not rely on any other electronic transmission (including transmission by electronic e-mail)." Question: Does this contradict L.2.2., which appears to allow for email submission? Recommendation: Re-word to only allow one modality for proposal submission.	The language will be corrected in the Final RFP. Procurement Integrated Enterprise Environment (PIEE) Solicitation Module is the only transmission option for EC2 solicitations.
276	L-M	p2 of 22	L.3.1; L.3.2	Is the PIEE tool, used for proposal submission, capable of protecting proposal containing Controlled Unclassified Information (CUI) information? Offerors may need to use CUI contract documentation for work samples since some Government agencies classify their contract documentation as CUI.	The Procurement Integrated Enterprise Environment (PIEE) is DoD Impact Level 4 (IL4) certified, in accordance with the DoD Cloud Computing Security Requirements Guide (SRG) and NIST SP 800-53 (Revision 5) for security and privacy controls for information systems. At IL4, the PIEE is authorized to retain DoD Controlled Unclassified Information (CUI). There is only a single process for uploading all attachments. Any marking on the uploaded attachment is the responsibility of the author of the file.
277	L-M	3	L.3.2	Electronic Reference Documents, "The SAM.gov website will reference back to this module." Does this mean that the final solicitation documents will not be posted on SAM.gov, but instead only referenced in a SAM.gov notice?	The Government expects this RFP advertisement will be posted on SAM.gov and the PIEE Solicitation Module.

278	L-M	3	L.3.2	Can Offerors establish accounts on PIEE prior to RFP release in order to learn the platform? If so, would the Government confirm that contractor accounts will not have a time limit, e.g. 30 days?	Yes. Users can register for accounts at any time. Accounts will go deactivate after 60 days due to lack of activity. If you need any further assistance, please call 866-618-5988.
279	L-M	3	L.3.2.1	Section L states that "The Solicitation module is a vendor portal for solicitation within the PIEE platform to automate and secure the process for capturing solicitations, attachments, and responses from industry. The Solicitation module allows vendors to retrieve and respond to solicitations and communicate directly with Solicitation Managers in a secure environment." Will the Government notify Offerors with advance notice when solicitation documents are planned to be posted to the PIEE platform?	The Government expects this RFP advertisement will be posted on SAM.gov and the PIEE Solicitation Module.
280	L-M	5	L.4.3 L.4.6	Offerors have no control over font and margin of work sample documents. Many work sample contract documents are outside the bounds of Section L -specified margins and often include data in headers and footers. Recommend work sample documents be excluded from font and margin requirements for ease in evaluation.	Work samples are now exempt from the formatting requirements.
281	L-M	5	L.4.3, L.4.5	Paragraph L.4.3 (General Page Text) specifies a font size of TNR 11 point and 0.75 inch margins. Paragraph L.4.5 (Tables/Graphics) refers to a TNR 10-point font and 0.5 inch margins, presumably for a page that consists only of a table or graphic. What are the font and margin limitations for pages that have a combination of General Text and Tables/Graphics?	3/4" on all sides.
282	L-M	pg.5	L.4.5	Section L.4.5 Table, Chart, and other graphics Instructions states: "Text shall be no less than 10-point Times New Roman Font, and margins shall be no less than ½ inch on all sides." Margin restrictions are usually associated with pages as outlined in Section L.4.3, not tables, charts, or graphics. Q: For clarity, will the Government consider deleting the words "...and margins shall be no less than ½ inch on all sides." in Section L.4.5, allowing Section L.4.3 to dictate margin requirements for the volumes?	The tables, charts and other graphics page instructions at L4.5. will be updated in the Final RFP to allow 3/4" margins.
283	L-M	5	L.4.5	Section L.4.5 states "Table, Chart, and other graphics Instructions. Legible tables, charts, graphics, figures, etc. may be used. These displays shall be uncomplicated, legible, and shall not exceed 11 x 17 inches in size. 11 x 17 may only be used for large tables and charts; they shall not be used for pages of text. Text shall be no less than 10-point Times New Roman Font, and margins shall be no less than ½ inch on all sides unless stated otherwise within this document. " The margin requirements are different than the margin requirements in Section L.4.3. This leads the this Offeror to believe that the 1/2 inch margin requirement only applies to tables, charts, and other graphics that consume a full 11x17 page. Will the Government please clarify the margin requirements?	The tables, charts and other graphics page instructions at L4.5. will be updated in the Final RFP to allow 3/4" margins. Offerors may use either 8.5 x 11 or 11 x 17" pages IAW L.4.5.
284	L-M	5 of 21	L.4.6	Section L.4.6 states: "Offerors shall not include proprietary markings on attachments and documents that will become a part of the contract (i.e., Volume IV documents)." Please specify which Volume IV documents must be submitted without proprietary markings, as much of the contents to be provided, such as Past Performance Information Sheets and the Organizational Structure Change History, should have such markings. If the Government intends for this requirement to apply to other volumes, please specify which associated attachments and documents should be submitted without proprietary markings, such as the SF 33 and SF 30.	L.4.6 will be updated. Offerors will provide proprietary markings in accordance with FAR 52.215-1-e.
285	L-M	5	L.4.6	May offerors also include a title page (not included in the page limits) where the confidentiality language from FAR 52.215-1 can be placed?	L.4.6 will be revised in accordance with FAR 52.215-1(e). While the title page will require the legend (FAR 52.215-1(e)(1)), each page must contain an additional legend (FAR 52.215-1(e)(2)).
286	L-M	5	L.4.6	Section L.4.6 states "Offerors shall not include proprietary markings on attachments and documents that will become a part of the contract (i.e., Volume IV documents)." Volume IV is the Past Performance volume. This Offeror believes that the Past Performance volume should contain proprietary markings. Will the Government please clarify the volume reference?	Proposal Markings shall be marked in accordance with FAR 52.215-1 (e). L.4.6. has been updated.
287	L-M	5	L.4.6	For ease in evaluation and to allow original work sample documents not be altered and as Disclosure Statements are included on the cover page of each Volume, recommend allowing Work Sample Documents be excluded from marking requirements on each page of work sample documents.	Proposals shall be marked in accordance with FAR 52.215-1(e), Restriction on Disclosure and Use of Data, and FAR 3.104-4, Disclosure, Protection, and Marking of Contractor Bid or Proposal Information and Source Selection Information.
288	L-M	5	L.4.6	For ease in evaluation and to allow original work sample documents not be altered and as Disclosure Statements are included on the cover page of each Volume, recommend allowing Work Sample Documents be excluded from (insert Disclosure Statement reference) marking requirements on each page of work sample documents.	Proposals shall be marked in accordance with FAR 52.215-1(e), Restriction on Disclosure and Use of Data, and FAR 3.104-4, Disclosure, Protection, and Marking of Contractor Bid or Proposal Information and Source Selection Information.
289	L-M	5, 6	L.4.6, L.5	The referenced section states that offerors shall not include proprietary markings on attachments and documents that will become a part of the contract (i.e., Volume IV documents). Would the Government please confirm that Offerors may mark the pages containing CPARS (which are highly confidential) and those prepared in response to sections L.9.6 (Organization Structure Change History) and L.9.7 (Specific Content, which may include proprietary information about problems and corrective actions)?	Confirmed, Offerors should mark CPARS in accordance with FAR 52.215-1 (e). L.4.6. has been updated.
290	L-M	5	L.4.8	The referenced section states that each volume must contain a glossary of all abbreviations and acronyms used with an explanation for each. Would the Government please confirm that this does not include acronyms and abbreviations used in the many contractual documents included in the work sample packages?	Confirmed.
291	L-M	5	L.4.8	Section L.4.8 states "Each volume shall contain a glossary of all abbreviations, acronyms used with an explanation for each." Will the Government please confirm that the Offeror is only to provide abbreviations and acronyms for original content?	Confirmed.
292	L-M	5	L.4.8	The requirement indicates that "each volume shall contain a glossary of all abbreviations, acronyms used with an explanation for each." Due to the past performance nature (e.g., potentially hundreds of pages of PWS/SOW documentation) of the proposal and the unique contractual artifacts required, can this requirement be made optional for each of the volumes? i.e., If the offeror feels an acronym list will help the evaluation team complete the assessment/scoring for a particular volume, an acronym list can be included?	Yes. Additionally note that: Glossaries, Abbreviations, and Acronyms included in original documents (i.e. work sample documents) are not counted against this limitation of pages.
293	L-M	5 of 21	L.5	Table 1 - Proposal Organization shows page limits for Volume I. Will the Government clarify that Offerors' responses to RFP requirements in L.6.3 (Responsibility Information), L.6.4 (SF 33), L.6.5 (SF30), and L.6.6 (Insurance Certificate) are exempted from any page-count limitation?	Page limitations will change. The insurance provision will be deleted. The government may require evidence of compliance (FAR clause 52.228-5, Insurance – Work on Government Installations in task order evaluations and contract administration.
294	L-M	5 of 21	L.5	Industry requests that the Government remove the page limitations on Volume II L.7.5 Teaming Agreements.	Teaming agreements are not required. The solicitation will be revised to remove providing the teaming agreement (and Joint Venture agreement). However, the offeror must list the companies/entities that (commitment by agreement or other legal obligation) will be supporting the offeror in the IDIQ (Atch 3).
295	L-M	5	L.5	On page 5, the requirement for Volume I states that the Responsibility Information is limited to 2 pages. Would the Government confirm that the 2 page limit is allocated to the 2-page Certification Regarding Responsibility Matters?	This will be updated in the Final RFP to reflect no page limit.
296	L-M	5	L.5	Would the Government please add to Table 1 the other items that are to be included in Volume I, such as the Cover Page, Table of Contents, SF 33, any SF 30s, Glossary, and if required, Insurance Information?	Table 1 will be revised to reference all the documents required in Volume 1 (referenced in L.6). This provision will be deleted. The government may require evidence of compliance (FAR clause 52.228-5, Insurance – Work on Government Installations in task order evaluations and contract administration.
297	L-M	6	L.5	Table 1 identifies a 30-page limit for Teaming Agreements. This Offerors' teaming agreement average about 15 pages per agreement. Will the Government please remove the page limitation for the teaming agreements?	Teaming agreements are not required. Recommend rephrasing as: "The solicitation will be revised to remove providing the teaming agreement (and Joint Venture agreement). However, the offeror must list the companies/entities that (commitment by agreement or other legal obligation) will be supporting the offeror in the IDIQ (Atch 3).
298	L-M	5	L.5	Table 1 in this section does not align with the instructions in Section L.1.2 on Page 1. We recommend deleting the redundant data in L.1.2 to reduce the probability of inconsistency across instruction sections.	This will be corrected in the Final RFP. This section is an introduction to the evaluation factors in the Special Notices section of L. It's not redundant or inconsistent. This section remains unchanged.
299	L-M	5	L.5	Table 1 does not include a section for the SF 33 and any SF 30's, as required by instructions in Sections L.6.4 and L.6.5. Please add a line item for these two requirements to Table 1.	This will be corrected in the Final RFP.

300	L-M	5 of 21	L.5	Can the Government confirm that Table 1, per row "L.7.5 Teaming Agreements", that the 30 Pages of the Page Limit is referencing 30 pages for the teaming agreement summaries described on page 8 of 21, Section L.7.5 Teaming Agreements? This is to ensure we properly interpret that the Government is not asking for the complete Teaming Agreements that the Offerors use internally in this regard, which can sometimes be up to or exceed 30 pages for a single Teaming Agreement.	Teaming agreements are not required. Recommend rephrasing as: "The solicitation will be revised to remove providing the teaming agreement (and Joint Venture agreement). However, the offeror must list the companies/entities that (commitment by agreement or other legal obligation) will be supporting the offeror in the IDIQ (Atch 3).
301	L-M	Page 6 and 8	L.5 and L7.4	Is the Government looking for the Offeror to include the entire teaming agreement in the proposal or just a TA Summary?	Teaming agreements are not required. Recommend rephrasing as: "The solicitation will be revised to remove providing the teaming agreement (and Joint Venture agreement). However, the offeror must list the companies/entities that (commitment by agreement or other legal obligation) will be supporting the offeror in the IDIQ (Atch 3).
302	L-M	5	L.5 Table 1	Table 1 - Proposal Organization includes a 2-page limit for L.6.7 Responsibility Information. Please confirm the 2-page limit is for L.6.7. Responsibility Matters/Determination as "Responsibility Information" is the L.6.3 requirement meaning the entire volume would be limited to 2 pages.	The Responsibility Information page limitation has been increased to a 30 page limit.
303	L-M	Table 1, p. 6 and L.7.3, p. 8	L.5 Table 1 - Proposal Organization and L.7.3	Section L.7.3 states the Offeror Company Information (Attachment 3) is required "for each legal entity participating in the offer." Table 1 - Proposal Organization states the page limit for the Offeror Company Information (attachment 3) in Vol II is limited to 2 pages. With the 2-page limitation and table font/margin restrictions, even if the tables for each entity are without spaces between the tables, this limits an offeror to only four tables (i.e., one for the prime with a limit of three subs)–the addition of any more tables will push past the 2 page limit for this section. Is the two page limit for <i>each table</i> completed for <i>each entity</i> (i.e., the table for each entity has a 2 page limit), rather than the entire Offeror Company Information section being limited to 2 pages?	Attachment 4 will be deleted. Offeror will complete Atch 3 for itself (Part I), as well as provide the information for all companies/entities that will be supporting offeror (Part II).
304	L-M	Page 6	L.5 Table 1 – Proposal Organization	Will the Government consider giving an unlimited page count for Teaming Agreements? Or, in the alternative can we have a combined total of 60 pages for TA's and Joint Venture Agreement?	Teaming agreements are not required. The solicitation will be revised to remove providing the teaming agreement (and Joint Venture agreement). However, the offeror must list the companies/entities that (commitment by agreement or other legal obligation) will be supporting the offeror in the IDIQ (Atch 3).
305	L-M	5, 6	L.5 L.6.2, L.6.3, L.6.4, L.6.5, L.6.6 and L.6.7	Section L.5 - Table 1 identifies a 2-page limit for Responsibility Information. Section L.6.3 requires that the Offeror include sections L.6.4 through L.6.7.3 as responses to Responsibility Information. The inclusion of those sections will cause the Offeror to far exceed the 2-page limit for Responsibility Information. Will the Government please clarify the instructions so that Offeror's can be compliant with the proposal instructions?	The Responsibility Information page limitation will be increased in the Final RFP to a 30 page limit.
306	L-M	5 of 21 7 of 21 15 of 21	L.5 L.6.7 M.2.3	Does the Volume I page limitation (2 pages) cited in Table 1 - Proposal Organization only apply to the completed Attachment 13, Certification Regarding Responsibility Matters? If not, then please specify what the page limitation covers, as Offerors may need additional page count to be able to respond appropriately. Please note that M.2.3 seems to indicate the completed Attachment 13 does not count toward the Volume I page limitation.	Yes, these 2 pages account for the 2 pages in Attachment 13. The page limitation will be increased in the Final RFP to 30 pages to allow for JV submissions. The Prime Offeror is responsible to submit Certification Regarding Responsibility Matters. No other parties are required to sign the form.
307	L-M	5-6, 8	L.5, L.7.3	The Offeror Company Information form is limited to 2 pages, but the RFP specifies that it is to be completed for "each legal entity participating in the Offeror." Some companies will have a large number of subcontractors. Would the Government please eliminate the page limit for this section so that Offerors are able to provide the form for each member of their teams? Alternative, would the Government please specify that the page limit is 2 page PER company?	Attachment 4 will be deleted. Offeror will complete Atch 3 for itself (Part I), as well as provide the information for all companies/entities that will be supporting offeror (Part II).
308	L-M	5-6, 8	L.5, L.7.5	If copies of teaming agreements are required, given the size of a typical teaming agreement, the allotted 30 pages may not be sufficient to show the agreements for all subcontractors. Would the Government please eliminate the page limit for this section so that Offerors are able to include the required information for all of their subcontractors? If teaming agreements are not requirement, would the Government please provide more detail about the required content for this section?	Teaming agreements are not required. The solicitation will be revised to remove providing the teaming agreement (and Joint Venture agreement). However, the offeror must list the companies/entities that (commitment by agreement or other legal obligation) will be supporting the offeror in the IDIQ (Atch 3).
309	L-M	5-6, 8	L.5, L.7.6	It's possible that some executed JV agreements may exceed 30 pages. Would the Government please eliminate the page limit for JV agreements?	Teaming agreements are not required. The solicitation will be revised to remove providing the teaming agreement (and Joint Venture agreement). However, the offeror must list the companies/entities that (commitment by agreement or other legal obligation) will be supporting the offeror in the IDIQ (Atch 3).
310	L-M	6, 11, 12	L.5, L.8.7.1.2, L.9.6	The proposal organization table specifies a limit of 5 pages for Section L.9.6 (Organization Structure Change History). Per Section L.8.7.1.2, Offerors must include "objective evidence" that could each be multiple pages (e.g., name change documents, SAM reports). Furthermore, Section L.9.6 requires the required information for the prime and all subcontractors. As a result, the written portion of these responses are likely to exceed 5 pages for large teams, and there will likely be many attachments to substantiate the information about legal entities. Consequently, would the Government please eliminate the page limit for this section?	The page limit will be increased to 20 pages in the Final RFP.
311	L-M	6, 13	L.5, L.9.7	The proposal organization table specifies a limit of 5 pages for Section L.9.7 (Specific Content). Because this proposal requires Offerors to include up to 62 separate contracts, Offerors may need more than 5 pages to discuss problems and corrective actions for the projects they show. Would the Government eliminate the page limit for this section to accommodate content for a significant number of contracts?	The page limit will be increased to 20 pages in the Final RFP.
312	L-M	5 of 21	L.5. Table 1	The page limitation for "Responsibility Information" is two pages. Question #1: Will the Government confirm that these two pages account for the two-page Attachment 13? Question #2: For Joint Ventures, will the Government allow those two pages for <u>each</u> of the Joint Venture partners?	Q1: Yes, these 2 pages account for the 2 pages in Attachment 13. Q2. Yes, the page limitation will be increased to 30 pages to allow for JV submissions. Additionally, the Certification Regarding Responsibility Matters is now required for all business entities included in the Teaming Arrangement.
313	L-M	6 8	L.5. Table 1, Volume II L.7.6	The page limitation for the Volume II section on Joint Venture Agreement is 30 pages. A typical Joint Venture Operating Agreement is over 30 pages, plus there are many additional Addendum pages and several pages for the Mentor-Protégé Agreement (MPA). The MPA is typically also required in a Joint Venture submission, along with proof of SBA approval of the MPA. Would the Government consider removing the page limitation for the Joint Venture Agreement and requiring the additional information for MPAs?	The Joint Venture Agreement will not be required in the Final RFP.
314	L-M	6 of 21	L.6	Will the Government allow Offerors to include a signed cover letter in Volume I, as this is an artifact often provided in contract volumes? We recommend exempting such a letter from any page limitations for the volume.	Offerors may sign their cover page IAW L.6.1. but it is not required. Cover letters are not counted against page limits IAW L.4.4.
315	L-M	7	L.6.2.7	Other large federal procurements like CIO-SP4 have allowed for Offeror's to provide third-party approved Accounting Systems, as opposed to DCAA/DCMA approved Accounting Systems. Can AMIC consider accepting third-party approved Accounting Systems as well for this EC2 procurement?	No. The requirements identified in paragraph L.6.7.2 will remain unchanged in the Final RFP.
316	L-M	6	L.6.3, L.6.4, L.6.5, L.6.6 and L.6.7	The Offeror is instructed to place responses to Sections L.6.4, L.6.5, L.6.6, and L.6.7 directly after the Table of Contents. This conflicts with the requirement in Section L.6.3 to include them in the Responsibility Information section. Will the Government please clarify the instructions so that Offeror's can be compliant with the proposal instructions?	This will be corrected in the Final RFP.
317	L-M	(see pg. 6 of Attach. C Sec. L&M)	L.6.4 - L.6.5	Should the requirements to include the completed SF-33 and SF-30(s) in Volume I be included as items in 'L.5 Table 1 Proposal Organization'?	Yes, this will be corrected in the Final RFP.
318	L-M	6	L.6.6	The requirement states that the " Offerors shall submit an insurance certificate that demonstrates their company's insurance coverage meeting the requirements of FAR Clause 252.217-7012 Liability and Insurance included in Section I of this solicitation and file the insurance certificate after the SF 33 and any SF 30s." Currently separate insurance and liability insurance is obtained for the specific work to be performed (i.e. at the Task Order level). Recommend this requirement be removed and requested at the Task Order level. Otherwise, including this requirement at the IDIQ level at time of bid, requires offerors to purchase insurance to which may never be needed, potentially wastes valuable resources. Recommend this requirement be deferred to task order proposals.	This provision will be deleted. The government may require evidence of compliance (FAR clause 52.228-5, Insurance – Work on Government Installations in task order evaluations and contract administration.
319	L-M	7	L.6.6	This requirement (to submit an insurance certificate) is not reflected in Table 1 of Section L.5, on Page 5. In which volume and section should this certificate be submitted?	This provision will be deleted. The government may require evidence of compliance (FAR clause 52.228-5, Insurance – Work on Government Installations in task order evaluations and contract administration.
320	L-M	7	L.6.6	Insurance Certificate: Offerors shall submit an insurance certificate that demonstrates their company's insurance coverage meeting the requirements of FAR Clause 252.217-7012 Liability and Insurance included in Section I of this solicitation and file the insurance certificate after the SF 33 and any SF 30s. This will not count against this volume's page limitation. This requirement conflicts with L.1.2.1. VOLUME I – CONTRACT & RESPONSIBILITY DOCUMENTATION, which struck the Insurance Requirement. Can the Gov't clarify whether the Insurance Certificate is required?	This provision will be deleted. The government may require evidence of compliance (FAR clause 52.228-5, Insurance – Work on Government Installations in task order evaluations and contract administration.
321	L-M	6	L.6.6	Is the Government planning to specify any details of the insurance certificate requirements? If so, please provide specific details of what the insurance certificate must include in terms of amounts and coverage.	This provision will be deleted. The government may require evidence of compliance (FAR clause 52.228-5, Insurance – Work on Government Installations in task order evaluations and contract administration.

322	L-M	7	L.6.6	The reference to "FAR Clause 252.217-7012 " should be changed to "DFAR Clause 252.217-7012"	This provision will be deleted. The government may require evidence of compliance (FAR clause 52.228-5, Insurance – Work on Government Installations in task order evaluations and contract administration.
323	L-M	7	L.6.6	The insurance requirements within DFAR Clause 252.217-7012 includes numerous references to "vessel". Our assumption is that all work will be performed at a land-based Government facility based on the locations identified within the PWS at Paragraph 5.5. Please confirm or correct that understanding and if proof of insurance, not covering vessels, will be acceptable.	This provision will be deleted. The government may require evidence of compliance (FAR clause 52.228-5, Insurance – Work on Government Installations in task order evaluations and contract administration.
324	L-M	6	L.6.6	Reference: L.6.6 states we must submit an insurance certificate Q: Can the Government please advise who to add for the additional insured coverage on the COI form?	This provision will be deleted. The government may require evidence of compliance (FAR clause 52.228-5, Insurance – Work on Government Installations in task order evaluations and contract administration.
325	L-M	8	L.6.6	L.6.6 states that the FAR Clause 252.217-7012 is included in Section I, however, this clause is not listed. Will the government confirm the correct FAR/DFARS Clause that should be used for insurance requirements?	This provision will be deleted. The government may require evidence of compliance (FAR clause 52.228-5, Insurance – Work on Government Installations in task order evaluations and contract administration.
326	L-M	8	L.6.6	DFARS Clause 252.217-7012 references work being performed on a Vessel. Does the government anticipate any task orders requiring offshore work?	This provision will be deleted. The government may require evidence of compliance (FAR clause 52.228-5, Insurance – Work on Government Installations) in task order evaluations and contract administration.
327	L-M	8	L.6.6	Will the government confirm the insurance requirements required for WC, and Causality, Accident, and Liability insurance?	This provision will be deleted. The government may require evidence of compliance (FAR clause 52.228-5, Insurance – Work on Government Installations in task order evaluations and contract administration.
328	L-M	6 of 21	L.6.6. Insurance Certificate	The draft solicitation removed the Insurance Certificate requirement from L.1.2.1. Volume I – Contract & Responsibility Documentation and, L.5. Table 1 - Proposal Organization. Will the Government confirm no response is required for Section L.6.6. Insurance Certificate and remove this text in final solicitation?	This provision will be deleted. The government may require evidence of compliance (FAR clause 52.228-5, Insurance – Work on Government Installations in task order evaluations and contract administration.
329	L-M	6 of 21	L.6.6. Insurance Certificate:	Does the Insurance Certificate need to be in the name of the JV, or each individual member of the JV? For an unpopulated JV (with no employees) can each JV member provide an insurance certificate?	This provision will be deleted. The government may require evidence of compliance (FAR clause 52.228-5, Insurance – Work on Government Installations in task order evaluations and contract administration.
330	L-M	7 of 21	L.6.7	This requirement states "Offerors shall complete and submit a copy of the attached Certification Regarding Responsibility Matters (Attachment 13) and file the form after the insurance certificate." Question: Does the Government have specific guidance on what Corporate Officer (e.g., Contracting Officer, Chief Financial Officer) needs to sign this form?	A duly authorized agent of the entity submitting the offer. This section will additionally be updated to require each entity listed as part of the Teaming Arrangement to submit a copy of the Certification Regarding Responsibility Matters.
331	L-M	7 of 22	L.6.7	This section refers to the Certification Regarding Responsibility Matters as being Attachment 13. However, Attachment 13 is titled "Past Performance Questionnaire." Please reconcile	This will be corrected in the Final RFP. The Cert. of Responsibility Matters is attachment 13.
332	L-M	7	L.6.7	For Joint Ventures, are the items listed in Section L.6.71 and 2 to be provided by the managing partner or all partners in the JV.	Regarding L.6.7.1 (Financial/Other Resources) and L-6.7.2 (Accounting System), a Joint Venture may rely on the capabilities, past performance, experience, business systems, and certifications of its partners. It's incumbent upon the JV offeror to affirmatively and specifically note where it is relying on the capabilities and resources of the specified JV partner to meet the requirements of the present acquisition.
333	L-M	7	L.6.7.1	The requirement states that the "Offeror shall provide a written statement explaining the Offeror's ability to obtain required resources to perform the contract requirements. The Offeror shall also provide evidence to support the explanation. Evidence includes, official letter(s) from financial institutions demonstrating that the Offeror has the financial resources required to cover all financial commitment." Given that many potential Offerors for this effort are large, publicly-traded companies, would the Government accept as evidence the consolidated financial statements, which are published as part of a corporate annual report? Or will the Government name another acceptable form of evidence for large institutions that will not be funded by a single financial institution?	This requirement will be removed from the final RFP.
334	L-M	7	L.6.7.1	Financial/Other Sources (page 7): Does not state the \$500,000 value, like Section M, Paragraph M.2.7 (page 16). Which one is correct?	This has been corrected and \$500,000 has been added.
335	L-M	7	L.6.7.2	There's a reference in the text to Attachment 16. Would the Government please confirm that this should be Attachment 11?	This will be corrected in the Final RFP.
336	L-M	7	L.6.7.2	Please allow for attestation and signature of a contractor client validating that relevant work to a EC2 Service Area as official contract documentation. Rationale: Increase competition and innovation. If a firm is performing a service for a customer that is directly related to a EC2 Service Area as a value add, it will not necessarily be found in official contract documentation (e.g., SOW/PWS/CDRLs).	The Government will accept attestation and signature as official contract documentation.
337	L-M	7	L.6.7.2	Given that the date of an award may vary for a variety of reasons, in addition to, DCAA/DCMA's schedule and possible delays are out of our control, we respectfully request that the government consider a window (6 months, 10, months, etc.) post-award for having the contractors accounting system approved. This will ensure that contractors who are committing to having their systems approved have the necessary time to do so. During that period, perhaps there is a restriction that the awarded contractor cannot accept and process Cost-Reimbursable (CR) task orders.	The requirements identified in paragraph L.6.7.2 will remain unchanged in the Final RFP.
338	L-M	7	L.6.7.2	Can contractors receive a waiver for the approved accounting system requirement if evidence is provided to demonstrate that the items or services offered have been previously purchased by the Department of Defense using commercial item procedures as provided for in DFARS 212?	The requirements identified in paragraph L.6.7.2 will remain unchanged in the Final RFP.
339	L-M	7	L.6.7.2.	As identified in L.6.7.2, the accounting system adequacy criteria is applicable to cost-reimbursement contracts. Since various contract types are anticipated for task order awards (firm-fixed-price, time-and-material, cost-reimbursement, etc.), can the accounting system adequacy requirement be modified to apply ONLY to individual cost-reimbursement task order awards (at the time of task order award) as opposed to the overall IDIQ contract award?	The requirements identified in paragraph L.6.7.2 will remain unchanged in the Final RFP.
340	L-M	7 of 21	L.6.7.2. Accounting System.	Under the new SBA rules please confirm that any individual member of the JV can provide the DCAA/DCMA certification.	An unpopulated Joint Venture may rely on the capabilities, past performance, experience, business systems, and certifications of its partners. It's incumbent upon the JV offeror to affirmatively and specifically note where it is relying on the capabilities and resources of the specified JV partner to meet the requirements of the present acquisition.
341	L-M	7	L.6.7.3	OCI mitigation plans are required with submission, however, should these be specific and required at the TO level? We recommend adding this requirement at the Task Order level in the Ordering Guide.	Identification of an actual or potential OCI for the IDIQ source selection is required, with mitigation plan as applicable. As services are required at the task order level, there may be other OCI issues, which will be addressed in the FOPR
342	L-M	8	L.7. Volume II Organization	The Volume II - Executive Summary does not include an opportunity to summarize the proposal and demonstrate an offeror's overall cybersecurity capabilities. Can the Government modify the requirement to include a 2-page Executive Summary of the proposal?	No. The Government expects the offeror's overall cyber capabilities to be evident through the use of past experience and past performance submissions.
343	L-M	8	L.7.1	This paragraph indicates Vol I but should be Vol II. Recommend the Government update this reference.	This will be corrected in the Final RFP.
344	L-M	8	L.7.2	Section L, L.7.2: Section L.7 addresses Vol II organization; however the instructions in L.7.2, which addresses the Table of Content for Vol II, states, "Offerors file the Table of Contents after the Vol I cover page." Verifying that this Vol I reference in the Vol II instructions is a typo and the TOC for Vol II will be filed after the Cover Page for Vol II.	This will be corrected in the Final RFP.
345	L-M	8 of 21	L.7.2. Table of Contents	The text for the Volume II Table of Contents states, "Offerors file the Table of Contents after the Volume I Cover Page." Please confirm this will be updated to reference Volume II instead of Volume I.	This will be corrected in the Final RFP.
346	L-M	8	L.7.3	Reference "Offeror Company Information. The Offeror shall complete Attachment 3. Offeror Company Information, for each legal entity participating in the offer." Offerors with large teams will easily exceed the 2 page limit when placing the formatted tables in the proposal document at the smallest font. Will the Government increase the page limit?	Offeror Company Information will be increased in the Final RFP to have a 10 page limitation. Attachment 4 will be deleted. Offeror will complete Atch 3 for itself (Part I), as well as provide the information for all companies/entities that will be supporting offeror (Part II).
347	L-M	8 of 21	L.7.3	Reference the data requirements for Attachment 3 Offeror Company Information. The forms call for the company's DUNS number. Question: Will the Government confirm that in addition to the company's DUNS number the input should also include the company's Unique Entity ID?	The DUNS is no longer used. The UEI is now required. This form will be updated in the Final RFP.
348	L-M	8 of 21	L.7.3	This section lists the requirement to complete Attachment 3 Other Company Information. Attachment 3 is a one-page document. Attachment B Section J listing of attachments indicates that Attachment 3 is a 52 page document. Question: Will the Government confirm that the Section L "Other Company Information" is satisfied by completing the one-page Attachment 3?	Q1. Section J will be corrected in the Final RFP and Q2. attachment 3, Offeror Company Information fulfills the requirements of L.7.3.
349	L-M	8 of 21	L.7.3	Section L.7.3, Other Company Information, states: "The Offeror shall complete Attachment 3. Offeror Company Information, for each legal entity participating in the offer. The Offeror shall provide all information on the form." Please confirm the term legal entity only applies to the prime Offeror and entities participating in a joint venture?	L.7.3 will be revised (below). L.7.3, Offeror Company Information, must be completed for the offeror (the prime offeror). The joint venture, with its own cage code, UIE, should provide the information.

350	L-M	8	L.7.3	Section L.7.3 indicates that the Offeror must complete Attachment 3 (Offeror Company Information) for each "legal entity" participating in the offer. Would the Government please confirm that when it refers to "legal entities" in this requirement, it is referring to the offering legal entity and its subcontractor legal entities, as opposed to any affiliates or subsidiaries that might be included in the Organization Structure Change History?	L.7.3 will be revised (below). L.7.3, Offeror Company Information, must be completed for the offeror (the prime offeror). The joint venture, with its own cage code, UIE, should provide the information.
351	L-M	8	L.7.3	Recommend Government consider Top Secret Facility Clearance a Pass/Fail element. A majority of this PWS requires cleared resources and offerors should have demonstrated an ability to staff cleared personnel on a Federal contract.	This has been considered and determined to not be necessary at the IDIQ level. Any facility clearance requirements will be defined at the task order level.
352	L-M	8	L.7.3	The paragraph states that if the offeror does not have a facility clearance, "the Offeror will obtain a facility clearance at the classification level required to bid on resulting Task Orders." If an Awardee does not already have a Top Secret facility clearance, there is risk to the Government that they would not ever be granted such a clearance, or that the clearance process would take so long that the Awardee would be unable to bid on most task orders. Would the Government consider making the minimum Secret Facility Clearance a pass-fail item for this submission?	There is no facility clearance required at the IDIQ level. If an Offeror does not have the facility clearance required at the TO level, they cannot bid on that TO.
353	L-M	8	L.7.3	Section L states "Offeror Company Information. The Offeror shall complete Attachment 3. Offeror Company Information, for each legal entity participating in the offer." Is Attachment 3 is to be completed by the Prime (Offeror) only or is it also required for teammates/subcontractors?	Attachment 3 must be completed by the offeror (prime offeror). Other companies/entities need to be listed in Part II of Atch 3.
354	L-M	8	L.7.3 Offeror Company Info.	In the first sentence reference is made to "legal entity". Recommend legal entity be replaced with "Teaming Partner and/or Joint Venture Member" OR the Government provide the definition for "legal entity" as it applies to the Solicitation.	L.7.3 will be revised (below). L.7.3, Offeror Company Information, must be completed for the offeror (the prime offeror). The joint venture, with its own cage code, UIE, should provide the information.
355	L-M	8	L.7.3 Offeror Company Info.	The sentence starting with "If none, the Offeror will obtain a facility clearance.." should be rewritten to better define the Government's Facility Clearance Level requirements at the Task Order proposal level. Recommend a rewrite such as "Offerors without a facility clearance at the Task Order classification level required shall be restricted from submitting a Task Order proposal."	This sentence will be removed in the Final RFP.
356	L-M	8	L.7.4	Reference Attachment 4, EC2 TEAM STRUCTURE. Please clarify what is an expected response for a Prime and a Subcontractor for Column E, Relationship to Prime.	Column E refers to the subcontractors business entity structure as related to the Prime Contractor entity. Examples may include: Subcontractor, Partner, Joint Venture, or other terminology used in the business arrangement for purposes of providing a proposal. Attachment 4 will be deleted. Offeror will complete Atch 3 for itself (Part I), as well as provide the information for all companies/entities that will be supporting offeror (Part II).
357	L-M	8	L.7.4	Reference Attachment 4, EC2 TEAM STRUCTURE. Please clarify what is an expected response for a Prime and a Subcontractor for Column G, Verification of Prime Status (i.e. prime contract references for Team Member)	This column/requirement has been removed. Attachment 4 will be deleted. Offeror will complete Atch 3 for itself (Part I), as well as provide the information for all companies/entities that will be supporting offeror (Part II).
358	L-M	Page 8	L.7.4	Will the Government please give guidance as to what needs to be included in the Teaming Agreement Summary?	The solicitation will be revised to remove providing the teaming agreement (and Joint Venture agreement). However, the offeror must list the companies/entities that (commitment by agreement or other legal obligation) will be supporting the offeror in the IDIQ (Atch 3).
359	L-M	8	L.7.4	Will Prime contract awardees be able to onboard new teammates at the Task Order procurement level?	IDIQ awardees (prime contractors) will not be precluded in proposing new teammates/subcontractors at the task order level. The task order solicitation may give consideration to offeror's utilization of new teammates/subcontractors, but may require additional information (for example, past experience and past performance).
360	L-M	8	L.7.4	Section L.7.4 states, "L.7.4. Team Structure. The Offeror shall identify the team structure it will use to meet Government requirements. The Offeror shall identify the team structure within Attachment 4. Team Structure. The Offeror shall: (a) Identify the team member's name, address, CAGE code, and UEI." However, in Attachment 4, the field for offerors to provide is for a DUNS number. Given the transition from a DUNS number to UEI, will the Government please update Attachment 4 to have a field for UEI rather than a DUNS number to match Section L?	The DUNS is no longer used. The UEI is now required. This will be updated in the Final RFP. Attachment 4 will be deleted. Offeror will complete Atch 3 for itself (Part I), as well as provide the information for all companies/entities that will be supporting offeror (Part II).
361	L-M		L.7.4	Reference: Attachment 4 Last Column. Q: It is not clear what input is required in the column "Verification of Prime Status". Can the Government explain what input is required in this column?	This column/requirement has been removed. Attachment 4 will be deleted. Offeror will complete Atch 3 for itself (Part I), as well as provide the information for all companies/entities that will be supporting offeror (Part II).
362	L-M	8 of 21	L.7.4	Since "Teaming arrangements are not restricted" per Section M.1.7, page 14 of 21; Can the Government confirm that an Offeror can include additional team members in the Team Structure as desired in accordance with L.7.4 (per Attachment 4 Team Structure) - but not use that team member for any work sample or associated Past Performance reference? The intent of this question is to provide Offerors growth flexibility and the ability to build partnerships with team members by having the option to working with them on future EC2 task orders.	Yes. Please annotate something such as "No Past Experience or Past Performance Information Provided" to raise awareness of the situation. Attachment 4 will be deleted. Offeror will complete Atch 3 for itself (Part I), as well as provide the information for all companies/entities that will be supporting offeror (Part II).
363	L-M	8	L.7.4	L.7.4. Team Structure states "The Offeror shall identify the team structure it will use to meet Government requirements. The Offeror shall identify the team structure within Attachment 4. Team Structure. The Offeror shall: (a) Identify the team member's name, address, CAGE code, and UEI. (b) Identify the relationship between the prime, each team member. (c) Identify EC2 Specialty Areas (SA) in which each team member(s) will provide performance." The current team structure spreadsheet does not include an entry field for UEI. Recommend this be added to attachment 4.	This will be added to form in the Final RFP. Attachment 4 will be deleted. Offeror will complete Atch 3 for itself (Part I), as well as provide the information for all companies/entities that will be supporting offeror (Part II).
364	L-M	8	L.7.4	L.7.4. Team Structure states "The Offeror shall identify the team structure it will use to meet Government requirements. The Offeror shall identify the team structure within Attachment 4. Team Structure. The Offeror shall: (a) Identify the team member's name, address, CAGE code, and UEI. (b) Identify the relationship between the prime, each team member. (c) Identify EC2 Specialty Areas (SA) in which each team member(s) will provide performance." As this is a multiple award IDIQ, to which task orders will be bid separately, Offerors will not know which TO's they will be proposing and therefore cannot assure any teaming partner / subcontractor any work scope to perform, especially since we do not know the place of performance nor are we collecting pricing proposals from the team as part of this bid. What we can do, is give teaming partners a swimlane in a specialty area and allow them to opt in and participate on task order competitions as they desire. Requiring firm specialty areas to which teaming partners will perform is more appropriate for task order proposals, to which if awarded to the Offeror, a subcontract will be negotiated with the teammate for the work scope proposed in that task order proposal. Recommend item (c) be changed to "(c) Identify EC2 Specialty Areas (SA) in which each team members (s) are planned to provided performance".	The offeror is reminded that in order to be awarded an IDIQ they must provide a proposal that meets the criteria listed therein. Only then can the offeror have the opportunity to propose on task orders. Attachment 4 will be deleted. Offeror will complete Atch 3 for itself (Part I), as well as provide the information for all companies/entities that will be supporting offeror (Part II).
365	L-M	8	L.7.4	Attachment 4 is requiring proof of a prime contract experience for teaming members only. Prime contractor experience is paramount to any Offeror who will be managing a large IDIQ of this scope with a significant team. Otherwise the AF EC2 team may make awards to companies who never bid on nor win any task order competitions due to lack of prime contract experience. Recommend prime offerors also have to provide proof of prime contract, via an FPDS-NG Report or past performance reference included in Vol 4.	Prime contractors are also part of the Team Structure and must list their name and details in Attachment 4, Team Structure. Attachment 4 will be deleted. Offeror will complete Atch 3 for itself (Part I), as well as provide the information for all companies/entities that will be supporting offeror (Part II).
366	L-M	8	L.7.4	Attachment 4 is requiring proof of a prime contract experience for teaming members but does not specify what proof is required. Recommend team members provide proof of prime contract, via an FPDS-NG Report or past performance reference included in Vol 4.	Prime contractors are also part of the Team Structure and must list their name and details. Attachment 4 will be deleted. Offeror will complete Atch 3 for itself (Part I), as well as provide the information for all companies/entities that will be supporting offeror (Part II).
367	L-M		L.7.4	RFP States "shall provide teaming agreement summary". What does this consist of?	The solicitation will be revised to remove providing the teaming agreement (and Joint Venture agreement). However, the offeror must list the companies/entities that (commitment by agreement or other legal obligation) will be supporting the offeror in the IDIQ (Atch 3).
368	L-M	8	L.7.4	Team Structure: Can prime ID/IQ awardees sub to other Prime ID/IQ awardees at the task order level? Will the government confirm there is flexibility to alter teaming arrangements at the Task order level (i.e. including a subset of IDIQ teaming partners in Task Order responses where capabilities align to requirements)?	The government does not on- or off-ramp subcontractors, team members of a prime contractor. IDIQ awardees (prime contractors) will not be precluded in proposing new teammates/subcontractors at the task order level. The Prime may add or remove Team Members as needed to fulfill requirements in Fair Opportunity Proposal Requests. The Prime has discretion as to how to structure its Team to meet Small Business goals, etc. The Prime may be a Large or Small Business. At the task order level, the government may consider the Prime contractor's team change and may require additional information (for example, past experience and past performance).
369	L-M	8	L.7.4 Team Structure	Recommend the first sentence be rewritten to read "The Offer shall identify the team structure (Ref FAR 9.6 Contractor Team Arrangements) it will use to meet Government requirements."	This sentence remains unchanged.
370	L-M	8	L.7.4(a)	The requirement asks offerors to include our SAM Unique Entity Identifier (UEI), but Attachment 4 does not have a field for? Will the Government be updating the form?	The DUNS is no longer used. The UEI is now required. This will be updated in the Final RFP.
371	L-M	8	L.7.4(c)	Please confirm reference to "EC2 Specialty Areas (SA)" is referring to Attachment 7, Self-Scoring Matrix, items identified as 2.1.1-2.1.6; 2.2.1-2.2.4; 2.3.1-2.3.4; 2.4.1-2.4.5; 2.5.1-2.5.3; 2.6.1-2.6.2; & 2.7.1-2.7.7?	That is the PWS mapping for the SAs.

372	L-M	8	L.7.4, L.7.5	The Mar 2022 Q&A specifically stated that the proposal would not require teaming agreements as part of the proposal in the next version of the draft RFP. Additionally Section L Vol 3 no longer allows offerors to include work samples from teaming partners as part of the instructions for Vol 3 Past Experience. Vol 4 specifically states that only past performances may be submitted to which there is a work sample provided a part of Vol 3 Past Experience. If offerors are allowed to submit works samples from teaming partners as part of Vol 3, recommend this guidance be incorporated as part of L for Vol 3 within the sections cover work samples. What is the rationale for providing a Team Structure as part of Vol 2 Executive Summary?	The solicitation will be revised to remove providing the teaming agreement (and Joint Venture agreement). However, the offeror must list the companies/entities that (commitment by agreement or other legal obligation) will be supporting the offeror in the IDIQ (Atch 3). IAW "M.1.7. Teaming Arrangements. Teaming arrangements are not restricted. Offerors submitting a proposal as the Prime Offeror in response to this solicitation are permitted to submit a separate proposal under which they would be a Subcontractor, or team member to another prime. Subcontractors are permitted to support multiple primes." Further, the Government requires teaming structures as part of volume II to reference the potentially numerous past experience and past performance proposal documents submitted response to the RFP. Lastly, past Q&As do not impact the current Draft RFP. The Draft RFP is a sovereign document. More importantly, the final RFP will be a sovereign independent document and not tied to any other previous versions or documents including the Draft RFP.
373	L-M	9	L.7.4, L.7.5, L.7.7	Teaming partners are described as legal entities, separate from the offeror, who has signed a teaming arrangement. Note, subcontracts are negotiated after a contract is awarded to a prime, where as teaming arrangements / agreements are negotiated prior to a bid being submitted to define the roles of the team. Internally within large companies, one business unit will act as a prime and put in place a subcontract equivalent with another business unit. Both are part of the same legal bidding entity, acting as the prime offeror, and thus no teaming agreement would be submitted. Section L.7.4 requires the offerors describe their team structure and include copies of the teaming agreements in section 7.5. Then section L.7.7 asks for consent letters to use past performance from subcontractors and teaming partners. But there is no requirement to include subcontractors as part of the team structure in section L.7.4. For the EC2 acquisition / proposal, what is the definition of a subcontractor that would necessitate the submission of a consent letter for past performance?	Entities with different Unique Entity Identifiers (UEI) in SAM are considered separate business entities and would necessitate the submission of a consent letter for past performance. "The solicitation will be revised to remove providing the teaming agreement (and Joint Venture agreement). However, the offeror must list the companies/entities that (commitment by agreement or other legal obligation) will be supporting the offeror in the IDIQ (Atch 3).
374	L-M	8	L.7.4, L.7.5	Will offerors need to include Team Structure for entire EC2 period of performance, or is this intended for offerors who are using team members for Volume III scoring?	The Offeror shall identify the team structure it will use to meet Government requirements.
375	L-M	8, 17	L.7.4, M.4.3	Is there a minimum number of experiences or a score value the prime must have in order to be considered qualified. This would be in addition to the overall 90% team score?	The Offeror must achieve an overall score of 90% for all SAs in order to move onto Factor 2.
376	L-M	1	L.7.4/M.1.7	The Team structure indicates that the team structure must be addressed in the solicitation to meet Government requirements. However, in the Ordering guide pg 5, Task Order Features last bullet indicates flexible terms that allow for adding new team members at the TO level. Please clarify Prime contractors can add additional teaming structures after award not part of initial proposal to provide additional/niche value at the TO level?	The government does not on- or off-ramp subcontractors, team members of a prime contractor. IDIQ awardees (prime contractors) will not be precluded in proposing new teammates/subcontractors at the task order level. The Prime may add or remove Team Members as needed to fulfill requirements in Fair Opportunity Proposal Requests. The Prime has discretion as to how to structure its Team to meet Small Business goals, etc. The Prime may be a Large or Small Business. At the task order level, the government may consider the Prime contractor's team change and may require additional information (for example, past experience and past performance).
377	L-M	8	L.7.5	Reference "The Offeror shall provide teaming agreement summary between the Prime Offeror and each team member. Can offerors provide the front/executed page summary of each respective Teaming agreement to satisfy this requirement? Since Teaming agreements can consist of many pages and exceed the limit of 30 pages for a large team.	The solicitation will be revised to remove providing the teaming agreement (and Joint Venture agreement). However, the offeror must list the companies/entities that (commitment by agreement or other legal obligation) will be supporting the offeror in the IDIQ (Atch 3).
378	L-M	8 of 21	L.7.5	This section requires "The Offeror shall provide teaming agreement summary between the Prime Offeror and each team member. " Question: Will the Government specify what is required in the Teaming Agreement Summary?	The solicitation will be revised to remove providing the teaming agreement (and Joint Venture agreement). However, the offeror must list the companies/entities that (commitment by agreement or other legal obligation) will be supporting the offeror in the IDIQ (Atch 3).
379	L-M	8	L.7.5	Section L.7.5 specifies that Offerors must provide "teaming agreement summary" between the Prime Offeror and each team member. Would the Government please provide more detail about the content of a "teaming agreement summary" and whether copies of the actual teaming agreements must be included in proposals?	The solicitation will be revised to remove providing the teaming agreement (and Joint Venture agreement). However, the offeror must list the companies/entities that (commitment by agreement or other legal obligation) will be supporting the offeror in the IDIQ (Atch 3).
380	L-M	8	L.7.5	Can the Government please clarify exactly what is required in L.7.5 "The Offeror shall provide teaming agreement summary between the Prime Offeror and each team member"?	The solicitation will be revised to remove providing the teaming agreement (and Joint Venture agreement). However, the offeror must list the companies/entities that (commitment by agreement or other legal obligation) will be supporting the offeror in the IDIQ (Atch 3).
381	L-M	8	L.7.5	Section L.7.5 states "The Offeror shall provide teaming agreement summary between the Prime Offeror and each team member." The definition of legal entities as used throughout the solicitation is not clear. Section M.5.2 discusses a teaming agreement requirement for legal entities. Will the Government please confirm that teaming agreements are not required for subsidiary companies that roll up to a parent company and operate under a single internal operational unit?	Entities with different Unique Entity Identifiers (UEI) in SAM are considered separate business entities. The solicitation will be revised to remove providing the teaming agreement (and Joint Venture agreement). However, the offeror must list the companies/entities that (commitment by agreement or other legal obligation) will be supporting the offeror in the IDIQ (Atch 3).
382	L-M	6	L.7.5	Instructions per Section L&M on Page 6 indicate that Volume II (Executive Summary) (ref: L.7.5) for Teaming Agreements is limited to 30 pages. Standard TA's often average 10-15 pages for each TA. We recommend that the Gov't revise the page limitation to make it "No Page Limit" for Teaming Agreements or provide guidance on what is required for the summary (e.g. Exhibit A which outlines teaming partner's roles and responsibilities, workshare, etc.). We also recommend that Joint Venture agreements should be unlimited as companies may have various corporate pages based on their policy.	The solicitation will be revised to remove providing the teaming agreement (and Joint Venture agreement). However, the offeror must list the companies/entities that (commitment by agreement or other legal obligation) will be supporting the offeror in the IDIQ (Atch 3).
383	L-M	(see pg. 8 of Attach. C Sec. L&M)	L.7.5	The Government stated that "The Offeror shall provide teaming agreement summary between the Prime Offeror and each team member." The definition of a "summary" is unclear. To meet this requirement, will the Government allow Offerors to submit the cover page of each Teaming Agreement along with a 1 page Offeror-created distillation of the scope of the subcontractor's expected contribution? If not, will the Government remove the 30 page limit for this section?	The solicitation will be revised to remove providing the teaming agreement (and Joint Venture agreement). However, the offeror must list the companies/entities that (commitment by agreement or other legal obligation) will be supporting the offeror in the IDIQ (Atch 3).
384	L-M	8	L.7.5	L.7.5. Teaming Agreements. The Offeror shall provide teaming agreement summary between the Prime Offeror and each team member. (30 page limit) Please clarify this requirement. Does the government wish the original entire contents of all teaming agreements? If so, with multiple team members, this could easily exceed 30 pages. OR just a listing/summary of all teaming agreements? If just a listing/summary, what content is requested?	The solicitation will be revised to remove providing the teaming agreement (and Joint Venture agreement). However, the offeror must list the companies/entities that (commitment by agreement or other legal obligation) will be supporting the offeror in the IDIQ (Atch 3).
385	L-M	8	L.7.5	This paragraph states "Teaming Agreements. The Offeror shall provide teaming agreement summary between the Prime Offeror and each team member." Providing Teaming Agreements for all Team Members could be voluminous. Recommend only TAs be submitted from those Team Members who will be providing Past Performance/Work Samples..	The solicitation will be revised to remove providing the teaming agreement (and Joint Venture agreement). However, the offeror must list the companies/entities that (commitment by agreement or other legal obligation) will be supporting the offeror in the IDIQ (Atch 3).
386	L-M	8 of 21	L.7.5	L.7.5 states "The Offeror shall provide teaming agreement summary between the Prime Offeror and each team member". We ask the Government to provide specific guidance or a template on the what is required as part of the "teaming agreement summary" in order to ensure that Offerors provide the required information. We recommend the Government specify a minimum set of data/information required to satisfy the L.7.5 Teaming Agreements requirement to avoid any confusion in this regard. We believe the Government is asking for a "summary" since many Offerors have lengthy teaming agreements and this will reduce the pages submitted.	The solicitation will be revised to remove providing the teaming agreement (and Joint Venture agreement). However, the offeror must list the companies/entities that (commitment by agreement or other legal obligation) will be supporting the offeror in the IDIQ (Atch 3).
387	L-M	8	L.7.5	Can the Government please clarify whether the offeror is required to submit a copy of the teaming agreement for each teaming partner within the 30 page limit for this section or just a teaming agreement summary between the prime offeror and each team member (as currently stated)?	The solicitation will be revised to remove providing the teaming agreement (and Joint Venture agreement). However, the offeror must list the companies/entities that (commitment by agreement or other legal obligation) will be supporting the offeror in the IDIQ (Atch 3).
388	L-M	8	L.7.5	Do members of an unpopulated JV need to provide subcontractor teaming partner consent letters?	The unpopulated JV must still provide subcontractor teaming partner consent letters.
389	L-M	8	L.7.5	What is required to satisfy this requirement: a summary list of each teaming partner, including their workshare allocation (if any) or the actual executed TAs?	The solicitation will be revised to remove providing the teaming agreement (and Joint Venture agreement). However, the offeror must list the companies/entities that (commitment by agreement or other legal obligation) will be supporting the offeror in the IDIQ (Atch 3).
390	L-M		L.7.5	Reference: "The Offeror shall provide teaming agreement summary between the Prime Offeror and each team member." Q: Does the offeror need to include a copy of all teaming agreements? Are the teaming agreements included in the 30 page limit?	The solicitation will be revised to remove providing the teaming agreement (and Joint Venture agreement). However, the offeror must list the companies/entities that (commitment by agreement or other legal obligation) will be supporting the offeror in the IDIQ (Atch 3).
391	L-M	8	L.7.5	What is contained in "Teaming Agreement Summary" and is a separate one required for each team member?	The solicitation will be revised to remove providing the teaming agreement (and Joint Venture agreement). However, the offeror must list the companies/entities that (commitment by agreement or other legal obligation) will be supporting the offeror in the IDIQ (Atch 3).
392	L-M	8	L.7.5	Section L.7.5 requests us to provide a "teaming agreement summary". What information from the TAs does the government want to see in this summary?	The solicitation will be revised to remove providing the teaming agreement (and Joint Venture agreement). However, the offeror must list the companies/entities that (commitment by agreement or other legal obligation) will be supporting the offeror in the IDIQ (Atch 3).

393	L-M	pg 8 of 22	L.7.5 Teaming Agreements	Please confirm that the Government expects the Specialty Areas assigned to each subcontractor in the "teaming agreement summary" required in L.7.5.	The solicitation will be revised to remove providing the teaming agreement (and Joint Venture agreement). However, the offeror must list the companies/entities that (commitment by agreement or other legal obligation) will be supporting the offeror in the IDIQ (Atch 3).
394	L-M	8	L.7.5.	What information is required in the Teaming Agreement Summary?	The solicitation will be revised to remove providing the teaming agreement (and Joint Venture agreement). However, the offeror must list the companies/entities that (commitment by agreement or other legal obligation) will be supporting the offeror in the IDIQ (Atch 3).
395	L-M	8	L.7.7	Reference Subcontractor/Teaming Member Consent Letter. Does the prime to submit a consent letter with the proposal?	Yes
396	L-M	8 & 9	L.7.7	Reference Subcontractor/Teaming Member Consent Letter. It is referred to as Attachment 5 and 14. Which one is correct and should offerors correct it in the form or file name?	Attachment 5 is correct and the form will be updated in the Final RFP.
397	L-M	8	L.7.7	Reference Subcontractor/Teaming Member Consent Letter. The solicitation number is incorrect in the document. Should offerors make the correction?	No. This will be corrected in the Final RFP.
398	L-M	8	L.7.7	Are the terms Subcontractor, Teaming Member, and Teaming Partner interchangeable or is there a difference to the Government?	The offeror (prime offeror) may be a company or Joint Venture. The offeror has other companies/entities (including subcontractors, teaming members/partners, affiliates, parent companies) which will support the offeror in performance under the IDIQ, under commitment, such as agreement or other legal obligation. For government consideration of the capabilities of the supporting company's past experience or past performance, it's incumbent upon the offeror to demonstrate that the company will be supporting the offeror and describe how they will be supporting the offeror under this IDIQ. The offeror must include these companies/entities in Atch 3.
399	L-M	9	L.7.7	This section refers to the Subcontractor/Teaming Partner Consent Letter as Attachment 5. However, the Subcontractor Teaming Partner Consent Letter is titled "Attachment 14." Please reconcile.	Attachment 5 is correct and the form will be updated in the Final RFP.
400	L-M	8	L.7.7.	Text: "Offerors shall only submit Past Performance Submissions that match Work Samples submitted as part of their Past Experience proposal." Question: Can the government please clarify how many past performance submissions (PPQs or CPARs) offerors should submit? Our interpretation of the Draft RFP as written is that the government is requesting a past performance submission for every work sample, which could mean up to 62 PPQs or CPARS (given the number of work samples); this seems unduly burdensome for evaluation. Recommendation: We recommend the government specify that offerors provide at least two and no more than five past performances (PPQs or CPARs), all of which represent projects referenced in the Project Experience work samples. This is a reasonable number for evaluation of the offerors project performance (in line with standard practice for other agency-level IDIQs and Government Wide Acquisition Contracts) and will help avoid significant delays to the procurement to allow for evaluating a larger set of past performance submissions.	The Work Samples will be used for both Factors. They will be scored for Factor 1 (past experience), if a 90% is achieved, the same Work Samples from the contracts will submitted for review in Factor 2 (past performance) with the other information required under Factor 2. The factor evaluations, however, are distinct and independent.
401	L-M	9 of 21	L.8	Please clarify how Offerors shall submit work sample documentation. Should Offerors provide the documentation in a separate document (in its original form) and file, or should they be embedded within the proposal response document?	Separate documents in their original form are acceptable.
402	L-M	9	L.8	This section and the following sections imply that the Table of Contents, the Work Sample Table of Contents, the Self-Scoring Matrix, the Cross Reference Matrix, the Work Sample Cover Sheets, and the Work Samples are all included in one physical document. We believe that the Self-Scoring Matrix, the Cross Reference Matrix, and the Work Samples should be attached to Volume III as distinct files (which is what the Cross Reference Matrix implies). The Work Sample Cover Sheets could be included directly in Volume III. Can the government confirm that this is the approach that you want the bidders to follow?	Confirmed. Moreover, we request that each Volume be a stand-alone document due to the anticipated number of solicitations and multiple Government teams working on the source selection.
403	L-M	9 of 22 & 11 of 22	L.8.2 & L.9.2	Both these sections direct the incorporation of a Table of Contents. The contents of both these volumes will consist of multiple PWS/SOW/Award/CPAR documents and other various cover sheets and forms. Question: Does the Government expect each of the document pages in these volumes to be sequentially numbered from the first page through the last page overriding the individual document's internal numbering? Question: If the answer to sequential page numbering is yes, will the Government confirm that the page references noted in the Cross Reference Matrix (Attachment 8) need to reflect the page numbers noted in these the Tables of Contents?	Answers to Question. Q1: No, Q2: N/A.; Please note that L.8.2 and L.9.2. are Table of Contents and L.8.3. and L.9.3. are the volume's detailed table of contents. Additionally, an entry box has been added to Attachment 6. Work Sample Cover Sheet, so offerors can also add the number of pages that are included in the work sample. Note: At the discretion of the offeror, it may be beneficial to add "page numbers for the work sample" if the offeror believes any potential for confusion exists.
404	L-M	9	L.8.4	The Dec 2021 allowed offerors to include work samples from their teammates / partners. The new version of Section L does not include this direction as part of the instructions for Vol 3 past experience for the work samples, but does allow for past performances from teaming partners as part of Vol 4 Past Performance. Additionally Vol 3 L.8.7.1.2 when discussing requirements for subsidiaries, or legal entities and the proof required to use work samples from recently required entities, it states "This same approach and documentation requirement applies to any Subcontractor/Teaming Partner work samples". Please confirm that offerors are able to include work samples from teaming partners for their self score matrix as part of their Vol 3 submission.	Confirmed. Offerors are able to include Work Samples from companies/entities as listed in Atch 3 in their Self Scoring submission. The Government will update the verbiage to reflect this in the Final RFP.
405	L-M	9	L.8.4	Section L.8.4 states "The Offeror shall complete Attachment 7. Self- Scoring Matrix. Self-scores shall be verifiable using the work samples provided in response to L.8.6. Only Column D and the Offeror's name can be manipulated for scoring/identification purposes." In the previous draft, the Self-Scoring Matrix tied the LCATS/Tasks to each Sub-Task (e.g., PWS 2.1.1 had 37 tasks). From this Offerors could justify claimed points based on something like a percentage (90%). Now, there is no link between the Self-Scoring Matrix and LCATS/Tasks that would provide a measure of coverage/compliance as proof that the points are sufficient. Will the Government provide a link from the Task list to the self-scoring matrix to auto calculate the score? If not, can offerors provide their own spreadsheet to show the linkage from tasks to the self-scoring matrix? Will the Government identify how many Work Samples drives the 0-5-10 points?	The link to LCAT tasks was removed because it was deemed too cumbersome. The link is now only to the SA, and only two Work Samples will be accepted for each SA. The LCAT was renamed PWS Supplement and the KSAs and Tasks within are informational only and to be used to understand what sort of work can satisfy the SA.
406	L-M	9 Attach 7	L.8.4	According to L.8.4, all fields in Attach 7 except Offeror's name and Column D are password protected. However, Column F on Attach 7 appears to be editable. Would the Government consider password protecting Column F so users do not mistakenly populate that column resulting in erroneous Government score?	This will be corrected in the Final RFP.
407	L-M	9, 10	L.8.4 - L.8.6	Given the changes in the Self-Scoring Sheet and the shift from demonstrating relevancy from the individual LCAT SA Tasks to the PWS and Supplemental PWS, how will the government determine that enough relevancy has been demonstrated to count as either 5 or 10 points in each SA?	For past experience validation (0, 5, 10 points), the government will follow the process outlined in M.4.2. If the offeror achieves a score of 90% or higher, then the offeror will be evaluated for past performance. The past performance relevancy assessment will be evaluated IAW the criteria listed at M.5.3.2." The factor evaluations, however, are distinct and independent.
408	L-M	pg 9 of 22; pg 20 of 22	L.8.4 Self-Scoring Matrix; M.6.1.2 Evaluation Methodology	Can the Government provide the Offerors additional clarification on the Scoring Instructions and the method the Government will use to evaluate the applicability of the Sample Work reference documents to the Offeror's self-scoring in the self-scoring matrix? For Scoring Matrix compliance, is the Government only checking for the number of Work Sample documents provided, or will the Government review the sample documents provided for the relevance of the TASK IDs associated with each Specialty Area and LCAT? Does scoring use the tasks for each LCAT defined in 2. PWS Supplement - Task Descriptions file, similar to the previous pre-Draft RFP scoring directions defined in the Scoring Instructions for the Self-Scoring Matrix file?	The PWS provides the relevant categories and specialty areas. The PWS supplement integrates those SAs (with the task IDs, KSAs, and more). The solicitation does not prescribe that the work sample must explicitly state each and every task ID or task (or KSA). However, where an offeror cites a work sample that is vague, does not address the tasks, or provides little nexus to the SA under the IDIQ, then the government cannot extrapolate and simply may not be able to validate that work sample.
409	L-M	pg 9 of 22; pg 20 of 22	L.8.4 Self-Scoring Matrix; M.6.1.2 Evaluation Methodology	Please clarify the maximum number of work samples that can be provided from one contract engagement. For instance, can Offerors provide a PWS and a list of CDRLs, or a list of LCAT descriptions and the PWS from one contract engagement in order to score ten points for the same Specialty Area; or must the two work samples for each Specialty Area be from two separate contract engagements?	2 work samples must be provided to gain 10 points for any of the 31 Specialty Areas.
410	L-M	9	L.8.4 L.4.6	Will the Government allow Offerors to add L.4.6 proposal marking of Disclosure Statements to the Self Scoring Matrix?	L.4.6 will be revised. If proprietary data is included, the offeror may so mark.
411	L-M	9	L.8.4, M.1.7	Are work samples limited to one per proposal submission? For example, can a large business provide the same work sample to more than one small business?	Yes. A large business may provide the same work sample to more than one small business.
412	L-M	9	L.8.4.1	This paragraph references the Self-Scoring Matrix with two different Attachments for the same matrix: "...All SAs shall be independently scored in column D of Attachment 7 Self-Scoring Matrix.... and the Government will not evaluate any solicitations with any other values in Column D of Attachment 9 - Self-Scoring Matrix..." Will the Government correct the reference to Attachment 9 so that there is no confusion following the instructions outlined in Section L?	This will be corrected in the Final RFP.

413	L-M	9	L.8.4.1	The Gov't included attachment 2 - PWS supplemental task descriptions in the 2d draft RFP. In the prior draft RFP from Dec 2021, this document was used to calculate the points for the specialty areas contained in the self score matrix. It is not clear from the evaluation criteria how this document will or will not be used to evaluate the work samples. Please clarify the purpose of this document in context of the self score matrix and the work samples.	The PWS provides the relevant categories and specialty areas. The PWS supplement integrates those SAs (with the task IDs, KSAs, and more). The solicitation does not prescribe that the work sample must explicitly state each and every task ID or task (or KSA). However, where an offeror cites a work sample that is vague, does not address the tasks, or provides little nexus to the SA under the IDIQ, then the government cannot extrapolate and simply may not be able to validate that work sample.
414	L-M	9	L.8.4.1	When annotating, are we to use the Task ID provided in the PWS Supplement? If so, is there a minimum requirement (for example, a percentage of tasks) needed to meet in order for the Work Sample to qualify for the 5 points?	The offeror need not annotate a percentage of tasks in order to qualify for the 5 points. The PWS provides the relevant categories and specialty areas. The PWS supplement integrates those SAs (with the task IDs, KSAs, and more). The solicitation does not prescribe that the work sample must explicitly state each and every task ID or task (or KSA). However, where an offeror cites a work sample that is vague, does not address the tasks, or provides little nexus to the SA under the IDIQ, then the government cannot extrapolate and simply may not be able to validate that work sample.
415	L-M	9	L.8.4.1	Will both large business and small business offerors have to meet the same 90% scoring threshold to qualify on the IDIQ?	Yes
416	L-M	9	L.8.4.1	Please confirm that an Offeror must achieve at minimum threshold of 90% on the Self-Score, after Government evaluation and validation, in order for the rest of their proposal package to be reviewed. Does the Government intend to have the Self-Score submitted at an earlier date, and then all qualifying Offerors will be invited to submit the rest of their Past Performance documentation?	No. All proposal documents should be submitted at the same time.
417	L-M	9	L.8.4.1	This paragraph refers to the Self Scoring Matrix as both Attachment 7 and Attachment 9. Please reconcile.	This will be corrected in the Final RFP.
418	L-M	9	L.8.4.1	Would the Government consider changing Column D to have data validation through a list to only allow values of 0, 5 or 10 per section L.8.4.1? This will reduce burden on both the Offerors and the Government by eliminating discrepancies and errors.	This will be corrected in the Final RFP.
419	L-M	9	L.8.4.1	Reference: Scoring Are subcontracts and prime contracts used in work samples point value the same?	Yes.
420	L-M	9	L.8.4.1	Text: "Only 0, 5, or 10 is permitted and the Government will not evaluate any solicitations with any other values in Column D of Attachment 9 - Self-Scoring Matrix. " Question: Does the Government mean "Attachment 7 - Self-Scoring Matrix"? Recommendation: Please update as needed. Thank you.	This will be corrected in the Final RFP.
421	L-M	9 of 21	L.8.4.1 and Answer A:21	Section L reference states that "Proposals shall be scored beginning with the O&M Category through the Securely Provision Category on the Self Scoring Matrix. All SAs shall be independently scored in column D of Attachment 7 Self-Scoring Matrix. RFI Q&A #21 states "To avoid confusion, the terms Functional and Program Areas are replaced with Categories and Specialty Areas moving forward. Specialty Areas will require cross-reference." For reference, the 01Nov2021 Section L para 2.4.5 was structured with 3-digit Functional Areas nested under a 2-digit Program Area. Section L reference to SAs [Specialty Areas] seems to coincide with 3-digit items such as 2.1.1 Data Administration; however the Q&A response seems to imply that these 3-digit items which used to be called Functional Areas will now referred to as "Categories." Question: Will the Government clarify the terminology: what is the correct term to use for reference to the 2-digit items such as 2.1 "Operate and Maintain (Category)? What is the correct term to use for reference to the 3-digit items such as 2.1.1 "Data Administration (Specialty Area)?" What is the correct term to use for reference to the 4-digit items presented in Attachment 2 PWS Supplement Tasks such as T0007 "Analyze and define data requirements and specifications" (Task Area Identifier)?	The correct terms will be provided in the Final RFP. Please note that previous RFI Q&As are not interrelated to this Draft RFP. Likewise, the Final RFP will not be subject to any previous postings or documents. The Final RFP will be a sovereign, stand-alone document, not related to the Draft RFP. The purpose of these Q&As is to iron out best practices and improvements so the Final RFP will be the most accurate and succinct possible document. The RFP (and not the preceding RFI, draft RFP, Q&As) , represents the authoritative, governing document. Please refer to the provisions of the RFP.
422	L-M	9 of 21	L.8.4.1. Scoring	The last sentence states, "Government will not evaluate any solicitations with any other values in Column D of Attachment 9 - Self-Scoring Matrix. An offeror must achieve a 90% or higher overall score to be deemed Qualified and advanced for Past Performance scoring." Please confirm this should reference Attachment 7 instead of Attachment 9?	This will be corrected in the Final RFP.
423	L-M	9	L.8.4.1; Attachment 7	Recommend the Government add back in the Work Sample Cross Reference Matrix Column included in the prior December 2021 Draft Self Scoring Matrix to allow offerors to support the Government's ease in evaluating the claimed scoring elements by Work Sample. Recommend the column be incorporated as an additional column between Column B "Category" and Column C "Maximum Self Score Points." For example an entry for this column might read "WS1; WS17".	This will be corrected in the Final RFP.
424	L-M	9	L.8.4.3	The Burden of Proof section is associated with the Self Scoring Matrix which only includes scores (and no other information). The Cross Reference document requests page numbers, paragraph numbers to identify the sections in the Work Samples that substantiate that the bidders has performed the work associated with the Specialty Areas. Does the government expect additional narrative in Volume III to substantiate that the contractor has performed the work associated with the Specialty Areas?	This will be corrected and L.8.4.3 will be L.8.5. and as applies to all Volume II, Past Experience. The offeror may add narrative in any form or fashion within the requirements of the RFP. Most notably Attachment 6, Work Sample Cover Sheet has space for narrative for each work sample.
425	L-M	9 of 22	L.8.4.3	This section states for" Burden of Proof. The burden of proof for substantiating points in the self-score system rests with the Offeror. The proposal shall contain sufficient data to substantiate the points claimed by the Offeror." Question: If the burden of proof rests on the number of claimed SA Tasks listed in the respective labor category tabs in Attachment 2 PWS Supplement Task Descriptions, how should offerors count those tasks that are repeated within two or three SA-relevant labor category taskings?	The PWS provides the relevant categories and specialty areas. The PWS supplement integrates those SAs (with the task IDs, KSAs, and more). The solicitation does not prescribe that the work sample must explicitly state each and every task ID or task (or KSA). However, where an offeror cites a work sample that is vague, does not address the tasks, or provides little nexus to the SA under the IDIQ, then the government cannot extrapolate and simply may not be able to validate that work sample.
426	L-M	10	L.8.4.3 and L.8.6.3	Given that L.8.4.3 notes that: "The burden of proof for substantiating points" rests with the offeror, can multiple artifacts (PWS, SOW, and/or CDRLs) from a single task order be combined and used as one (1) work sample against that SA to strengthen substantiation?	Yes. This is acceptable and recommended. Section L.8.6.2 will be revised to provide further clarification of work sample submissions. The work samples shall consist of only official contract documentation. "Official contract documentation" includes key documents integral to contract performance, including contracts, orders, modifications, PWS/SOW/SOO, CDRLs, subcontracting plans, invoices, meeting minutes, progress reports, monthly status reports, or other reports. The contractor may submit other documentation it regards to be integral to the contract (i.e., CPARS, FPDS, memos from COs/government official/prime contractor), but offerors are cautioned that the documentation is validated for past experience (not past performance) and that authenticity (contract-contemporaneous documents) and level of detail are critical considerations of any work sample. The Government cautions offerors to ensure detailed information (through the work sample and attachments (Atch 6). Do not presume that the government will necessarily extrapolate details that are not clearly presented. Submission of relevant excerpts (vice submitting an entire document) is recommended. In Atch 6 and the work sample, spelling out critical acronyms, providing "lay person" explanations, and marking/highlighting (or otherwise distinguishing) key excerpts may also ensure that the Government may consider the work sample and its nexus to the SAs under the IDIQ. The markings/highlighting should be evident that the marking/highlighting were newly-added by the offeror and not part of the original document.
427	L-M	10 of 22	L.8.5	This section states "The Offeror shall include a work sample identifier (i.e., WS1-WS62), EC2 SA, document title, document date, page(s), paragraph(s), table number(s) (if applicable), and block(s) (if applicable) within Column E, Reference. Offerors shall submit references that illustrate experience in EC2 SAs." Question: Since there are 31 SAs and an allowance for two Work Samples per SA, will the Government confirm that Attachment 8 could expand to include 62 rows if the offeror has two Work Samples per SA? Question: Since each Work Sample will have a single row per SA, and the Offeror may have dozens of relevant paragraphs to cite, will the Government confirm the offeror can use "wrap text" to expand the depth of the cells in Column E Reference? Question: Will the Government confirm that the data element in Column E "document date page" should be "document date, page?" Question: Reference Attachment 8 column C, will the Government confirm that these numbers should be revised to match the Work Sample #s or should they remain aligned with the 31 SA #s?	Q1: Confirmed, the worksheet may expand to include up to 62 rows/work samples. Q2: Confirmed. Offerors may use wrap text to expend the cells. Q3: Confirmed, Column E should read document date, page. This has been updated in Attachment 8, Q4:Worksheet has been updated to pertain to the specific specialty area with an "a" for the first WS and a "b" for the second.

428	L-M	10 of 21	L.8.5	<p>The requirement states "The Offeror shall identify the type of document provided as a work sample in Column E. The Offeror shall include a work sample identifier (i.e., WS1-WS62), EC2 SA, document title, document date, page(s), paragraph(s), table number(s) (if applicable), and block(s) (if applicable) within Column E, Reference. Offerors shall submit references that illustrate experience in EC2 SAs. The purpose of the Cross Reference Matrix is to map the SA to the Work Sample." As the offeror documents multiple pages and potentially dozens of paragraphs within the WS that demonstrate EC2 SA relevant work, the process does not seem to provide a means to "map" identified paragraphs to a <u>specific</u> EC2 SA work requirement (e.g. PWS task and/or PWS Supplement task).</p> <p>Question: Will the Government permit the Offeror to use callout boxes or similar text boxes located <u>in the margins</u> near the cited paragraph within the WS that notes the "mapping" of that PWS task to an element of that SA's PWS description (e.g., administer database) and/or PWS Supplement Task descriptions (e.g. T0007, T0642)?</p> <p>Question: To assist evaluators verify the noted page and paragraph number tasking, will the Government allow offerors to highlight the specific tasking they mapped to the PWS Task or PWS Supplemental Task in their Work Sample?</p>	<p>Section L.8.6.2 will be revised to provide further clarification of work sample submissions. The work samples shall consist of only official contract documentation. "Official contract documentation" includes key documents integral to contract performance, including contracts, orders, modifications, PWS/SOW/SOO, CDRLs, subcontracting plans, invoices, meeting minutes, progress reports, monthly status reports, or other reports. The contractor may submit other documentation it regards to be integral to the contract (i.e., CPARS, FPDS, memos from COs/government official/prime contractor), but offerors are cautioned that the documentation is validated for past experience (not past performance) and that authenticity (contract-contemporaneous documents) and level of detail are critical considerations of any work sample.</p> <p>The Government cautions offerors to ensure detailed information (through the work sample and attachments (Atch 6). Do not presume that the government will necessarily extrapolate details that are not clearly presented. Submission of relevant excerpts (vice submitting an entire document) is recommended. In Atch 6 and the work sample, spelling out critical acronyms, providing "lay person" explanations, and marking/highlighting (or otherwise distinguishing) key excerpts may also ensure that the Government may consider the work sample and its nexus to the SAs under the IDIQ. The markings/highlighting should be evident that the marking/highlighting were newly-added by the offeror and not part of the original document.</p>
429	L-M	page 10 of 22	L.8.5	Would the Government please confirms that the Offeror shall identify the type of document provided as a work sample within Column D ?	Column D of the Cross-Reference Matrix should simply be the type of document. E.g., PWS, SOW, etc.
430	L-M	10	L.8.5	This section says " <i>If the Offeror uses a subsidiary or legal entity as a prime work sample the Offeror shall be sure to include a reference to the objective evidence which demonstrates that they are a legal entity of the parent corporation and affirm that this subsidiary/legal entity will be supporting offeror in the performance of this contract</i> ". Please clarify whether this affirmation should go in the Cross Reference Matrix, in Volume III, or in the Team Structure section of Volume II.	Team Structure of Volume II.
431	L-M	10	L.8.5	In addition to identifying in the Cross Reference Matrix (CRM), to help evaluators locate the specific scope for verification purposes, can offerors highlight the precise content and/or headers in the work sample?	<p>Section L.8.6.2 will be revised to provide further clarification of work sample submissions. The work samples shall consist of only official contract documentation. "Official contract documentation" includes key documents integral to contract performance, including contracts, orders, modifications, PWS/SOW/SOO, CDRLs, subcontracting plans, invoices, meeting minutes, progress reports, monthly status reports, or other reports. The contractor may submit other documentation it regards to be integral to the contract (i.e., CPARS, FPDS, memos from COs/government official/prime contractor), but offerors are cautioned that the documentation is validated for past experience (not past performance) and that authenticity (contract-contemporaneous documents) and level of detail are critical considerations of any work sample.</p> <p>The Government cautions offerors to ensure detailed information (through the work sample and attachments (Atch 6). Do not presume that the government will necessarily extrapolate details that are not clearly presented. Submission of relevant excerpts (vice submitting an entire document) is recommended. In Atch 6 and the work sample, spelling out critical acronyms, providing "lay person" explanations, and marking/highlighting (or otherwise distinguishing) key excerpts may also ensure that the Government may consider the work sample and its nexus to the SAs under the IDIQ. The markings/highlighting should be evident that the marking/highlighting were newly-added by the offeror and not part of the original document.</p>
432	L-M	10	L.8.5	Section L.8.5 requires offerors who use a subsidiary or legal entity for a prime work sample to "include a reference to the objective evidence which demonstrates that they are a legal entity of the parent corporation and affirm that this subsidiary/legal entity will be supporting offeror in the performance of this contract." Could the Government please clarify where offerors should include the evidence and affirmation statements required for subsidiary or legal entity work sample use? Is it to be included in Volume IV Organization Structure Change History section?	Team Structure of Volume II.
433	L-M	10	L.8.5	L.8.5 states that "The purpose of the Cross Reference Matrix is to map the SA to the Work Sample." Shouldn't Attachment 10 (EC2 Contract Cross Rerence matrix) have two lines per SA? Offerors can add lines, but it is visually easier to process and reduces potential for errors if the template includes 2 lines per SA for the 2 work samples.	This will be corrected in the Final RFP.
434	L-M	10 of 22	L.8.5	<p>This section states "The Offeror shall include a work sample identifier (i.e., WS1-WS62), EC2 SA, document title, document date, page(s), paragraph(s), table number(s) (if applicable), and block(s) (if applicable) within Column E, Reference. Offerors shall submit references that illustrate experience in EC2 SAs."</p> <p>The requirement to identify the page and paragraph number of the Work Sample "EC SA" does not appear to provide the evaluator ample information to track to a specific element of the SA Work Sample PWS (RFP Attachment 1) or PWS Supplement Task Descriptions (RFP Attachment 2).</p> <p>Question: Will the Government provide additional clarification on how offerors are to note the WS PWS specific "EC SA" task element for that singular page and paragraph element (e.g. "SA 2.1.1 TID 0008" for PWS Supplement SA 2.1.1 Data Administration OM-DTA-001 task T0008...or "PWS 2.2.1.1" for a task related to the PWS description of Cybersecurity Management?</p>	Final RFP will include directions and a clearly laid out language.
435	L-M	10	L.8.5 Cell E.4	Recommend the Government modify their instructions under L.8.5 to allow offerors to complete a separate Cross Reference Matrix for each Work sample completed to reflect the scoring elements claimed. This will allow the Government to quickly evaluate each work sample scored and for offerors to provide simple descriptions for the documentation organized. Additionally, to further support ease in evaluation recommend the Government allow offerors to add as many PWS Specialty Area rows as necessary for each source document type provided for the EC2 SAs claimed. This will support the Government's ease in evaluation and allow the Government to quickly move through the Work Sample documentation.	Final RFP will include directions and a clearly laid out language.
436	L-M	10	L.8.5 L.4.6	Will the Government allow Offerors to add L.4.6 proposal marking of Disclosure Statements to the Cross Reference Matrix?	If the contractor believes the cross reference matrix to be source selection information in accordance with the definition provided at FAR Part 2 the offeror may label it as such, yes.
437	L-M	10, 11	L.8.5, L.8.7.1.2	In the two referenced sections, the RFP specifies that If an Offeror uses a subsidiary or legal entity as a prime work sample it must include a reference to the objective evidence which demonstrates that they are a legal entity of the parent corporation and affirm that this subsidiary/legal entity will be supporting offeror in the performance of this contract. Should this information be included on the Work Sample Cover Sheet, in Column C of the Cross Reference Matrix, or in some other location within the proposal?	Team Structure of Volume II.
438	L-M	10	L.8.5.3	<p>Section L.8.5.3 states "However, individual task orders, performed under an IDIQ contract, can be used as a work sample."</p> <p>Situations exist where relevant same program contract/task order support have been provided under multiple contract/task orders (old contract/task order, bridge contract, new contract/task order) yet each are under a different contract vehicle with a different contract number and with all three programs contract/task orders meeting the relevancy requirements of L.8.7.1 and M.5.3.1.</p> <p>In this situation, will Offerors be allowed to use each contract/task order as separate work samples?</p>	Yes
439	L-M	Page 10; 1	L.8.5; Column D	RFP L.8.5 states "The Offeror shall identify the type of document provided as a work sample in Column E." Should this be Column D?	This will be corrected in the Final RFP.
440	L-M	10; 1	L.8.5; Column D	<p>On the Pre-Solicitation Conference call, the Government appeared to suggest multiple documents from the same contract — such as the PWS and the CDRL — can be provided in a single work sample for a given Specialty Area. If this is correct, then please:</p> <p>1) update RFP Section L.8.5 to indicate multiple documents are permitted in each work sample by making appropriate items plural (e.g., "document title(s)", "document title(s)", "document date(s)", etc.)</p> <p>2) update the Cross Reference Matrix so the label of Column D is "Document Types" (plural) instead of "Document Type" (singular)</p>	A Work Sample can satisfy multiple Specialty Areas and each needs to be specifically identified. To fully satisfy any specific Specialty Area (10 points), two separate Work Samples (different contracts) must be provided.
441	L-M	10	L.8.6	Reference Work Sample Cover Sheet. For "subcontractor work samples, the Offeror shall provide at least two (2) POCs for the prime company." There is only one field for "3. Prime Company Point of Contact"	A 2nd POC entry will be added for the 2nd POC in the Final RFP.
442	L-M	10	L.8.6	Can the government please provide an example of an annotated and scored Work Sample?	Final RFP will include directions, which will include the requested Work Sample.

443	L-M	10	L.8.6	Should work samples be uniquely assigned to the 31 Specialty Areas? For example, the offeror may use the same contract for more than one specialty area, but submits a uniquely annotated set of documentation per specialty area to avoid having hundreds of markings on a single work sample.	Yes, work samples and the specialist area they are associated with is referenced in attachment 8, Cross Reference Matrix.
444	L-M	10	L.8.6	If you have been a subcontractor for one of the Specialties, what documentation do you provide to substantiate work experience in the absence of a PWS, SOW, or CDRL?	Subcontractors may obtain PWS/SOW/CDRLs from SAM. However, in the absence of PWS/SOW/CDRL, the offeror may exercise its discretion in determining other official contract documentation to provide. For example, a subcontractor might submit its contract with the prime contractor, invoices, reports, other documents it prepared. Offerors are not precluded from submission of other documents/memos they regard as integral to the contract, but offerors must understand that the burden rests on the offeror to substantiate the past experience.
445	L-M	10	L.8.6	To reduce file size, recommend allowing Offerors to provide only the relevant pages from each work sample.	Offerors need not submit documents or pages that don't support or actively demonstrate the offeror's past experience in performing any particular specialty area.
446	L-M	10	L.8.6	When reading the work sample sections L & M, it is not clear what needs to be included from the Task Order, PWS etc for the work sample citation. Do they want the full PWS with specific section highlighted and cited on the Work Sample cover sheet and matrix or only the pertinent page or paragraph from the full PWS etc.? It is unlimited page count, but seems like it could be a lot of data to have to scan and transmit if the want the full volume/citation.	<p>A full PWS or an excerpt alongside a cover page is satisfactory. Section L.8.6.2 will be revised to provide further clarification of work sample submissions. The work samples shall consist of only official contract documentation. "Official contract documentation" includes key documents integral to contract performance, including contracts, orders, modifications, PWS/SOW/SOO, CDRLs, subcontracting plans, invoices, meeting minutes, progress reports, monthly status reports, or other reports. The contractor may submit other documentation it regards to be integral to the contract (i.e., CPARS, FPDS, memos from COs/government official/prime contractor), but offerors are cautioned that the documentation is validated for past experience (not past performance) and that authenticity (contract-contemporaneous documents) and level of detail are critical considerations of any work sample.</p> <p>The Government cautions offerors to ensure detailed information (through the work sample and attachments (Atch 6). Do not presume that the government will necessarily extrapolate details that are not clearly presented. Submission of relevant excerpts (vice submitting an entire document) is recommended. In Atch 6 and the work sample, spelling out critical acronyms, providing "lay person" explanations, and marking/highlighting (or otherwise distinguishing) key excerpts may also ensure that the Government may consider the work sample and its nexus to the SAs under the IDIQ. The markings/highlighting should be evident that the marking/highlighting were newly-added by the offeror and not part of the original document.</p>
447	Work Sample Cover Sheet	10 of 21	L.8.6.1	This form's instructions refer to SOC-E and defines Scope of Work as "Program Management, Operations & Maintenance, Install/Warehouse, SOC-Enterprise Services/Helpdesk." Question: Will the Government update the form to reflect the EC2 Scope of Work?	This was an error and will be corrected in the Final RFP.
448	L-M	pg.10	L.8.6.1	L.8.6.1. Work Sample Cover Sheet states: "For subcontractor work samples, the Offeror shall provide at least two (2) POCs for the prime company." Q: Can the Government please confirm that if a prime Offeror's teaming partners can submit work samples, these samples can be instances where the teaming partner in question performed work as a subcontractor?	Confirmed. Subcontractor work is sufficient as long as they are identified in Volume II and Attachment 3.
449	L-M	10	L.8.6.1	States: For subcontractor work samples, the Offeror shall provide at least two POCs for the Prime Company. Please clarify if this is for the Offeror's subcontractors and/or if this is for work samples presented by the Prime for work they completed as a subcontractor.	Subcontractor work is sufficient as long as they are identified in Volume II and Attachment 3.
450	L-M	(see pg. 10 of Attach. C Sec. L&M)	L.8.6.1	Section L.8.6.1 states that "For subcontractor work samples, the Offeror shall provide at least two (2) POCs for the prime company." For subcontractor work samples is it only necessary to include the two prime company POCs on the Attachment 6, and no Government POCs are required? This would make sense given that there is no contractual relationship between a subcontractor and the Government.	Government POCs are not required if there is no relationship between the Government and the subcontractor.
451	L-M	10	L.8.6.1	This section refers to the Work Sample Cover Sheet as Attachment 6. However, the Work Sample Cover Sheet is title "Attachment 8." Please reconcile.	This will be corrected in the Final RFP.
452	L-M	10	L.8.6.1	This section states "For subcontractor work samples, the Offeror shall provide at least two (2) POCs for the prime company." However, the Work Sample Cover Sheet provides space for only one Prime Company POC. Please reconcile.	This will be corrected in the Final RFP.
453	L-M		L.8.6.1	Reference Attachment Headers for Attachments 3,5,6,9 Q: The Attachment header is not consistent with the file name or Attachment references in Section L. can the Government please make these consistent.	This will be corrected in the Final RFP.
454	L-M	10	L.8.6.1.	Previous Q&A (Q100 and others) noted that Prime offerors can submit Past Experience/Performance for work on which they were a subcontractor; and the draft RFP language in L.8.6.1 also indirectly indicates that this is permitted: "For subcontractor work samples, the Offeror shall provide at least two (2) POCs for the prime company. The Government may contact the prime company POCs provided ..." Will the Government be adding direct language that allows Prime experience as a subcontractor to Section L of the final RFP?	Offerors may submit past experience or past performance proposal information as having participated at any level including as a Prime, Subcontractor, Partner, or other business arrangements.
455	L-M	10	L.8.6.2	<p>Section L.8.6.2 states "If a work sample substantiates multiple SAs then, each SA work effort must be identified within the work sample. Offerors shall only provide official contract documentation. Offerors shall give each work samples an identifier (i.e. WS1-WS62)."</p> <p>This Offeror has executed a few self-scoring contract efforts. We ask that the Government consider a work sample pre-review process prior to the FRFP to review and comment on work samples. We have done this on a prior major acquisition (ASTRO MA IDIQ TCV of \$8.5B) which enabled the Government an opportunity to preview the offerors' inputs ensuring that they received the best material to evaluate the self-scoring matrix method. This accomplished two objectives for the Government. First it allows for the offeror to increase the quality and vector of the offerors' inputs saving the Government the time and cost of interacting with substandard work samples during Source Selection. All offerors are afforded the pre-review opportunity. Secondly, the acquisition team gets a sense/preview of the vast amount of material they will have to evaluate during the source selection process. We alone fully expect to produce hundreds of pages of Government based documented evidence for each work sample. We recommend highlighting references and providing annotations (like what FEDSIM did on the ASTRO contract) to make the Gov. evaluation process more efficient.</p>	Offerors are free to highlight any portion they would like and to do anything that makes it easier for the Government to expediently locate the information for validation purposes. The Government does not find it necessary to host a pre-review session(s) of offeror's work samples.
456	L-M	10 of 21	L.8.6.2	The requirement states "If a work sample substantiates multiple SAs then, each SA work effort must be identified within the work sample." Question: When a PWS includes work that covers multiple SAs and/or Categories, will the Government allow that same PWS to have multiple Work Sample identifiers? For example if PWS "ABC" contains taskings that support both SA 2.1.1 and SA 2.2.2, then PWS "ABC" would be numbered WS01 and used to reference SA 2.1.1 taskings and that same PWS "ABC" then labeled WS03 and used to reference SA 2.1.2 taskings [assumes Offeror has two WSs for SA 2.1.1)	Yes. A single Work Sample may be used to fulfill multiple SAs. Please utilize the Cross Reference Matrix to capture the scenario described.
457	L-M	10 of 21	L.8.6.2	The requirement for Work Samples states "The work samples shall consist of only official contract documentation which may include Performance Work Statements (PWS), Statements of Work (SOW), or Contract Data Requirement Lists (CDRLs)." Question: Recognizing the multiple sections of a PWS/SOW/CDRL, will the Government permit the offeror to extract non-relevant pages from the document and only include the cover page and pages that include relevant information?	Yes. Offerors need not include non-relevant pages or documents.
458	L-M	11 of 21	L.8.6.2	The requirement for Work Samples states "All pages within the work samples shall be numbered." Question: If the offeror extracts pages from the WS document, will the Government accept the modified PWS/SOW/CDRL document with non-sequential page numbering?	Yes. An entry box has been added to Attachment 6. Work Sample Cover Sheet, so offerors can also add the number of pages that are included in the work sample. Note: At the discretion of the offeror, it may be beneficial to add "page numbers for the work sample" if the offeror believes any potential for confusion exists. An additional alternative is to place the page number at the bottom, right of the page (to distinguish from the original page numbering of the PWS/document).
459	L-M	10 of 21	L.8.6.2	This section states "When contracts are used for work samples, the Offeror shall also include the signed cover page associated with the contract (not counted against page limits)." Question: Will the Government clarify what is meant by the "cover page associated with the contract?" Is the CO-signed contract award document the intended document?	Yes. The CO signed contract award document is the intended cover page/document. It should be 1 or no more than 2 pages.

460	L-M	10 of 21	L.8.6.2	The Government states that: "The work samples shall consist of only official contract documentation which may include Performance Work Statements (PWS), Statements of Work (SOW), or Contract Data Requirement Lists (CDRLs)." Will the Government confirm that an SSO, CLIN documentation, and an FPDS report are acceptable forms of documentation?	<p>Section L.8.6.2 will be revised to provide further clarification of work sample submissions. The work samples shall consist of only official contract documentation. "Official contract documentation" includes key documents integral to contract performance, including contracts, orders, modifications, PWS/SOW/SOO, CDRLs, subcontracting plans, invoices, meeting minutes, progress reports, monthly status reports, or other reports. The contractor may submit other documentation it regards to be integral to the contract (i.e., CPARS, FPDS, memos from COs/government official/prime contractor), but offerors are cautioned that the documentation is validated for past experience (not past performance) and that authenticity (contract-contemporaneous documents) and level of detail are critical considerations of any work sample.</p> <p>The Government cautions offerors to ensure detailed information (through the work sample and attachments (Atch 6). Do not presume that the government will necessarily extrapolate details that are not clearly presented. Submission of relevant excerpts (vice submitting an entire document) is recommended. In Atch 6 and the work sample, spelling out critical acronyms, providing "lay person" explanations, and marking/highlighting (or otherwise distinguishing) key excerpts may also ensure that the Government may consider the work sample and its nexus to the SAs under the IDIQ. The markings/highlighting should be evident that the marking/highlighting were newly-added by the offeror and not part of the original document.</p>
461	L-M	10 of 22	L.8.6.2	L.8.6.2 states: "All pages within the work samples shall be numbered." Would the Government prefer that Offerors embed contract documentation in MS word files in order to sequentially number them, or should Offerors leave documentation in original form even if it is not page numbered?	Original documents are preferred but either approach is acceptable if it follows the submission criteria provided in the RFP. Note: At the discretion of the offeror, it may be beneficial to add "page numbers for the work sample" if the offeror believes any potential for confusion exists. An additional alternative is to place the page number at the bottom, right of the page (to distinguish from the original page numbering of the PWS/document).
462	L-M	10 of 21	L.8.6.2	It is likely that some work samples may have a Statement of Objectives (SOO) instead of a traditional SOW or PWS. For those contracts that only have a SOO, would the Government allow a signed letter from a program Contracting Officer or Contracting Officer Representative outlining actual work performed by the Offeror as substantiation? Allowing this form of substantiation has been standard practice on other self-scoring solicitations such as OASIS and CIO-SP4.	<p>Yes. This is permissible. Section L.8.6.2 will be revised to provide further clarification of work sample submissions. The work samples shall consist of only official contract documentation. "Official contract documentation" includes key documents integral to contract performance, including contracts, orders, modifications, PWS/SOW/SOO, CDRLs, subcontracting plans, invoices, meeting minutes, progress reports, monthly status reports, or other reports. The contractor may submit other documentation it regards to be integral to the contract (i.e., CPARS, FPDS, memos from COs/government official/prime contractor), but offerors are cautioned that the documentation is validated for past experience (not past performance) and that authenticity (contract-contemporaneous documents) and level of detail are critical considerations of any work sample.</p> <p>The Government cautions offerors to ensure detailed information (through the work sample and attachments (Atch 6). Do not presume that the government will necessarily extrapolate details that are not clearly presented. Submission of relevant excerpts (vice submitting an entire document) is recommended. In Atch 6 and the work sample, spelling out critical acronyms, providing "lay person" explanations, and marking/highlighting (or otherwise distinguishing) key excerpts may also ensure that the Government may consider the work sample and its nexus to the SAs under the IDIQ. The markings/highlighting should be evident that the marking/highlighting were newly-added by the offeror and not part of the original document.</p>
463	L-M	10	L.8.6.2	Section L.8.6.2 specifies that work samples may consist of only "official contract documentation" which may include Performance Work Statements (PWS), Statements of Work (SOW), or Contract Data Requirement Lists (CDRLs). In many cases, these documents do not provide the level of detail that would make it obvious that the contract supports a specific SA. Would the Government confirm that it will also permit contract attachments, contract modifications, documents included by reference in the contract, and documents that are part of the contract file (e.g., monthly progress reports and invoices, deliverables)?	<p>Section L.8.6.2 will be revised to provide further clarification of work sample submissions. The work samples shall consist of only official contract documentation. "Official contract documentation" includes key documents integral to contract performance, including contracts, orders, modifications, PWS/SOW/SOO, CDRLs, subcontracting plans, invoices, meeting minutes, progress reports, monthly status reports, or other reports. The contractor may submit other documentation it regards to be integral to the contract (i.e., CPARS, FPDS, memos from COs/government official/prime contractor), but offerors are cautioned that the documentation is validated for past experience (not past performance) and that authenticity (contract-contemporaneous documents) and level of detail are critical considerations of any work sample.</p> <p>The Government cautions offerors to ensure detailed information (through the work sample and attachments (Atch 6). Do not presume that the government will necessarily extrapolate details that are not clearly presented. Submission of relevant excerpts (vice submitting an entire document) is recommended. In Atch 6 and the work sample, spelling out critical acronyms, providing "lay person" explanations, and marking/highlighting (or otherwise distinguishing) key excerpts may also ensure that the Government may consider the work sample and its nexus to the SAs under the IDIQ. The markings/highlighting should be evident that the marking/highlighting were newly-added by the offeror and not part of the original document.</p>
464	L-M	10	L.8.6.2	Section L.8.6.2 specifies that work samples may consist of only "official contract documentation" which may include Performance Work Statements (PWS), Statements of Work (SOW), or Contract Data Requirement Lists (CDRLs). Sometimes the contract documents do not reflect the full awarded value or the full period of performance, and those items are changed incrementally as options are exercised or additional scope is added. For federal projects, would the Government permit inclusion of the latest FPDS report to verify the full period of performance and the total contract value including all options?	<p>Section L.8.6.2 will be revised to provide further clarification of work sample submissions. The work samples shall consist of only official contract documentation. "Official contract documentation" includes key documents integral to contract performance, including contracts, orders, modifications, PWS/SOW/SOO, CDRLs, subcontracting plans, invoices, meeting minutes, progress reports, monthly status reports, or other reports. The contractor may submit other documentation it regards to be integral to the contract (i.e., CPARS, FPDS, memos from COs/government official/prime contractor), but offerors are cautioned that the documentation is validated for past experience (not past performance) and that authenticity (contract-contemporaneous documents) and level of detail are critical considerations of any work sample.</p> <p>The Government cautions offerors to ensure detailed information (through the work sample and attachments (Atch 6). Do not presume that the government will necessarily extrapolate details that are not clearly presented. Submission of relevant excerpts (vice submitting an entire document) is recommended. In Atch 6 and the work sample, spelling out critical acronyms, providing "lay person" explanations, and marking/highlighting (or otherwise distinguishing) key excerpts may also ensure that the Government may consider the work sample and its nexus to the SAs under the IDIQ. The markings/highlighting should be evident that the marking/highlighting were newly-added by the offeror and not part of the original document.</p>
465	L-M	10	L.8.6.2	In regards to the Work Samples submitted, should Offeror's submit the entire PWS/SOW/CDRL or just the signed cover page and relevant pages being mapped to EC2 Speciality Areas?	<p>Section L.8.6.2 will be revised to provide further clarification of work sample submissions. The work samples shall consist of only official contract documentation. "Official contract documentation" includes key documents integral to contract performance, including contracts, orders, modifications, PWS/SOW/SOO, CDRLs, subcontracting plans, invoices, meeting minutes, progress reports, monthly status reports, or other reports. The contractor may submit other documentation it regards to be integral to the contract (i.e., CPARS, FPDS, memos from COs/government official/prime contractor), but offerors are cautioned that the documentation is validated for past experience (not past performance) and that authenticity (contract-contemporaneous documents) and level of detail are critical considerations of any work sample.</p> <p>The Government cautions offerors to ensure detailed information (through the work sample and attachments (Atch 6). Do not presume that the government will necessarily extrapolate details that are not clearly presented. Submission of relevant excerpts (vice submitting an entire document) is recommended. In Atch 6 and the work sample, spelling out critical acronyms, providing "lay person" explanations, and marking/highlighting (or otherwise distinguishing) key excerpts may also ensure that the Government may consider the work sample and its nexus to the SAs under the IDIQ. The markings/highlighting should be evident that the marking/highlighting were newly-added by the offeror and not part of the original document.</p>

466	L-M	10	L.8.6.2	In regards to the Work Samples submitted, should Offeror's highlight the sections in the PWS/SOW/CDRLs that are relevant to EC2 Specialty Areas?	<p>Section L.8.6.2 will be revised to provide further clarification of work sample submissions. The work samples shall consist of only official contract documentation. "Official contract documentation" includes key documents integral to contract performance, including contracts, orders, modifications, PWS/SOW/SOO, CDRLs, subcontracting plans, invoices, meeting minutes, progress reports, monthly status reports, or other reports. The contractor may submit other documentation it regards to be integral to the contract (i.e., CPARS, FPDS, memos from COs/government official/prime contractor), but offerors are cautioned that the documentation is validated for past experience (not past performance) and that authenticity (contract-contemporaneous documents) and level of detail are critical considerations of any work sample.</p> <p>The Government cautions offerors to ensure detailed information (through the work sample and attachments (Atch 6). Do not presume that the government will necessarily extrapolate details that are not clearly presented. Submission of relevant excerpts (vice submitting an entire document) is recommended. In Atch 6 and the work sample, spelling out critical acronyms, providing "lay person" explanations, and marking/highlighting (or otherwise distinguishing) key excerpts may also ensure that the Government may consider the work sample and its nexus to the SAs under the IDIQ. The markings/highlighting should be evident that the marking/highlighting were newly-added by the offeror and not part of the original document.</p>
467	L-M	10	L.8.6.2	In addition to the contractual documentation, can we use CPARs and FPDS as supporting documentation to validate Period of Performance, Work Sample Value, etc.?	<p>Section L.8.6.2 will be revised to provide further clarification of work sample submissions. The work samples shall consist of only official contract documentation. "Official contract documentation" includes key documents integral to contract performance, including contracts, orders, modifications, PWS/SOW/SOO, CDRLs, subcontracting plans, invoices, meeting minutes, progress reports, monthly status reports, or other reports. The contractor may submit other documentation it regards to be integral to the contract (i.e., CPARS, FPDS, memos from COs/government official/prime contractor), but offerors are cautioned that the documentation is validated for past experience (not past performance) and that authenticity (contract-contemporaneous documents) and level of detail are critical considerations of any work sample.</p> <p>The Government cautions offerors to ensure detailed information (through the work sample and attachments (Atch 6). Do not presume that the government will necessarily extrapolate details that are not clearly presented. Submission of relevant excerpts (vice submitting an entire document) is recommended. In Atch 6 and the work sample, spelling out critical acronyms, providing "lay person" explanations, and marking/highlighting (or otherwise distinguishing) key excerpts may also ensure that the Government may consider the work sample and its nexus to the SAs under the IDIQ. The markings/highlighting should be evident that the marking/highlighting were newly-added by the offeror and not part of the original document.</p>
468	L-M	10	L.8.6.2	Can the government please confirm that we are to only submit the pages that are relevant/annotated and remove all other pages that are not?	<p>Section L.8.6.2 will be revised to provide further clarification of work sample submissions. The work samples shall consist of only official contract documentation. "Official contract documentation" includes key documents integral to contract performance, including contracts, orders, modifications, PWS/SOW/SOO, CDRLs, subcontracting plans, invoices, meeting minutes, progress reports, monthly status reports, or other reports. The contractor may submit other documentation it regards to be integral to the contract (i.e., CPARS, FPDS, memos from COs/government official/prime contractor), but offerors are cautioned that the documentation is validated for past experience (not past performance) and that authenticity (contract-contemporaneous documents) and level of detail are critical considerations of any work sample.</p> <p>The Government cautions offerors to ensure detailed information (through the work sample and attachments (Atch 6). Do not presume that the government will necessarily extrapolate details that are not clearly presented. Submission of relevant excerpts (vice submitting an entire document) is recommended. In Atch 6 and the work sample, spelling out critical acronyms, providing "lay person" explanations, and marking/highlighting (or otherwise distinguishing) key excerpts may also ensure that the Government may consider the work sample and its nexus to the SAs under the IDIQ. The markings/highlighting should be evident that the marking/highlighting were newly-added by the offeror and not part of the original document.</p>
469	L-M	Page 10	L.8.6.2	Column D in the attachment states as examples: "Contract Documentation (award document, Statement of Work, Performance Work Statement, CDRLs, etc.)" while RFP L.8.6.2 only permits Performance Work Statements (PWS), Statements of Work (SOW), or Contract Data Requirement Lists (CDRLs). In light of previous Government Answers that the Government intends to review and update the list of documents that are acceptable, will the Government allow and provide a list of other official documents that are acceptable?	<p>Section L.8.6.2 will be revised to provide further clarification of work sample submissions. The work samples shall consist of only official contract documentation. "Official contract documentation" includes key documents integral to contract performance, including contracts, orders, modifications, PWS/SOW/SOO, CDRLs, subcontracting plans, invoices, meeting minutes, progress reports, monthly status reports, or other reports. The contractor may submit other documentation it regards to be integral to the contract (i.e., CPARS, FPDS, memos from COs/government official/prime contractor), but offerors are cautioned that the documentation is validated for past experience (not past performance) and that authenticity (contract-contemporaneous documents) and level of detail are critical considerations of any work sample.</p> <p>The Government cautions offerors to ensure detailed information (through the work sample and attachments (Atch 6). Do not presume that the government will necessarily extrapolate details that are not clearly presented. Submission of relevant excerpts (vice submitting an entire document) is recommended. In Atch 6 and the work sample, spelling out critical acronyms, providing "lay person" explanations, and marking/highlighting (or otherwise distinguishing) key excerpts may also ensure that the Government may consider the work sample and its nexus to the SAs under the IDIQ. The markings/highlighting should be evident that the marking/highlighting were newly-added by the offeror and not part of the original document.</p>
470	L-M	Page 10; 1	L.8.6.2	RFP L.8.6.2 cites WS identifiers in the range of WS1 to WS62, which conforms with RFP L.8.6.3 two (2) WS's per EC2 Specialty Area (SA) while the WS Cover Sheet Work Sample Identifier instructions state to assign an identifier in the range of WS1 to WS15. Please clarify.	This will be corrected in the Final RFP.
471	L-M	10	L.8.6.2	<p>Section L.8.6.2 states "Work Samples. The work samples shall consist of only official contract documentation which may include Performance Work Statements (PWS), Statements of Work (SOW), or Contract Data Requirement Lists (CDRLs)."</p> <p>Will the Government please confirm that this list of work samples is only an example, and that Offerors may provide other sources of official contract documentation?</p>	<p>Section L.8.6.2 will be revised to provide further clarification of work sample submissions. The work samples shall consist of only official contract documentation. "Official contract documentation" includes key documents integral to contract performance, including contracts, orders, modifications, PWS/SOW/SOO, CDRLs, subcontracting plans, invoices, meeting minutes, progress reports, monthly status reports, or other reports. The contractor may submit other documentation it regards to be integral to the contract (i.e., CPARS, FPDS, memos from COs/government official/prime contractor), but offerors are cautioned that the documentation is validated for past experience (not past performance) and that authenticity (contract-contemporaneous documents) and level of detail are critical considerations of any work sample.</p> <p>The Government cautions offerors to ensure detailed information (through the work sample and attachments (Atch 6). Do not presume that the government will necessarily extrapolate details that are not clearly presented. Submission of relevant excerpts (vice submitting an entire document) is recommended. In Atch 6 and the work sample, spelling out critical acronyms, providing "lay person" explanations, and marking/highlighting (or otherwise distinguishing) key excerpts may also ensure that the Government may consider the work sample and its nexus to the SAs under the IDIQ. The markings/highlighting should be evident that the marking/highlighting were newly-added by the offeror and not part of the original document.</p>

472	L-M	10	L.8.6.2	<p>Section L.8.6.2 states "The work samples shall consist of only official contract documentation which may include Performance Work Statements (PWS), Statements of Work (SOW), or Contract Data Requirement Lists (CDRLs)."</p> <p>There may be situations where contractual documents may not carry all of the information necessary to substantiate the Offeror's scores. Examples include missing contract numbers, missing signatures, missing document dates, etc.</p> <p>When these situations occur, may the Offeror request a "Statement of Fact" from the cognizant contracting officer to confirm the missing information?</p> <p>If Statements of Fact are acceptable, in situations where the cognizant contracting officer (CO) retired when the contract ended and no new cognizant CO was identified (the CO was not replaced), may the Offeror ask the contract's COR to (1) provide a signed letter confirming the CO's retirement as of the contract's end date, and (2) sign any statements of fact that would normally be signed by the CO?</p>	<p>Section L.8.6.2 will be revised to provide further clarification of work sample submissions. The work samples shall consist of only official contract documentation. "Official contract documentation" includes key documents integral to contract performance, including contracts, orders, modifications, PWS/SOW/SOO, CDRLs, subcontracting plans, invoices, meeting minutes, progress reports, monthly status reports, or other reports. The contractor may submit other documentation it regards to be integral to the contract (i.e., CPARS, FPDS, memos from COs/government official/prime contractor), but offerors are cautioned that the documentation is validated for past experience (not past performance) and that authenticity (contract-contemporaneous documents) and level of detail are critical considerations of any work sample.</p> <p>The Government cautions offerors to ensure detailed information (through the work sample and attachments (Atch 6). Do not presume that the government will necessarily extrapolate details that are not clearly presented. Submission of relevant excerpts (vice submitting an entire document) is recommended. In Atch 6 and the work sample, spelling out critical acronyms, providing "lay person" explanations, and marking/highlighting (or otherwise distinguishing) key excerpts may also ensure that the Government may consider the work sample and its nexus to the SAs under the IDIQ. The markings/highlighting should be evident that the marking/highlighting were newly-added by the offeror and not part of the original document.</p>
473	L-M	10	L.8.6.2	<p>Section L.8.6.2 states "All pages within the work samples shall be numbered."</p> <p>This requirement can be interpreted in a number of different ways. For example, the Government could be asking us to place page numbers on official contract documents that do not contain them. Another example would be numbering each work sample document with a page number format that included the work sample indicator (i.e., WS1 - Page 1, WS2, Page 2, etc.)</p> <p>Will the Government please expand on this requirement so that Offeror's can meet the Government's intent?</p>	<p>Each volume shall match the TOC for that Volume. :/8.7.2 is updated to read "All pages within the work samples shall be numbered. (ex. Page 1 of 12, Page 2 of 12, etc.)"</p>
474	L-M	10	L.8.6.2	<p>Section L.8.6.2 states "Work Samples. The work samples shall consist of only official contract documentation which may include Performance Work Statements (PWS), Statements of Work (SOW), or Contract Data Requirement Lists (CDRLs)."</p> <p>Will the Government accept selected pages of the official contract documentation (PWS, SOW, CDRL, etc.) PWS documents with relevant self-scoring sections highlighted within the documentation? This will reduce the volume of material the Government will need to read if highlighted official contract documentation is provided in this manner.</p>	<p>Section L.8.6.2 will be revised to provide further clarification of work sample submissions. The work samples shall consist of only official contract documentation. "Official contract documentation" includes key documents integral to contract performance, including contracts, orders, modifications, PWS/SOW/SOO, CDRLs, subcontracting plans, invoices, meeting minutes, progress reports, monthly status reports, or other reports. The contractor may submit other documentation it regards to be integral to the contract (i.e., CPARS, FPDS, memos from COs/government official/prime contractor), but offerors are cautioned that the documentation is validated for past experience (not past performance) and that authenticity (contract-contemporaneous documents) and level of detail are critical considerations of any work sample.</p> <p>The Government cautions offerors to ensure detailed information (through the work sample and attachments (Atch 6). Do not presume that the government will necessarily extrapolate details that are not clearly presented. Submission of relevant excerpts (vice submitting an entire document) is recommended. In Atch 6 and the work sample, spelling out critical acronyms, providing "lay person" explanations, and marking/highlighting (or otherwise distinguishing) key excerpts may also ensure that the Government may consider the work sample and its nexus to the SAs under the IDIQ. The markings/highlighting should be evident that the marking/highlighting were newly-added by the offeror and not part of the original document.</p>
475	L-M	10	L.8.6.2	Regarding this requirement, "If a work sample substantiates multiple SAs then, each SA work effort must be identified within the work sample.", please confirm that the Offeror would enter the multiple SA names/titles in Part III of the Work Sample Cover Sheet form.	Confirmed.
476	L-M	10	L.8.6.2	Please clarify whether Offerors should use the PWS section number (example: 2.1.2) , the Cross-Reference Matrix SA # in Column C (example, #2), or the SA title (example: Knowledge Management) when identifying the linkages between SAs and Work Samples in the Work Sample Cover Sheet.	Please use all references that make it clear and easy for the Government to validate the information.
477	L-M	10	L.8.6.2	Offerors shall only provide official contract documentation. Question: May Offerors annotate official contract documentation using "sticky notes" and highlighting to help Government evaluators identify relevant text?	<p>Section L.8.6.2 will be revised to provide further clarification of work sample submissions. The work samples shall consist of only official contract documentation. "Official contract documentation" includes key documents integral to contract performance, including contracts, orders, modifications, PWS/SOW/SOO, CDRLs, subcontracting plans, invoices, meeting minutes, progress reports, monthly status reports, or other reports. The contractor may submit other documentation it regards to be integral to the contract (i.e., CPARS, FPDS, memos from COs/government official/prime contractor), but offerors are cautioned that the documentation is validated for past experience (not past performance) and that authenticity (contract-contemporaneous documents) and level of detail are critical considerations of any work sample.</p> <p>The Government cautions offerors to ensure detailed information (through the work sample and attachments (Atch 6). Do not presume that the government will necessarily extrapolate details that are not clearly presented. Submission of relevant excerpts (vice submitting an entire document) is recommended. In Atch 6 and the work sample, spelling out critical acronyms, providing "lay person" explanations, and marking/highlighting (or otherwise distinguishing) key excerpts may also ensure that the Government may consider the work sample and its nexus to the SAs under the IDIQ. The markings/highlighting should be evident that the marking/highlighting were newly-added by the offeror and not part of the original document.</p>
478	L-M	(see pg. 10 of Attach. C Sec. L&M)	L.8.6.2	What 'official contract documentation' is required when the prime Offeror/teammate submits a work sample that was performed as a subcontractor? Subcontractors will not have access to the signed prime contracts or even the prime's PWS/SOW or CDRLs. For work performed as a subcontractor, may the Offeror/teammate submit a signed subcontract and the associated subcontract SOW issued by the prime as the required 'official contract documentation'? Not allowing this will preclude all Offerors from utilizing any work samples performed as a subcontractor.	<p>Section L.8.6.2 will be revised to provide further clarification of work sample submissions. The work samples shall consist of only official contract documentation. "Official contract documentation" includes key documents integral to contract performance, including contracts, orders, modifications, PWS/SOW/SOO, CDRLs, subcontracting plans, invoices, meeting minutes, progress reports, monthly status reports, or other reports. The contractor may submit other documentation it regards to be integral to the contract (i.e., CPARS, FPDS, memos from COs/government official/prime contractor), but offerors are cautioned that the documentation is validated for past experience (not past performance) and that authenticity (contract-contemporaneous documents) and level of detail are critical considerations of any work sample.</p> <p>The Government cautions offerors to ensure detailed information (through the work sample and attachments (Atch 6). Do not presume that the government will necessarily extrapolate details that are not clearly presented. Submission of relevant excerpts (vice submitting an entire document) is recommended. In Atch 6 and the work sample, spelling out critical acronyms, providing "lay person" explanations, and marking/highlighting (or otherwise distinguishing) key excerpts may also ensure that the Government may consider the work sample and its nexus to the SAs under the IDIQ. The markings/highlighting should be evident that the marking/highlighting were newly-added by the offeror and not part of the original document.</p>
479	L-M	(see pg. 10 of Attach. C Sec. L&M)	L.8.6.2	Will the Government allow two separate sections within the same work reference to support a single Specialty Area (ex. one work sample on page 2 and one work sample on page 10 supporting the same Specialty Area)?	Yes.

480	L-M	(see pg. 10 of Attach. C Sec. L&M)	L.8.6.2	Section L states “The work samples shall consist of only contract documentation which may include Performance Work Statements (PWS), Statements of Work (SOW), or Contract Data Requirement Lists (CDRLs).” Will the Government consider other official contract documentation such as Statements of Capabilities and Statements of Objectives, and actual contract deliverables (such as MSRs) as work samples?	<p>Section L.8.6.2 will be revised to provide further clarification of work sample submissions. The work samples shall consist of only official contract documentation. "Official contract documentation" includes key documents integral to contract performance, including contracts, orders, modifications, PWS/SOW/SOO, CDRLs, subcontracting plans, invoices, meeting minutes, progress reports, monthly status reports, or other reports. The contractor may submit other documentation it regards to be integral to the contract (i.e., CPARS, FPDS, memos from COs/government official/prime contractor), but offerors are cautioned that the documentation is validated for past experience (not past performance) and that authenticity (contract-contemporaneous documents) and level of detail are critical considerations of any work sample.</p> <p>The Government cautions offerors to ensure detailed information (through the work sample and attachments (Atch 6). Do not presume that the government will necessarily extrapolate details that are not clearly presented. Submission of relevant excerpts (vice submitting an entire document) is recommended. In Atch 6 and the work sample, spelling out critical acronyms, providing "lay person" explanations, and marking/highlighting (or otherwise distinguishing) key excerpts may also ensure that the Government may consider the work sample and its nexus to the SAs under the IDIQ. The markings/highlighting should be evident that the marking/highlighting were newly-added by the offeror and not part of the original document.</p>
481	L-M	10	L.8.6.2	Since recent changes to the EC2 PWS and other associated document have been released, and offerors are supposed to present/site evidence of a performance claimed from our existing Contract Documentation/PWS; What is the limitation on contract documents that we could use to present an offerors claim of certain performance? Since some offerors have contracts that are within the last 3-years of performance, we all know contracts with IT performance (due to recent Cyber upgrades) have been force to align existing PWS IT skills and continue to meet performance standards while faced with advances in IT capabilities and sometimes without an accompanying modification change to reflect in the PWS. Sometimes these changes are enforce or pushed remotely with nothing more than an advisory email. With changes in Base-communications Back Bone, IT structure, is an offeror subjected to provide such changes directed by the base communications structure necessary even without official documentation or explanation to the change (i.e. upgrades in firewall procedures, cyber-defensive procedures, automatic systems upgrades based on threat or external attacks), or can an offeror state this experience or changes have occurred and provide documentation, outside of the Contract Award document (such as an email from the Government or a Monthly Report submitted to the Govt as a Deliverable) supporting the contract or PWS?	<p>Section L.8.6.2 will be revised to provide further clarification of work sample submissions. The work samples shall consist of only official contract documentation. "Official contract documentation" includes key documents integral to contract performance, including contracts, orders, modifications, PWS/SOW/SOO, CDRLs, subcontracting plans, invoices, meeting minutes, progress reports, monthly status reports, or other reports. The contractor may submit other documentation it regards to be integral to the contract (i.e., CPARS, FPDS, memos from COs/government official/prime contractor), but offerors are cautioned that the documentation is validated for past experience (not past performance) and that authenticity (contract-contemporaneous documents) and level of detail are critical considerations of any work sample.</p> <p>The Government cautions offerors to ensure detailed information (through the work sample and attachments (Atch 6). Do not presume that the government will necessarily extrapolate details that are not clearly presented. Submission of relevant excerpts (vice submitting an entire document) is recommended. In Atch 6 and the work sample, spelling out critical acronyms, providing "lay person" explanations, and marking/highlighting (or otherwise distinguishing) key excerpts may also ensure that the Government may consider the work sample and its nexus to the SAs under the IDIQ. The markings/highlighting should be evident that the marking/highlighting were newly-added by the offeror and not part of the original document.</p>
482	L-M	10	L.8.6.2	Should the offeror include all of the pages of the Work Sample documents (which would be quite long) or only those pages relevant to substantiating the Specialty Areas?	<p>Section L.8.6.2 will be revised to provide further clarification of work sample submissions. The work samples shall consist of only official contract documentation. "Official contract documentation" includes key documents integral to contract performance, including contracts, orders, modifications, PWS/SOW/SOO, CDRLs, subcontracting plans, invoices, meeting minutes, progress reports, monthly status reports, or other reports. The contractor may submit other documentation it regards to be integral to the contract (i.e., CPARS, FPDS, memos from COs/government official/prime contractor), but offerors are cautioned that the documentation is validated for past experience (not past performance) and that authenticity (contract-contemporaneous documents) and level of detail are critical considerations of any work sample.</p> <p>The Government cautions offerors to ensure detailed information (through the work sample and attachments (Atch 6). Do not presume that the government will necessarily extrapolate details that are not clearly presented. Submission of relevant excerpts (vice submitting an entire document) is recommended. In Atch 6 and the work sample, spelling out critical acronyms, providing "lay person" explanations, and marking/highlighting (or otherwise distinguishing) key excerpts may also ensure that the Government may consider the work sample and its nexus to the SAs under the IDIQ. The markings/highlighting should be evident that the marking/highlighting were newly-added by the offeror and not part of the original document.</p>
483	L-M	10	L.8.6.2	This section says " <i>If a work sample substantiates multiple SAs then, each S4 work effort must be identified within the work sample</i> ". Please clarify if the expectation is that the Work Samples should be annotated with references to the Specialty Areas or that the page/paragraph numbers in the Cross Reference Matrix is sufficient?	Both practices are acceptable and would help support compliance to achieve the goals of para. L.8.4.3.
484	L-M	10	L.8.6.2	"Not counted against page limits" is counter to L.5 Table 1 which states L.8.6 has "No Page Limit." Can the Government clarify?	This will be corrected in the Final RFP.
485	L-M	10	L.8.6.2	Can the Government specify if the entire work sample document is required or just the applicable cross-referenced sections?	<p>Offerors need not include non-relevant pages or documents. Section L.8.6.2 will be revised to provide further clarification of work sample submissions. The work samples shall consist of only official contract documentation. "Official contract documentation" includes key documents integral to contract performance, including contracts, orders, modifications, PWS/SOW/SOO, CDRLs, subcontracting plans, invoices, meeting minutes, progress reports, monthly status reports, or other reports. The contractor may submit other documentation it regards to be integral to the contract (i.e., CPARS, FPDS, memos from COs/government official/prime contractor), but offerors are cautioned that the documentation is validated for past experience (not past performance) and that authenticity (contract-contemporaneous documents) and level of detail are critical considerations of any work sample.</p> <p>The Government cautions offerors to ensure detailed information (through the work sample and attachments (Atch 6). Do not presume that the government will necessarily extrapolate details that are not clearly presented. Submission of relevant excerpts (vice submitting an entire document) is recommended. In Atch 6 and the work sample, spelling out critical acronyms, providing "lay person" explanations, and marking/highlighting (or otherwise distinguishing) key excerpts may also ensure that the Government may consider the work sample and its nexus to the SAs under the IDIQ. The markings/highlighting should be evident that the marking/highlighting were newly-added by the offeror and not part of the original document.</p>
486	L-M	10	L.8.6.2	L.8.6.2 states: " <i>The work samples shall consist of only official contract documentation which may include Performance Work Statements (PWS), Statements of Work (SOW), or Contract Data Requirement Lists (CDRLs). When contracts are used for work samples, the Offeror shall, also include the signed cover page associated with the contract (not counted against page limits).</i> " This statement implies that only three types of artifacts are acceptable to be submitted as a work sample: a PWS, a SOW or a CDRL. A Contract Data Requirements List (CDRL) is a list of authorized data requirements for a specific procurement that forms part of a contract. It is comprised of either a single DD Form 1423, or a series of DD Forms 1423 containing data requirements and delivery information. (1) Does the Government want the DD 1423(s) identifying the data that will be or has been required by the end user, or does the Government want the actual data that was delivered? (2) Like a DD 1423, a SOW or PWS is also a component of the contract. Does the Government want the signature page when a DD1423 and/or SOW or PWS is provided as a work sample? (3) Are the DD1423 and the SOW/PWS the only parts of the contract that are acceptable components of the contract that can be submitted as artifacts that prove Past Experience supporting the SAs identified in the Self-Scoring Sheet and the Cross-Reference matrix, or may other components of the contract be used, such as Labor Category descriptions?	<p>Section L.8.6.2 will be revised to provide further clarification of work sample submissions. The work samples shall consist of only official contract documentation. "Official contract documentation" includes key documents integral to contract performance, including contracts, orders, modifications, PWS/SOW/SOO, CDRLs, subcontracting plans, invoices, meeting minutes, progress reports, monthly status reports, or other reports. The contractor may submit other documentation it regards to be integral to the contract (i.e., CPARS, FPDS, memos from COs/government official/prime contractor), but offerors are cautioned that the documentation is validated for past experience (not past performance) and that authenticity (contract-contemporaneous documents) and level of detail are critical considerations of any work sample.</p> <p>The Government cautions offerors to ensure detailed information (through the work sample and attachments (Atch 6). Do not presume that the government will necessarily extrapolate details that are not clearly presented. Submission of relevant excerpts (vice submitting an entire document) is recommended. In Atch 6 and the work sample, spelling out critical acronyms, providing "lay person" explanations, and marking/highlighting (or otherwise distinguishing) key excerpts may also ensure that the Government may consider the work sample and its nexus to the SAs under the IDIQ. The markings/highlighting should be evident that the marking/highlighting were newly-added by the offeror and not part of the original document.</p>
487	L-M	10	L.8.6.2	Can the Government clarify whether a single Work Sample is defined as one document? And if so, can the offeror submit an entire Task Order, and—as long as the Task Order contains, within its sequentially numbered page count, sections identified as a PWS or SOW and multiple CDRL forms—will that entire document be recognized as ONE work sample? Or is the Government looking for segmented elements of the Task Order to identify specific Specialty Areas such that each segmented element (SOW, CDRL, or Labor Category descriptions, etc.) would be classified as a single work sample that would be identified and categorized in support of one Specialty Area?	A Work Sample can satisfy multiple Specialty Areas and each needs to be specifically identified. To fully satisfy any specific Specialty Area (10 points), two separate Work Samples (different contracts) must be provided.

488	L-M	10	L.8.6.2	At times, awarded contract SOW or PWS documents are not written clearly enough to reflect the true scope of a contract or all relevant solutions performed/delivered. Will the Government allow submission of brief commentary/explanation (that can be validated in the PPI and PPQ) or perhaps alternate or additional proof of work performed, for instance a sample deliverable that identifies specific functional outcomes provided?	L.8.6.2. and M.4.1 will be updated to clarify the acceptable submissions for past experience proposals.
489	L-M	10	L.8.6.2	Can Offerors desiring to use classified contracts to document Specialty Area past performance submit a statement referring the government reviewers to the contractual POC of the classified contract to verify appropriate past performance in lieu of a work sample?	No. Classified proposal information shall not be submitted and will not be evaluated. The burden of proof is defined at L.8.5. The Government will evaluate unclassified proposal information only and determine if the past experience is relevant IAW M.4.1.
490	L-M	10 of 21	L.8.6.2	Section L.8.6.2 states, "The work samples shall consist of only official contract documentation which may include Performance Work Statements (PWS), Statements of Work (SOW), or Contract Data Requirement Lists (CDRLs)." Many times, the PWS or SOW does not drill down into the level of detail that would substantiate the Specialty Area (SA) required in this draft solicitation. Would the government consider including an attachment that could be signed by a government official validating the work performed on a specific contract.	Section L.8.6.2 will be revised to provide further clarification of work sample submissions. The work samples shall consist of only official contract documentation. "Official contract documentation" includes key documents integral to contract performance, including contracts, orders, modifications, PWS/SOW/SOO, CDRLs, subcontracting plans, invoices, meeting minutes, progress reports, monthly status reports, or other reports. The contractor may submit other documentation it regards to be integral to the contract (i.e., CPARS, FPDS, memos from COs/government official/prime contractor), but offerors are cautioned that the documentation is validated for past experience (not past performance) and that authenticity (contract-contemporaneous documents) and level of detail are critical considerations of any work sample. The Government cautions offerors to ensure detailed information (through the work sample and attachments (Atch 6). Do not presume that the government will necessarily extrapolate details that are not clearly presented. Submission of relevant excerpts (vice submitting an entire document) is recommended. In Atch 6 and the work sample, spelling out critical acronyms, providing "lay person" explanations, and marking/highlighting (or otherwise distinguishing) key excerpts may also ensure that the Government may consider the work sample and its nexus to the SAs under the IDIQ. The markings/highlighting should be evident that the marking/highlighting were newly-added by the offeror and not part of the original document.
491	L-M	10 of 21	L.8.6.2	Section L.8.6.2 states, "The work samples shall consist of only official contract documentation which may include Performance Work Statements (PWS), Statements of Work (SOW), or Contract Data Requirement Lists (CDRLs)." Does 'CDRL' refer to the actual deliverable or the contractual list documented with the contract?	L.8.7.2 has been updated to read: "The work samples shall consist of only official contract documentation which may include Performance Work Statements (PWS), Statements of Work (SOW), Contract Data Requirement Lists (CDRLs), or other official contract documentation that demonstrates the offeror's past experience of performing the same or similar work. " Official contract documentation may be a letter from a Government official providing details of a contract's past experience or past performance. Any official contract documentation will be accepted.
492	L-M	10 of 21	L.8.6.2	In describing the allowable "official contract documentation" for work samples, the Government states this "may include" the PWS, SOW, CDRLs. We interpret the phrase "may include" to mean that other official contract documentation is allowable. We believe additional official contract documentation would also include items such as CPARS, reports, Data Item Descriptions (DID), Data Requirement Deliverables (DRD), work orders, task assignments. Is this correct?	Section L.8.6.2 will be revised to provide further clarification of work sample submissions. The work samples shall consist of only official contract documentation. "Official contract documentation" includes key documents integral to contract performance, including contracts, orders, modifications, PWS/SOW/SOO, CDRLs, subcontracting plans, invoices, meeting minutes, progress reports, monthly status reports, or other reports. The contractor may submit other documentation it regards to be integral to the contract (i.e., CPARS, FPDS, memos from COs/government official/prime contractor), but offerors are cautioned that the documentation is validated for past experience (not past performance) and that authenticity (contract-contemporaneous documents) and level of detail are critical considerations of any work sample. The Government cautions offerors to ensure detailed information (through the work sample and attachments (Atch 6). Do not presume that the government will necessarily extrapolate details that are not clearly presented. Submission of relevant excerpts (vice submitting an entire document) is recommended. In Atch 6 and the work sample, spelling out critical acronyms, providing "lay person" explanations, and marking/highlighting (or otherwise distinguishing) key excerpts may also ensure that the Government may consider the work sample and its nexus to the SAs under the IDIQ. The markings/highlighting should be evident that the marking/highlighting were newly-added by the offeror and not part of the original document.
493	L-M	10 of 21	L.8.6.2	On some multi-year contracts, "official contract documentation", such as PWS and SOWs, are written broadly to allow the Government flexibility in dynamic and rapidly evolving technical domains. In the event that an Offeror clearly performs a given Specialty Area, but it is not clear in the available "official contract documentation", will the Government accept a signed affirmation from an appropriate Government technical representative (such as the respective CO, COR, or COTR) that states the specified Specialty Area is (or has been), in fact, performed as an acceptable work sample. Offerors could also specify the associated PWS or SOW area for additional clarity if desired by the Government. This approach would ensure that no Offeror is denied credit for Specialty Areas they actually perform, and the integrity of such a claim is substantiated by providing the Government such definitive proof by such a signed affirmation by a Government official.. Additionally, this may be useful to Offerors who provide the Specialty Area on a classified contract where associated SOW, PWS, CDRLs, or other official contract documentation is classified.	Section L.8.6.2 will be revised to provide further clarification of work sample submissions. The work samples shall consist of only official contract documentation. "Official contract documentation" includes key documents integral to contract performance, including contracts, orders, modifications, PWS/SOW/SOO, CDRLs, subcontracting plans, invoices, meeting minutes, progress reports, monthly status reports, or other reports. The contractor may submit other documentation it regards to be integral to the contract (i.e., CPARS, FPDS, memos from COs/government official/prime contractor), but offerors are cautioned that the documentation is validated for past experience (not past performance) and that authenticity (contract-contemporaneous documents) and level of detail are critical considerations of any work sample. The Government cautions offerors to ensure detailed information (through the work sample and attachments (Atch 6). Do not presume that the government will necessarily extrapolate details that are not clearly presented. Submission of relevant excerpts (vice submitting an entire document) is recommended. In Atch 6 and the work sample, spelling out critical acronyms, providing "lay person" explanations, and marking/highlighting (or otherwise distinguishing) key excerpts may also ensure that the Government may consider the work sample and its nexus to the SAs under the IDIQ. The markings/highlighting should be evident that the marking/highlighting were newly-added by the offeror and not part of the original document.
494	L-M	10	L.8.6.2	The draft PWS states that 'only official contract documentation which may include Performance Work Statements (PWS), Statements of Work (SOW), or Contract Data Requirement Lists (CDRLs) -we understand this is not an all inclusive list, but will the government confirm that deliverables documented in the contract which are "Official Contract Documents" are included in this as well as any official documentation provided by a Contracting Officer, as Contracting Officer documentation is binding and legal.	Section L.8.6.2 will be revised to provide further clarification of work sample submissions. The work samples shall consist of only official contract documentation. "Official contract documentation" includes key documents integral to contract performance, including contracts, orders, modifications, PWS/SOW/SOO, CDRLs, subcontracting plans, invoices, meeting minutes, progress reports, monthly status reports, or other reports. The contractor may submit other documentation it regards to be integral to the contract (i.e., CPARS, FPDS, memos from COs/government official/prime contractor), but offerors are cautioned that the documentation is validated for past experience (not past performance) and that authenticity (contract-contemporaneous documents) and level of detail are critical considerations of any work sample. The Government cautions offerors to ensure detailed information (through the work sample and attachments (Atch 6). Do not presume that the government will necessarily extrapolate details that are not clearly presented. Submission of relevant excerpts (vice submitting an entire document) is recommended. In Atch 6 and the work sample, spelling out critical acronyms, providing "lay person" explanations, and marking/highlighting (or otherwise distinguishing) key excerpts may also ensure that the Government may consider the work sample and its nexus to the SAs under the IDIQ. The markings/highlighting should be evident that the marking/highlighting were newly-added by the offeror and not part of the original document.
495	L-M	10	L.8.6.2	For Work Sample Documentation, the paragraph states, "Offerors shall only provide official contract documentation." What if the official contract award documentation is very vague, but in completing a general scope of work the contractor performed relevant activities. May an actual deliverable document showing delivery of specific relevant work be allowed?	Section L.8.6.2 will be revised to provide further clarification of work sample submissions. The work samples shall consist of only official contract documentation. "Official contract documentation" includes key documents integral to contract performance, including contracts, orders, modifications, PWS/SOW/SOO, CDRLs, subcontracting plans, invoices, meeting minutes, progress reports, monthly status reports, or other reports. The contractor may submit other documentation it regards to be integral to the contract (i.e., CPARS, FPDS, memos from COs/government official/prime contractor), but offerors are cautioned that the documentation is validated for past experience (not past performance) and that authenticity (contract-contemporaneous documents) and level of detail are critical considerations of any work sample. The Government cautions offerors to ensure detailed information (through the work sample and attachments (Atch 6). Do not presume that the government will necessarily extrapolate details that are not clearly presented. Submission of relevant excerpts (vice submitting an entire document) is recommended. In Atch 6 and the work sample, spelling out critical acronyms, providing "lay person" explanations, and marking/highlighting (or otherwise distinguishing) key excerpts may also ensure that the Government may consider the work sample and its nexus to the SAs under the IDIQ. The markings/highlighting should be evident that the marking/highlighting were newly-added by the offeror and not part of the original document.

496	L-M	10 of 21	L.8.6.2	<p>L.8.6.2 states "Work Samples. The work samples shall consist of only official contract documentation which may include Performance Work Statements (PWS), Statements of Work (SOW), or Contract Data Requirement Lists (CDRLs)."</p> <p>Question: Will the Government accept official documents that the PWS/SOW refer to in the taskings (e.g. Reference Documents) that provide additional detail as to what that particular PWS/SOW task requires?</p>	<p>Section L.8.6.2 will be revised to provide further clarification of work sample submissions. The work samples shall consist of only official contract documentation. "Official contract documentation" includes key documents integral to contract performance, including contracts, orders, modifications, PWS/SOW/SOO, CDRLs, subcontracting plans, invoices, meeting minutes, progress reports, monthly status reports, or other reports. The contractor may submit other documentation it regards to be integral to the contract (i.e., CPARS, FPDS, memos from COs/government official/prime contractor), but offerors are cautioned that the documentation is validated for past experience (not past performance) and that authenticity (contract-contemporaneous documents) and level of detail are critical considerations of any work sample.</p> <p>The Government cautions offerors to ensure detailed information (through the work sample and attachments (Atch 6). Do not presume that the government will necessarily extrapolate details that are not clearly presented. Submission of relevant excerpts (vice submitting an entire document) is recommended. In Atch 6 and the work sample, spelling out critical acronyms, providing "lay person" explanations, and marking/highlighting (or otherwise distinguishing) key excerpts may also ensure that the Government may consider the work sample and its nexus to the SAs under the IDIQ. The markings/highlighting should be evident that the marking/highlighting were newly-added by the offeror and not part of the original document.</p>
497	L-M	10	L.8.6.2	<p>As a subcontractor, we are obligated to ask the prime for permission to release that information. How do we handle circumstances when the prime refuses to permit the release or refuses to ask their Government customer for that permission?</p>	<p>Subcontractors may obtain PWS/SOW/CDRLs from SAM. However, in the absence of PWS/SOW/CDRL, the offeror may exercise its discretion in determining other official contract documentation to provide. For example, a subcontractor might submit its contract with the prime contractor, invoices, reports, other documents it prepared. Offerors are not precluded from submission of other documents/memos they regard as integral to the contract, but offerors must understand that the burden rests on the offeror to substantiate the past experience.</p>
498	L-M	10	L.8.6.2	<p>Reference: Work Samples</p> <p>Should the Work Samples (i.e SOW, PWS, CDRLs) be highlighted and cross referenced to the PWS and or the PWS Supplement?</p>	<p>The Offeror can highlight and do whatever is needed to make the information easier for the Government to validate.</p>
499	L-M	10	L.8.6.2	<p>Please modify the requirement for DCAA approval/adequacy to apply only to vendors which intend to propose against task orders that are cost type.</p> <p>Rationale: Provides clarification. Section L.6.7.2 indicates that to be eligible for award, offerors must either already have an approved/adequate accounting system for cost-reimbursement contracts or acquire a such a system prior to contract award.. However, in the Solicitation document (page 3, Section B) Item 0001 indicates that at least some task orders will be fixed price. Further, the DCAA Preaward Survey (page 4, just before Question 3) states that questions 3 - 22 are only required if the contractor is planning on bidding Cost Type Contracts.</p>	<p>The requirements identified in paragraph L.6.7.2 will remain unchanged in the Final RFP.</p>
500	L-M	10	L.8.6.2	<p>The paragraph indicates that "Offerors shall only provide official contract documentation." Does a sub contract and accompanying subcontractor SOW or PWS suffice where the prime contractors contract number is referenced in the documentation.</p>	<p>Subcontractors may obtain PWS/SOW/CDRLs from SAM. However, in the absence of PWS/SOW/CDRL, the offeror may exercise its discretion in determining other official contract documentation to provide. For example, a subcontractor might submit its contract with the prime contractor, invoices, reports, other documents it prepared. Offerors are not precluded from submission of other documents/memos they regard as integral to the contract, but offerors must understand that the burden rests on the offeror to substantiate the past experience.</p>
501	L-M	10	L.8.6.2	<p>Do Monthly Status Reports submitted to the Government as deliverables qualify as official contract documentation that can be provided as evidence when related Government-provided documents (e.g., PWS/SOW, CDRL) contain less detail about the actual work performed?</p>	<p>Yes. Section L.8.6.2 will be revised to provide further clarification of work sample submissions. The work samples shall consist of only official contract documentation. "Official contract documentation" includes key documents integral to contract performance, including contracts, orders, modifications, PWS/SOW/SOO, CDRLs, subcontracting plans, invoices, meeting minutes, progress reports, monthly status reports, or other reports. The contractor may submit other documentation it regards to be integral to the contract (i.e., CPARS, FPDS, memos from COs/government official/prime contractor), but offerors are cautioned that the documentation is validated for past experience (not past performance) and that authenticity (contract-contemporaneous documents) and level of detail are critical considerations of any work sample.</p> <p>The Government cautions offerors to ensure detailed information (through the work sample and attachments (Atch 6). Do not presume that the government will necessarily extrapolate details that are not clearly presented. Submission of relevant excerpts (vice submitting an entire document) is recommended. In Atch 6 and the work sample, spelling out critical acronyms, providing "lay person" explanations, and marking/highlighting (or otherwise distinguishing) key excerpts may also ensure that the Government may consider the work sample and its nexus to the SAs under the IDIQ. The markings/highlighting should be evident that the marking/highlighting were newly-added by the offeror and not part of the original document.</p>
502	L-M	10	L.8.6.2	<p>Are CPARs considered acceptable contract documentation for use as work samples?</p>	<p>Section L.8.6.2 will be revised to provide further clarification of work sample submissions. The work samples shall consist of only official contract documentation. "Official contract documentation" includes key documents integral to contract performance, including contracts, orders, modifications, PWS/SOW/SOO, CDRLs, subcontracting plans, invoices, meeting minutes, progress reports, monthly status reports, or other reports. The contractor may submit other documentation it regards to be integral to the contract (i.e., CPARS, FPDS, memos from COs/government official/prime contractor), but offerors are cautioned that the documentation is validated for past experience (not past performance) and that authenticity (contract-contemporaneous documents) and level of detail are critical considerations of any work sample.</p> <p>The Government cautions offerors to ensure detailed information (through the work sample and attachments (Atch 6). Do not presume that the government will necessarily extrapolate details that are not clearly presented. Submission of relevant excerpts (vice submitting an entire document) is recommended. In Atch 6 and the work sample, spelling out critical acronyms, providing "lay person" explanations, and marking/highlighting (or otherwise distinguishing) key excerpts may also ensure that the Government may consider the work sample and its nexus to the SAs under the IDIQ. The markings/highlighting should be evident that the marking/highlighting were newly-added by the offeror and not part of the original document.</p>
503	L-M	10	L.8.6.2	<p>To help with scoring documents recommend the Government allow .pdf comment boxes and highlighting text features work sample documents for ease in evaluation.</p>	<p>This is allowable.</p>
504	L-M	10	L.8.6.2	<p>Is it the Government's intent that the work sample volume page numbers be sequential within the Past Experience volume or by work sample? To aid in evaluation recommend page numbers be sequential by work sample (ex: WS1 - 1).</p>	<p>IAW L.8.7.2., All pages within each work sample shall be numbered. (ex. Page 1 of 12, Page 2 of 12, etc.) . An additional alternative is to place the page number at the bottom, right of the page (to distinguish from the original page numbering of the PWS/document).</p>
505	L-M	10 of 21	L.8.6.2 & L.8.7.1	<p>L.8.6.2 states "Work Samples. The work samples shall consist of only official contract documentation which may include Performance Work Statements (PWS), Statements of Work (SOW), or Contract Data Requirement Lists (CDRLs)."</p> <p>L.8.7.1 states "Work Sample Qualifications. Work samples shall meet these minimum qualifications:</p> <p>(a) Be a past or current contracts (including Federal, State, and local government and private) for efforts similar to the Government requirement in accordance with the criteria listed herein."</p> <p>Private contracts use several different approaches, other than a PWS, SOW or CDRL, to define the work/services required by the contractor/service provider e.g. Engagement Letter for Services.</p> <p>Question: Will the Government confirm that Work Sample documentation reflecting private/commercial work requirements similar to PWS and PWS Supplement taskings are acceptable?</p>	<p>Yes. Any customer/Government generated documents or data reports are considered official contract documentation as long as it pertains directly to the work sample.</p>
506	L-M	10	L.8.6.2.	<p>Frequently, work in this area is classified. If we have work samples that are classified, will the government allow us to submit them as a classified document?</p>	<p>No. Classified proposal information shall not be submitted and will not be evaluated. The burden of proof is defined at L.8.5. The Government will evaluate unclassified proposal information only and determine if the past experience is relevant IAW M.4.1.</p>

507	L-M	10 of 21	L.8.6.2.	<p>re: the Offeror shall, also include the signed cover page associated with the contract (not counted against page limits). Where an offeror is submitting work as a subcontractor a SF cover page may not be applicable or available. Will the government accept subcontract agreements for cited work samples?</p>	<p>Section L.8.6.2 will be revised to provide further clarification of work sample submissions. The work samples shall consist of only official contract documentation. "Official contract documentation" includes key documents integral to contract performance, including contracts, orders, modifications, PWS/SOW/SOO, CDRLs, subcontracting plans, invoices, meeting minutes, progress reports, monthly status reports, or other reports. The contractor may submit other documentation it regards to be integral to the contract (i.e., CPARS, FPDS, memos from COs/government official/prime contractor), but offerors are cautioned that the documentation is validated for past experience (not past performance) and that authenticity (contract-contemporaneous documents) and level of detail are critical considerations of any work sample.</p> <p>The Government cautions offerors to ensure detailed information (through the work sample and attachments (Atch 6). Do not presume that the government will necessarily extrapolate details that are not clearly presented. Submission of relevant excerpts (vice submitting an entire document) is recommended. In Atch 6 and the work sample, spelling out critical acronyms, providing "lay person" explanations, and marking/highlighting (or otherwise distinguishing) key excerpts may also ensure that the Government may consider the work sample and its nexus to the SAs under the IDIQ. The markings/highlighting should be evident that the marking/highlighting were newly-added by the offeror and not part of the original document.</p>
508	L-M	10	L.8.6.2.Work Samples	<p>Will the Government please clarify if Contractor Performance Assessment Reports (CPARS), Monthly Status Reports (MSRs), and other deliverables are considered "official contract documentation" and therefore allowed to substantiate experience?</p>	<p>Section L.8.6.2 will be revised to provide further clarification of work sample submissions. The work samples shall consist of only official contract documentation. "Official contract documentation" includes key documents integral to contract performance, including contracts, orders, modifications, PWS/SOW/SOO, CDRLs, subcontracting plans, invoices, meeting minutes, progress reports, monthly status reports, or other reports. The contractor may submit other documentation it regards to be integral to the contract (i.e., CPARS, FPDS, memos from COs/government official/prime contractor), but offerors are cautioned that the documentation is validated for past experience (not past performance) and that authenticity (contract-contemporaneous documents) and level of detail are critical considerations of any work sample.</p> <p>The Government cautions offerors to ensure detailed information (through the work sample and attachments (Atch 6). Do not presume that the government will necessarily extrapolate details that are not clearly presented. Submission of relevant excerpts (vice submitting an entire document) is recommended. In Atch 6 and the work sample, spelling out critical acronyms, providing "lay person" explanations, and marking/highlighting (or otherwise distinguishing) key excerpts may also ensure that the Government may consider the work sample and its nexus to the SAs under the IDIQ. The markings/highlighting should be evident that the marking/highlighting were newly-added by the offeror and not part of the original document.</p>
509	L-M	10	L.8.6.3	<p>Section L.8.6.3 states "There is a limit of 2 work samples per Specialty Area (SA). The Offeror shall submit work sample(s) for each scored EC2 SA of the Self-Scoring Matrix in order to demonstrate their past experience. IDIQ contracts are not an acceptable proof of past experience (or past performance) and shall not be provided as a work sample."</p> <p>It is not clear if the two work samples (or more) are for the overall work sample or the two work samples (or more) are for each of the Specialty Area sub-areas as well? For example is it two work samples for 2.1 Operate and Maintain, or is it 2 work samples for each of the sub areas under 2.1 (i.e. 2.1.1 thru 2.1.6). With these two scenarios for 2.1, the Offerors could end up providing 2 work samples, 12 work samples, or possibly 14 work samples.</p> <p>Will the Government clarify the number of work samples for each specialty area?</p>	<p>Two (2) Work Samples for every specialty area.</p>
510	L-M	10 of 22	L.8.6.3	<p>Reference Single Award (SA) IDIQ contracts, highly recommend adopting the successful solicitation wording used under AFLCMC EPASS 2 and AFTC TMAS 2 whereby: "An acceptable work sample is defined as either a contract, a single award IDIQ, or a single task order issued under a master IDIQ contract (reference FAR 16.501-1). A single award IDIQ to include all accompanying task orders will only count as one (1) acceptable work sample. Single- award IDIQs are acceptable work samples ONLY if the owning agency issues one (1) annual Contract Performance Assessment Rating (CPAR) per year on the IDIQ (as opposed to a CPAR on each individual Task Order under that IDIQ). An IDIQ contract by itself will not count as an acceptable work sample, unless it meets the qualifications of the Single Award IDIQ with only one (1) annual CPAR." This allows full "scoring" for applicable SA IDIQ contracts that have CPARS at the IDIQ level.</p>	<p>There is a limit of 2 work samples per Specialty Area (SA). The Offeror shall submit work sample(s) for each scored EC2 SA of the Self-Scoring Matrix in order to demonstrate their past experience. IDIQ contracts (multiple award or single award) are not an acceptable proof of past experience (or past performance) in themselves and shall not be provided as a work sample. However, individual task orders, performed under an IDIQ contract, can be used as a work sample. One task order shall be considered one work sample. The offeror must define the individual task order that is submitted as the work sample. A work sample must reflect accomplished work through the past or on-going contract, not the mere potential or speculative opportunity to acquire contracts or perform work in the future.</p>
511	L-M	10	L.8.6.3	<p>If a Task Order SOW used as Work Sample in Past Experience references back to a requirement referenced in the IDIQ SOW, will the offeror be allowed to submit the IDIQ SOW as Part 2 of the Work Sample, essentially providing the Government with a single work sample with two parts?</p>	<p>There is a limit of 2 work samples per Specialty Area (SA). The Offeror shall submit work sample(s) for each scored EC2 SA of the Self-Scoring Matrix in order to demonstrate their past experience. IDIQ contracts (multiple award or single award) are not an acceptable proof of past experience (or past performance) in themselves and shall not be provided as a work sample. However, individual task orders, performed under an IDIQ contract, can be used as a work sample. One task order shall be considered one work sample. The offeror must define the individual task order that is submitted as the work sample. A work sample must reflect accomplished work through the past or on-going contract, not the mere potential or speculative opportunity to acquire contracts or perform work in the future.</p>
512	L-M	10	L.8.6.3	<p>Can the Government please confirm that a project work sample may be used across multiple specialty areas?</p>	<p>A Work Sample can satisfy multiple Specialty Areas and each needs to be specifically identified. To fully satisfy any specific Specialty Area (10 points), two separate Work Samples (different contracts) must be provided.</p>
513	L-M	10	L.8.6.3	<p>The Government states that "If a work sample substantiates multiple SAs then, each SA work effort must be identified within the work sample.". Our understanding of this requirement is that, if a single contract includes tasks relevant to multiple SAs, then a single work sample would be submitted, with a single narrative description that incorporates all applicable SAs, rather than individual work samples for each relevant and applicable SA. Can the Government please confirm the correct interpretation?</p>	<p>A Work Sample can satisfy multiple Specialty Areas and each needs to be specifically identified. To fully satisfy any specific Specialty Area (10 points), two separate Work Samples (different contracts) must be provided.</p>
514	L-M	10 of 21	L.8.6.3	<p>Section L.8.6.3 states "IDIQ contracts are not an acceptable proof of past experience (or past performance) and shall not be provided as a work sample. However, individual task orders, performed under an IDIQ contract, can be used as a work sample."</p> <p>Please confirm that the "IDIQ" reference in this section means "multiple award IDIQ contracts" like it is used in the following section L.8.6.4. We interpret that the Government intent means a multiple award IDIQ contract type, as the EC2 IDIQ is with multiple awardees, where this restriction ensures an Offeror cannot claim performance credit (i.e., a work sample) for being one of many awardees, and credit is only accepted for Task Orders that the Offeror actually executed under the multiple award IDIQ. We ask that the Government make this explicit and use the term "multiple award IDIQ contracts" versus "IDIQ contracts" to differentiate from "single award IDIQ contracts" where there is only one awardee for the single contract - specified by a single contract number for the entire Period of Performance (PoP), all "Task Orders" are only ever issued to that singular awardee - often nearly the identical Task Order repeated annually and never competed for the entire PoP for the contract, any only one set of annual CPARS are provided to the single awardee at the contract level - covering all performance. This is a common approach used in NASA for flexibility and we plan to use such a single award IDIQ as one of our work samples, but want to ensure this difference is clarified since it meets the Government's clear intent as we understand it, and allows us to properly take actual performance credit for the contract in work samples. (Please note, we are eager to provide any additional details/substantiations/clarity to the Government if needed since other Offeror's are likely in a similar position for sole work they have on a single award IDIQ contract.)</p>	<p>There is a limit of 2 work samples per Specialty Area (SA). The Offeror shall submit work sample(s) for each scored EC2 SA of the Self-Scoring Matrix in order to demonstrate their past experience. IDIQ contracts (multiple award or single award) are not an acceptable proof of past experience (or past performance) in themselves and shall not be provided as a work sample. However, individual task orders, performed under an IDIQ contract, can be used as a work sample. One task order shall be considered one work sample. The offeror must define the individual task order that is submitted as the work sample. A work sample must reflect accomplished work through the past or on-going contract, not the mere potential or speculative opportunity to acquire contracts or perform work in the future.</p>
515	L-M	Page 10; 3	L.8.6.3	<p>The WS Cover Sheet Primary Scope of Work instructions states: "Enter one or more of the following: Program Management, Operations & Maintenance, Install/Warehouse, SOC-Enterprise Services/Helpdesk" which appear to be from a different RFP PWS than EC2. Please clarify.</p>	<p>This will be corrected in the Final RFP.</p>
516	L-M	Page 10; 3	L.8.6.3	<p>The WS Cover Sheet Percentage of SOC-E Program Areas Covered Under Work Sample instructions states: "Identify the percentage of work supporting SOC-E Program Areas." Please confirm that this refers to the computed percentage of the number of PWS SA performed within each Category.</p>	<p>This will be corrected in the Final RFP.</p>

517	L-M	10 of 21	L.8.6.4	Although multiple contract/task orders issued against a multiple-award IDIQ cannot be combined and counted as one contract reference, would the Government allow task orders issued under single-award IDIQs to be combined and counted as one contract reference since all of the resulting work was performed by the same Contractor?	There is a limit of 2 work samples per Specialty Area (SA). The Offeror shall submit work sample(s) for each scored EC2 SA of the Self-Scoring Matrix in order to demonstrate their past experience. IDIQ contracts (multiple award or single award) are not an acceptable proof of past experience (or past performance) in themselves and shall not be provided as a work sample. However, individual task orders, performed under an IDIQ contract, can be used as a work sample. One task order shall be considered one work sample. The offeror must define the individual task order that is submitted as the work sample. A work sample must reflect accomplished work through the past or on-going contract, not the mere potential or speculative opportunity to acquire contracts or perform work in the future.
518	L-M	Page 10	L.8.6.4	The current draft RFP only specifically addresses multiple award (MA) IDIQ contracts and states that "multiple task orders cannot be combined on MA IDIQ contract.". Single Award IDIQ contracts are not addressed. The following RFI 3 Q&A responses address Single Award IDIQ Work Samples: "Q117: Section L - Page 9 – Section 2.4.1.1.2 states that Offerors using single award IDIQ contract numbers as a contract reference ...a maximum of three task orders can be combined and counted as one contract reference...Can the government explain why a single award IDIQ can combine task orders as one contract reference whereas task orders issued against a multiple award IDIQ cannot be combined and counted as one contract reference? A117: Section 2.4.1.1.2 will be updated and clarified within the draft RFP to address this concern. It's the Government's intention to allow single award IDIQs with multiple task orders to be used as stand-alone references meaning each task order is one contract reference. Additionally, we expect that task orders under a single award IDIQ can be used in different Categories or Specialty Areas. Section 2.4.1.1.2 will be updated and clarified within the draft RFP." "Q135: Draft Section L, Volume II - Past Experience Paragraph 2.4.1.1.2 – Single Award IDIQ contracts are allowed to be used with a maximum of three task orders issued against the single award IDIQ as a single reference. If the single award IDIQ has more than 3 task orders issued against the contract, can we use the single award IDIQ as a second reference with additional task orders? A135: Yes. Single award IDIQs with multiple task orders can be used as stand-alone references. Additionally, task orders under a single award IDIQ can be used in different Categories or Specialty Areas. Section 2.4.1.1.2 will be updated and clarified within the draft RFP. It's the Government's intention to provide Offerors w/ the opportunity to obtain the highest possible past experience ratings while receiving the most efficient amount of past experience information that is necessary to adjudicate the rating." Many Single Award IDIQ contracts issue many limited Task Orders for various reasons, including to fund specific areas of the overall project or to provide more detailed task requirements. etc. 1) How many task orders can Offerors combine from a single award IDIQ on each work sample? 2) Can a Single Award IDIQ PWS/SOW be used as a stand-alone reference (Work Sample) if it has covered <u>covered</u> task orders that function as Technical Direction Letters (TDL) or if the task	This has been corrected. An IDIQ may be multiple award or single award and IAW L.8.7.4. Contract/task order for the purpose of evaluating work samples is defined as a singular agreement used to document a mutually binding legal relationship obligating the seller to furnish supplies or services in exchange for the buyer paying for them. Multiple contract/task orders cannot be combined and counted as one contract reference
519	L-M	10	L.8.6.4	The solicitation clearly states that multiple task orders issued against a multiple-award IDIQ cannot be combined and counted as one contract reference. Please address whether multiple task orders issued against a <i>single-award IDIQ</i> can be combined and counted as one contract reference, provided that those task orders are issued by a single customer and a single requirement (SOW or PWS).	This has been corrected. An IDIQ may be multiple award or single award and IAW L.8.7.4. Contract/task order for the purpose of evaluating work samples is defined as a singular agreement used to document a mutually binding legal relationship obligating the seller to furnish supplies or services in exchange for the buyer paying for them. Multiple contract/task orders cannot be combined and counted as one contract reference
520	L-M	10	L.8.6.4	We understand that multiple task orders issued against a multiple-award IDIQ cannot be combined and counted as one contract reference. Will the Government allow the combination of multiple task/delivery orders under a single award IDIQ to be used as a single work sample (Past Experience) and Past Performance?	This has been corrected. An IDIQ may be multiple award or single award and IAW L.8.7.4. Contract/task order for the purpose of evaluating work samples is defined as a singular agreement used to document a mutually binding legal relationship obligating the seller to furnish supplies or services in exchange for the buyer paying for them. Multiple contract/task orders cannot be combined and counted as one contract reference
521	L-M	10	L.8.6.4	In the previous draft of Section L (2.4.1.1.2) the government stated that 'A maximum of three (3) task orders issued against a single-award IDIQ can be combined and counted as one (1) contract reference to address the criteria'. The new Section L.8.6.4 does not include this language and only addresses multiple-award IDIQs (Multiple contract/task orders issued against a multiple-award IDIQ cannot be combined and counted as one contract reference'), can the Government revise this section to include the language on single-award IDIQs?	This has been corrected. An IDIQ may be multiple award or single award and IAW L.8.7.4. Contract/task order for the purpose of evaluating work samples is defined as a singular agreement used to document a mutually binding legal relationship obligating the seller to furnish supplies or services in exchange for the buyer paying for them. Multiple contract/task orders cannot be combined and counted as one contract reference
522	L-M	10	L.8.7.1	"Work samples shall meet these minimum qualifications: (a) Be a past or current contracts (including Federal, State, and local government and private) for efforts similar to the Government requirement in accordance with the criteria listed herein. " Question: Is private defined as commercial contracts?	"Private" includes commercial and non-governmental contracts.
523	L-M	pg.11	L.8.7.1	L.8.7.1. Work Sample Qualifications states: "(c) Work was accomplished by a legal business entity included in the Team Structure." Q: Can the Government confirm that a prime Offeror's teaming partners can provide work samples where the teaming partners are subcontractors to another Prime?	Yes, there is no restriction on this, we simply ask that it is identified in Volume II and Attachment 3.
524	L-M	11	L.8.7.1	Section L.8.7.1 states that for Work Samples, "all work must have been completed within the last three years." Does this mean that ongoing contracts that began within the past three years are not eligible as Work Samples?	No. Ongoing is acceptable, we only ask for proof that the work has occurred for more than 6 months and within the last 3 years.
525	L-M	10	L.8.7.1	Regarding the sentence " <i>Be a past or current contracts (including Federal, State, and local government and private)</i> ", can the government clarify what is meant by " <i>private</i> "? Does this mean a commercial, non-government contract or something else? Note: the wording in Section M.5.3.2.1 has " <i>commercial</i> " contracts.	"Private" includes commercial and non-governmental contracts.
526	L-M	10	L.8.7.1	The Government states that the definition of a work sample includes "...past or current contracts (including Federal, State, and local government and private)...". Is it the Government's intent to allow commercial, entirely non-governmental work to apply as relevant experience for this solicitation?	Yes. Private will be defined in the Final RFP. In the past performance volume, in the absence of CPARS data, the offeror must obtain a PPQ.
527	L-M	10	L.8.7.1	Would the Government clarify if multiple task orders under a Single Award IDIQ (SAIDIQ) can be combined into a single Work Sample for submission or if each Task/Delivery order must be separately scored?	A Work Sample can satisfy multiple Specialty Areas and each needs to be specifically identified. To fully satisfy any specific Specialty Area (10 points), two separate Work Samples (different contracts) must be provided.
528	L-M	10	L.8.7.1	Does section L.8.7.1 request us to document how each provided work sample meets the qualifications described in these instructions or is this a description of how the government will assess work sample qualification?	The Work Sample will be validated against the EC2 PWS. The PWS supplement can be used as a guide to understand what can be used to validate the SA.
529	L-M	10	L.8.7.1	Misnumbered. Recommend the Government update paragraph numbering.	This will be corrected in Final RFP.
530	L-M	11	L.8.7.1	This paragraph indicates work must have been completed within the last three years, language does not allow for ongoing work - however Section M 5.3.1 indicates work can be ongoing - please clarify ongoing work is acceptable.	This will be corrected in the Final RFP.
531	L-M	10	L.8.7.1	We recommend the government increase the recency threshold for past performance work samples to 5 years. These projects are still very recent and relevant and will provide the government and industry with the ability to draw upon a broader set of corporate capabilities and innovation.	The recency threshold will remain at 3 years in the Final RFP.
532	L-M	10 of 21	L.8.7.1(b)	L.8.7.1(b) states that work samples shall meet the following minimum qualification: "Performed the work for a minimum of six months in duration and all work must have been completed within the last three years from the date of this RFP's date of issuance." We recommend requiring Offerors to provide documentation evidence for the contract period of performance to validate it is within the last 3 years from the date of the RFP. Documentation could include an FPDS form.	The government has already provided direction in the solicitation. Attachment 6 requires the offeror to identify the period of performance.
533	L-M	10 of 21	L.8.7.1(b)	L.8.7.1(b) states that work samples shall meet the following minimum qualification: "Performed the work for a minimum of six months in duration and all work must have been completed within the last three years from the date of this RFP's date of issuance." Since periods of performance are typically 5 years, will the Government confirm that at least 6 months of performance must have been performed within the previous 3 years, and allow Offerors to submit contracts that are within the period of performance but are ongoing.	"At least 6 months of performance must have been performed within the 3 previous years" is measured from the end date of the work sample contract's period of performance.
534	L-M	10 of 21	L.8.7.1(b)	L.8.7.1(b) states that work samples shall meet the following minimum qualification: "Performed the work for a minimum of six months in duration and all work must have been completed within the last three years from the date of this RFP's date of issuance." We recommend the Government use the RFP's proposal submission date rather than date of issuance to account for possible proposal amendments and modifications.	The requirement remains unchanged.
535	L-M	11 of 21	L.8.7.1.1	The requirement for Joint Ventures states "Offerors that are Joint Ventures, including Mentor-Protégé Joint Ventures, must submit information to fully meet all requirements of the solicitation, including any contract and responsibility determination requirements, past experience, past performance, business systems and certifications of the Joint Venture and that of individual partners of the Joint Venture." Question: For non-populated Joint Ventures, will the Government confirm that these requirements can be met by supplying these items under the name of each member of the Joint Venture and not in the name of the Joint Venture itself? For example, the Volume I Financial/Other Resources statement and Accounting System documentation be provided in the name of each member of the Joint Venture and not as a reflection of the Joint Venture entity.	An unpopulated Joint Venture may rely on the capabilities, past performance, experience, business systems, and certifications of its partners. It's incumbent upon the JV offeror to affirmatively and specifically note where it is relying on the capabilities and resources of the specified JV partner to meet the requirements of the present acquisition.

536	L-M	11	L.8.7.1.1	"Nothing herein requires that a protégé partner's contribution or experience, solely or individually, meet the same requirements as non-protégé offerors." Question: Please expand the definition in this section of a "Protégé partner and non-protégé offerors and clarify the meaning of this sentence.	The government refers to the provisions of 13 CFR §125.8 and §125.9, which provide more guidance regarding mentor-protégé joint ventures. The provisions in Section L are derived therefrom.
537	L-M	11	L.8.7.1.1	Does the protégé of the JV have to provide both the work samples for the minimum of 6 Specialty Areas in order to receive the maximum of 10 points per Specialty Area?	No. The protégé must provide one work sample minimum for at least 6 different Specialty Areas.
538	L-M	35 11	L.8.7.1.1	<p>The Government provided a answer to JV Mentor Protégé responses on page 35 of the slide deck stating from the 31 SAs, the JV must demonstrate contribution/experience of the protégé member in a minimum of six defined categories/specialty areas. The Government stated the JV does not need to provide both Work Samples for any one Specialty Area. The Government stated within a Specialty Area one work sample may come from a mentor and one from a protégé.</p> <p>Question: Will the Government allow for any qualifying team member to provide the second work sample within an SA. For example: Data Management, the Protégé member provides a relevant work sample for 5 points, and a Team Member other than the mentor provides the second work sample for Data Management for the additional 5 points to make the score of 10.</p> <p>Rationale: JVs are established to help small business grow in both capability and competency and are not necessarily established for one or one mapping of competencies.</p>	The requirement for JV protégé work samples does not preclude teaming members (including subcontractors) work samples. However, the Offeror must identify the teaming partners (companies) which will support the Offeror in the performance of the IDIQ (see Atch 3, Part II)
539	L-M	11 of 21	L.8.7.1.1. L.8.7.1.2	Similar to the intent of L.8.7.1.1 Joint Ventures requiring that "the JV must demonstrate the contributions/experience of the protégé member in a minimum of six of the defined categories/specialty areas", we recommend the Government require that any prime Offeror similarly demonstrate performance in at least six (6) of the Specialty Areas in order to ensure the Government receives offers from credible prime Offerors. This may mitigate an over-reliance on subcontractors to achieve a high score that is not attributable to the prime's experience.	The Government will not otherwise require a certain number of past experience work samples from the prime offeror. Where the prime offeror relies on subcontractor (or other company/entity) work samples in particular SAs, it is incumbent upon that prime offeror to also state that the subcontractor will actually be performing under the IDIQ in that respective SA. The Offeror must identify all companies/entities which will support the Offeror in the performance of the IDIQ (Atch 3, Part II)
540	L-M	11 and 20	L.8.7.1.1./ M.6.1.2	For mentor protégé joint venture (MP JV) offerors, Section L.8.7.1.1 states the JV must demonstrate the contributions/ experience of the protégé member in a minimum of six (6) of the defined categories/specialty areas. Requiring the protégé to ONLY have to demonstrate a minimum of six (6) of the defined categories/specialty areas presents an unfair advantage to total small business offerors who are required to demonstrate a minimum of 28. Furthermore, requiring only six (6) from protégés of an MP JV potentially defies even the U.S. Small Business Administration's own regulations and policies. In a recent rulemaking, SBA said that MP JV proteges must "bring something to the table other than [their] size or socioeconomic status." 85 Fed. Reg. 66146, 66167-68, Oct. 16, 2020. Moreover, MP JV proteges are required to perform 40% of any set-aside contract awarded to an MP JV. It cannot be sound policy for the Federal Government to award a large contract to an MP JV irrespective of the reasonable qualifications and capabilities of the protégé. Based on this, will the government require that a JV must demonstrate the contributions/ experience of the protégé member in a minimum of 40% of the required minimum 28 categories/specialty areas, with 40% of the 28 being a minimum of eleven (11) of the defined categories/specialty areas required by the protégé?	The government will not revise the established minimum number of protégé work samples. The provisions of 13 CFR 125.8 are applicable however to Joint Ventures.
541	L-M	11	L.8.7.1.2	L.8.7.1.2 states "Offerors may also include subsidiaries, or legal entities which fall under the Offeror, with the offeror's affirmation that the subsidiary/legal entity will be supporting the offeror in the performance of this contract.. In order to use subsidiaries or legal entities as a prime work sample, (1) the acquisition of the subsidiary or legal entities shall have been finalized as of the date of this RFPs issuance, and (2) objective evidence shall be included in the Volume IV Organization Structure Change History Section of the RFP to demonstrate that they are now a legal entity of the Offeror. If the criteria above are met, subsidiary or legal entity work samples will be considered prime work samples even if the work occurred prior to the company being acquired. This same approach and documentation requirement applies to any Subcontractor/Teaming Partner work samples" Teaming partners are external entities to the Offeror, therefore we cannot provide any proof of ownership by us. Are you intending to require teaming partners who are using a work sample from a subsidiaries or legal entitie, to provide this same documentation, to which the Offeror would submit on their behalf? Please clarify.	L.8.7.1.2 will be revised. L.8.7.1.2 and M.4.2 authorize the offeror to provide work samples of other entities (team members, subcontractors)(Atch 3). If the entity member/subcontractor operated under a different company name (i.e., as relevant to the work sample), then the offeror must provide the organization structure history.
542	L-M	11 of 21	L.8.7.1.2	<p>Some Offerors have organizational structures that are comprised of corporate affiliates, also called sister companies, who share a corporate parent that are able to leverage shared services such as Finance, Contracts, Legal, and Information Technology, which provide efficiencies to the Government. Similar to the "subsidiary/legal entity" relationships to the Prime Offeror in Section L.8.7.1.2, such affiliates/sister companies can similarly be affirmed to be used in "supporting the offeror in the performance of this contract". This is allowed in many Federal contracts in accordance with applicable Federal Acquisition Regulations (FAR) rules. In this regard, in order to allow this, we recommend the Government slightly modify the language of L.8.7.1.2 in this manner:</p> <p>L.8.7.1.2. Offerors may also include subsidiaries or legal entities which fall under the Offeror, or corporate affiliates, with the offeror's affirmation that the subsidiary/legal entity/affiliate will be supporting the offeror in the performance of this contract. In order to use subsidiaries or legal entities as a prime work sample, (1) the acquisition of the subsidiary or legal entities shall have been finalized as of the date of this RFPs issuance, and (2) objective evidence shall be included in the Volume IV Organization Structure Change History Section of the RFP to demonstrate that they are now a legal entity of the Offeror. If the criteria above are met for subsidiary or legal entities, the work samples will be considered prime work samples even if the work occurred prior to the company being acquired. This same approach and documentation requirement applies to any Subcontractor/Teaming Partner work samples.</p> <p>Additionally, some similar minor modifications to add the term "affiliates" would be needed in Section L.8.5 (page 10 of 21). Offerors are also able to clearly indicate this in L.7.4 Team Structure (page 8 of 21) to show this relationship.</p>	The language will be changed as follows: L.8.7.1.2. Work Samples of Other Companies/Entities L.8.7.1.2.1. Under the prime offeror's work samples, the prime offeror may rely on companies/entities. A subsidiary shall have been finalized as of the date of proposal submission with information included in the Volume IV Organization Structure Change History Section to support. L.8.7.1.2.3. Where the prime offeror relies on SA work samples from other companies/entities, it is incumbent upon the prime offeror to state that the company/entity to note how the company/entity will actually be performing under the IDIQ in that respective SA (Team Structure, Atch 3).
543	L-M	11	L.8.7.11	New DRFP language currently states: "From the thirty-one defined categories/specialty areas, the JV must demonstrate the contributions/experience of the protégé member in a minimum of six of the defined categories/specialty areas." Question - Will the government allow the work smaples provided by the protege to reflect expeirence ganed by the protege as a subcontractor as long as they show evidence of the specific areas where the subcontractor performed the effort. Consider allowing this evidence to include T&M invoices from the subcotntractor to the prime.	See L.8.6.1. The government will consider a work sample as a subcontractor or team member. The work sample submission must clearly demonstrate the subcontractor's name and its participation relative to the specialty area (SA) (Atch 3, Part II). The work samples shall consist of only official contract documentation. "Official contract documentation" includes key documents integral to contract performance, including contracts, orders, modifications, PWS/SOW/SOO, CDRLs, subcontracting plans, invoices, meeting minutes, progress reports, monthly status reports, or other reports. The contractor may submit other documentation it regards to be integral to the contract (i.e., CPARS, FPDS, memos from COs/government official/prime contractor), but offerors are cautioned that the documentation is validated for past experience (not past performance) and that authenticity (contract-contemporaneous documents) and level of detail are critical considerations of any work sample. The Government cautions offerors to ensure detailed information (through the work sample and attachments (Atch 6). Do not presume that the government will necessarily extrapolate details that are not clearly presented. Submission of relevant excerpts (vice submitting an entire document) is recommended. In Atch 6 and the work sample, spelling out critical acronyms, providing "lay person" explanations, and marking/highlighting (or otherwise distinguishing) key excerpts may also ensure that the Government may consider the work sample and its nexus to the SAs under the IDIQ. The markings/highlighting should be evident that the marking/highlighting were newly-added by the offeror and not part of the original document.
544	L-M	11	L.8.7.11	Will the government except past performance performed by the Joint venture to be counted as meeting the 6 SA by the protégé. As the protégé is required to be the managing member of the JV and has to perform a minimum percentage of all efforts it stands to reason this should count as prime work submitted by the JV.	Yes. With regard to the 6 SA minimum submission of protégé partner, the Government will accept a work sample from the JV (that included the protégé partner). The JV work sample may be counted in meeting the protégé's "minimum of six" provision. However, in Atch 8, Part III, the JV must note the substantive participation of the protégé partner. See also question #556.
545	L-M	11	L.9	Given that the Government is allowing offerors to include commercial past performance and work samples; will the government please consider an allowance for the omission of a commercial company's proprietary data in an offeror's past experience and past performance volumes, the Work Sample Cover Sheet, and the Past Performance Questionnaire such as TCV and Contract type? Can ranges for quantitative data be provided instead of exact amounts and dates? Offerors may be prohibited from disclosing this data by our customers.	The offeror may include proprietary markings on the work sample, and the government is required to safeguard/non-disclose the information. The offeror may also consider other alternatives to meet its obligation to the former prime contractor, including redaction, memo from prime contractor (i.e., generally discussing Total Contract Value, between \$500,000 and \$2,000,000), etc. The offeror is cautioned that the government can only rely on the submitted information, and redactions of a material nature could potentially impact evaluation.

546	L-M	11	L.9	In the commercial sector, we have several retainer contracts, to which we provide cyber security services on an as needed basis such as breach remediation, and other cyber crime investigative support, to which our clients do not want these activities or fact of occurrence attributed to them, and thus are not willing to allow us to disclose their name in a work sample cover sheet or past performance reference. Given that the Government is allowing offerors to include commercial past performance and work samples; will the government please consider an allowance for the omission of a commercial company's proprietary data in an offeror's past experience and past performance volumes, the Past Performance Questionnaire, and the Work Sample Cover Sheet, such as the commercial customer name? Can commercial customer name be obfuscated - such as instead of naming of the company, we would say "top US airline", or "largest US grocer", etc.	The offeror may include proprietary markings on the work sample, and the government is required to safeguard/non-disclose the information. The offeror may also consider other alternatives to meet its obligation to the former prime contractor, including redaction, memo from prime contractor (i.e., generally discussing Total Contract Value, between \$500,000 and \$2,000,000), etc. The offeror is cautioned that the government can only rely on the submitted information, and redactions of a material nature could potentially impact evaluation.
547	L-M	11	L.9	Will the government consider revising the past experience (work sample) and past performance requirements to be more in line with a commercial customer's need to protect proprietary information? Commercial clients will not provide proprietary information or allow for its release; the same information that government agencies freely share. An example of corporate proprietary data includes total contract number or value, time that commercial customers work with a vendor, and their personnel personal data including names. Corporations have a position that their information regarding how they engage vendors can present a competitive advantage to their competition. For this reason they prevent their vendors from releasing that data. The Department of Veteran's Affairs example of proposal instructions allows companies to reference programs while adhering to our customer's confidentiality agreements. While the scope of the VA RFP and key personnel requirements differ, this structure is an example that allows the government to assess past performance relevance to their scope, while not compromising bidder's commercial client's confidentiality. The VA's past performance requirements is included here for information: Source: "REQUEST FOR TASK ORDER PROPOSAL (RTOP) #36C10E20R0001 VETERANS INTAKE, CONVERSION, AND COMMUNICATIONS SERVICES (VICCS) TASK ORDER #2 – MAIL AUTOMATION SERVICES a) Capability and Experience (narrative shall address each element below): 1.a.1. The Offeror shall submit a Capabilities and Experience volume directly addressing the criteria below. The Offeror may use their experience, prior entity experience, subcontractor experience and personnel experience to respond. The Offeror shall address 2 or more examples of large-scale engagements of similar size, scope, and complexity. The Offeror shall specifically prioritize more relevant (in context of scope) private industry experience over less relevant Government (including VA-specific) experience. Where Contractors, or their subcontractors, may have a private sector practice and a public sector practice, they may use private sector practice experiences as their own. If an Offeror cannot disclose the specific customer for whom work was	The offeror may include proprietary markings on the work sample, and the government is required to safeguard/non-disclose the information. The offeror may also consider other alternatives to meet its obligation to the former prime contractor, including redaction, memo from prime contractor (i.e., generally discussing Total Contract Value, between \$500,000 and \$2,000,000), etc. The offeror is cautioned that the government can only rely on the submitted information, and redactions of a material nature could potentially impact evaluation.
548	L-M	12-Nov	L.9	The RFP is unclear about the number of examples offerors are to include for the past performance evaluation. If past performance information and CPARs or PPQs are required for all Work Samples (up to 62), that will present a huge burden to the Government (evaluators and those filling out PPQs) and to large and small businesses preparing bids. Would the Government please consider whether past performance information for a subset of all Work Samples will provide it the information it needs to assess Offerors' past performance and clarify how many past performance examples are required?	2 maximum Work Samples per SA. Those same Work Samples will be used for both Factors.
549	L-M	11 of 21	L.9.3	The term "Specialty Areas" is used several times in this document, and Section L.9.3. references "Specialty Areas identified in the PWS". However, Attachment 1 PWS does not use the term "Specialty Area" in the document. We only found an apparent definition of the term in Attachment 14. EC2 Ordering Guide. For clarity, we recommend the Government define the terms "Categories" and "Specialty Areas" in the PWS, and specify how the PWS items relate to those terms.	The Government will consider this for the final RFP however Categories and Specialty Areas are listed in Attachment 2, PWS Supplement.
550	L-M	11	L.9.4	Reference: "Error Reference was not found..." Q: Can the government please resolve this error?	This has been corrected.
551	L-M	11	L.9.5	As the RFP is currently written, Offerors can submit an unlimited number of past performance contracts. Will the Government provide a range for the number of past performance contracts for proposal submission? We recommend a maximum of three (3) past performance submissions?	There is a maximum of two Work Samples per SA. A Work Sample can satisfy multiple Specialty Areas and each needs to be specifically identified. To fully satisfy any specific Specialty Area (10 points), two separate Work Samples (different contracts) must be provided.
552	L-M	12 and 18	L.9.5 and M.4.2.	Are there any limitations to providing Classified contracts as references? If acceptable, please advise on how to reference when such classification restrictions are required.	Classified proposal information shall not be submitted and will not be evaluated. The burden of proof is defined at L.8.5. The Government will evaluate unclassified proposal information only and determine if the past experience is relevant IAW M.4.1.
553	L-M		L.9.5.1	L.9.5.1 states "A Past Performance Submission consists of a 1) Past Performance Information Sheet, and either a 2) Past Performance Questionnaire , or a 3) Contractor Performance Assessment Reports. Past Performance Submissions must reflect work accomplished by a legal entity included in Volume II, Team Structure with a properly executed Teaming Agreement as required by Volume II, Teaming Agreement " Currently the team structure spreadsheet does not allow for the listing of the offeror, only teaming partners. Therefore, the Offeror is not permitted to submit past performance, as we cannot put in place a teaming agreement with our selves. Recommend this be revised to allow Offerors to submit their own past performance references, along with references from teaming partners.	Wording will be revised in the Final RFP. Past performance information can be included from the offeror or the offeror's proposed team (the companies/entities that will support offeror in the IDIQ
554	L-M	12	L.9.5.1	Section L states "A Past Performance Submission consists of a 1) Past Performance Information Sheet, and either a 2) Past Performance Questionnaire , or a 3) Contractor Performance Assessment Reports." Cost Plus Award Fee (CPAF) contracts/task orders have Award Fee Evaluation Boards (EVABs) that are akin to CPARS. Will offerors be allowed to submit EVABs for CPAF contracts/task orders in lieu of PPQs? Note: Answer may impact Section L.9.5.3.	Section L.9.5 will be updated in the Final RFP to allow submission of supporting documentation to demonstrate the quality of the offeror's past performance. CPAR must be submitted; only if CPAR is unavailable can offeror provide EVAB or PPQ.
555	L-M	12	L.9.5.1	"Offerors shall only submit Past Performance Submissions that match Work Samples submitted as part of their Past Experience proposal." Is the Government requiring that Offerors submit a certain number of PP submissions (for example, minimum of 1 and up to 5), or is the requirement that Offerors shall submit PP submissions for each/every Work Sample cited in their Past Experience proposal?	There is a maximum of two Work Samples per SA. A Work Sample can satisfy multiple Specialty Areas and each needs to be specifically identified. To fully satisfy any specific Specialty Area (10 points), two separate Work Samples (different contracts) must be provided.
556	L-M	12	L.9.5.1	Can the Government clarify which contracts should be used in the Past Performance Volume? Do bidders need to submit a Past Performance citation for each and every Past Experience artifact/Work Sample in the Past Experience Volume?	Yes, each Work Sample should be cited. There is a maximum of two Work Samples per SA. A Work Sample can satisfy multiple Specialty Areas and each needs to be specifically identified. To fully satisfy any specific Specialty Area (10 points), two separate Work Samples (different contracts) must be provided.
557	L-M	12	L.9.5.1	The instructions for Past Performance submissions states "A Past Performance Submission consists of a 1) Past Performance Information Sheet, and either a 2) Past Performance Questionnaire, or a 3) Contractor Performance Assessment Reports. Past Performance Submissions must reflect work accomplished by a legal entity included in Volume II, Team Structure with a properly executed Teaming Agreement as required by Volume II, Teaming Agreement." Attachment 10 (PPQ) includes a row stating "Describe your role on the contract (e.g., Prime or Subcontractor)." Can the Government please confirm that a Past Performance submission may include contracts in which any performing entity on the Offeror's team served as a subcontractor?	Yes, there is no restriction on this, we simply ask that it is identified in Volume II and Attachment 3.
558	L-M	12	L.9.5.1	The instructions for Past Performance submissions states "A Past Performance Submission consists of a 1) Past Performance Information Sheet, and either a 2) Past Performance Questionnaire, or a 3) Contractor Performance Assessment Reports. Past Performance Submissions must reflect work accomplished by a legal entity included in Volume II, Team Structure with a properly executed Teaming Agreement as required by Volume II, Teaming Agreement." For cases where the performing entity on the Offeror's team served as a subcontractor, can the Government please confirm that a PPQ from the prime contractor or a prime contractor's evaluation report of the subcontractor can be used to support a Past Performance submission as applicable?	Yes, there is no restriction on this, we simply ask that it is identified in Volume II and Attachment 3.

559	L-M	12	L.9.5.1	The instructions for Past Performance submissions states "Offerors shall not submit new contract references for the Past Performance Submission." Can the Government please define the word "new" in terms of minimum contract execution duration since contract award at the time of proposal submission? Is it the 6 month minimum duration as specified in Paragraph M.5.3.1?	The insurance provision will be deleted. The government may require evidence of compliance (FAR clause 52.228-5, Insurance – Work on Government Installations in task order evaluations and contract administration.
560	L-M	11	L.9.5.1	Reference:Offerors shall only submit Past Performance Submissions that match Work Samples submitted as part of their Past Experience proposal. Q: Is the offeror required to use all Work Samples from Past Experience? Or is there a minimum or maximum amount of Past Performance ?	A Work Sample can satisfy multiple Specialty Areas and each needs to be specifically identified. To fully satisfy any specific Specialty Area (10 points), two separate Work Samples (different contracts) must be provided.
561	L-M	12	L.9.5.1 and L.9.5.4	L.9.5.1 states that applicants must submit either a PPQ or a CPARS, but L.9.5.4 states that applicants must provide a CPARS for each Work Sample. Which is it, either a PPQ or CPARS or just a CPARS?	PPQs shall only be submitted in instances when CPARS information is unavailable (i.e. subcontracted work or initial CPAR is not finalized)
562	L-M	pg 12 of 22	L.9.5.1 Past Performance Submissions	Can the Government please clarify the following in the Past Performance volume: Is it required that the Past Performance Volume include both a Past Performance Questionnaire (PPQ) or a Contractor Performance Assessment Reports (CPAR) (per L.9.5.1) or are all CPARS required if the company was Prime (per Attachment 12 NOTE)? Please clarify if a PPQ without a CPAR is a compliant submission. Please clarify if a Prime without CPARS can submit a PPQ. The DRFP requirements include: "L.9.5.1: A Past Performance Submission consists of a 1) Past Performance Information Sheet, and either a 2) Past Performance Questionnaire, or a 3) Contractor Performance Assessment Reports. " "In ATTACHMENT 12 PAST PERFORMANCE INFORMATION (PPI) *NOTE: If Prime is checked above, offerors must submit all completed CPARS reports related to the effort listed above, to include interim and final reports."	It is a CPARS if one exists, if not then the Government requires a PPQ.
563	L-M	pg 12 of 22	L.9.5.1 Past Performance Submissions	As some Government Contracting Offices require significant lead time for processing PPQs, is the Government prepared to accept the PPQs at this time?	No, please submit documentation once the Final RFP has been released.
564	L-M	12 of 21	L.9.5.2	The Government states: "Offerors shall submit a PPI sheet (Attachment 12) for each work sample." We recommend establishing a maximum number of PPIs for the Past Performance Volume to streamline evaluation while still providing sufficient data to assess contractor performance.	Please see L.9.5. A PPI sheet is required for each work sample. There is a limit of 2 work samples per SA (L.8.6.2). Multiple contracts cannot be combined and counted as one contract reference. This means offerors are only allowed to submit one PPI per work sample with a maximum of 2 work samples per SA. Thereby with 31 SAs, 2 work samples per SA, and 1 PPI per work sample = The number of PPI submissions will not exceed 62.
565	L-M	pg.12	L.9.5.2	Section L.9.5.2. Past Performance Information (PPI) Sheet states: "Offerors shall submit Attachment 9, Past Performance Info Sheet for each work sample." This requirement inherently favors large integrators who may be able to utilize only one or two references as work samples against a broad range of EC2 SAs, whereas companies of smaller size with more focused contracts may have to provide significantly more work samples (and PPI Sheets and CPARS/PPQs) to demonstrate the same proof. Tying the number of PPI sheet submissions directly to the number of work samples unfairly disadvantages smaller Offerors/teams in terms of overall proposal response efforts expended, and may inadvertently serve to limit competition. Q: Will the Government consider requesting a set number of PPI Sheets and CPARS/PPQ submissions (for instance, allowing Offerors/teams to provide their "top three" references) as a traditional method of evaluating past performance that does not place unequal burdens on smaller Offerors/teams and will not inadvertently limit competition?	No, the Government will not limit past performance to only three entries. All contracts (from past experience work samples) will be assessed in past performance.
566	L-M	12	L.9.5.3	If a company joins multiple teams as a subcontractor and submits the same project as a past performance reference more than once, can the company submit a single PPQ for that project reference? This would minimize the burden on both Government clients completing the PPQ, proposal evaluators and would ensure there is no confusion following the instructions outlined in Section L.	Yes, this is permissible provided all information in the PPQ is accurate.
567	L-M	12	L.9.5.3	Regarding the past performance questionnaires, the guidance states that when completed CPARS or similar reports are submitted to reflect past performance data on a work sample, the PPQ is not required. For commercial and private contracts, which do not have CPARS, what other similar reports are acceptable? On the commercial side, our customers complete Medalia and Net Promotor Score surveys on our performance? Is it correct to assume that Medalia and or Net Promotor Score surveys can be submitted in lieu of CPARS for private / commercial references?	It is a CPARS if one exists, if not then the Government requires a PPQ.
568	L-M	12	L.9.5.3	In this section the Government refers to CPARS "or similar reports." What types of other reports are acceptable? Award or incentive fee documentation, for example?	L.9.5.2. will be updated to clarify and provide examples.
569	L-M	12	L.9.5.3	We recommend that the government index and manage submitted PPQ by contract number, and task order number if applicable, so that Government POCs can complete the PPQ just once, without regard to the number of EC2 teams in which the contractor is bidding. This will reduce administrative burden on the Government based on the numerous Offerors likely responding to EC2, and the unrestricted teaming for EC2.	PPQs may not have contract numbers and/or task numbers, meaning the Government cannot apply this recommendation.
570	L-M	(see pg. 12 of Attach. C Sec. L&M)	L.9.5.3	Section L.9.5.3 states that "Offerors shall use the Government provided Past Performance Questionnaire (Attachment 10), which includes the Government provided PPQ Cover Letter." There doesn't appear to be any Government provided PPQ Cover Letter, but there are four lines of text at the top of Attachment 10 which provide some guidance to the person completing Attachment 10. Is this the "PPQ Cover Letter" to which the Government refers, or is the PPQ Cover Letter missing from the Attachment 10 file?	Yes. The Government will provide this in the Final RFP.
571	L-M	(see pg. 12 of Attach. C Sec. L&M)	L.9.5.3	Section L.9.5.3 states that "PPQs shall only be submitted in instances when CPARS information is unavailable (i.e., subcontracted work...)" When an Offeror requests the Government to complete a PPQ regarding work performed as a subcontractor is the expectation that the evaluator completing the PPQ will provide feedback on the performance of that subcontractor, or the entire contract team's performance as a whole? Few Government Contracting Officers or CORs will have the ability to separate and score the performance of a single subcontractor that is part of a larger prime contract team.	L.9.5.2. will be updated to clarify this requirement and provide additional options to submit Past Performance Information.
572	L-M	12	L.9.5.3	Section L. 9.5.3.: Instructions state that "Government/Client completed PPQ must not be submitted to the Offeror." This seems to imply that the USAF will accept PPQs filled out by Prime contractors ("Client") (vs the Gov customer) where subcontract performance is being used for the EC2 proposal (i.e., since the Government would only know the Prime, not the subcontractor, for that performance contract). Please verify that PPQs filled out by the Prime for any subcontract performance referenced on the EC2 proposal will be accepted.	Confirmed. PPQs filled out by the Prime for subcontracted work will be accepted.
573	L-M	12	L.9.5.3	Please confirm if Past Performance citations where the Offeror performed as a subcontractor are acceptable to qualify for relevancy in SA self-scoring.	Confirmed. PPQs and signed work attestations will be accepted for SA self scoring purposes.
574	L-M	12	L.9.5.3	This section refers to the Past Performance Questionnaire as Attachment 10. However, the Past Performance Questionnaire is titled "Attachment 13." Please reconcile.	This will be corrected in the Final RFP.
575	L-M	(see pg. 12 of Attach. C Sec. L&M)	L.9.5.3 – L.9.5.4	In RFI 3 Questions and Answers (Questions & Answers for RFP # 3 – Enterprise Cyber Capabilities) Q/As 17, 18, 118, 157, 162, 163, 164, 165, 166, the Government responded, "The Government does not expect to require Offerors to submit CPARS." However, the Draft RFP in section L.9.5.3 states "When completed CPARS or similar reports are submitted to reflect past performance data on a work sample, the PPQ is not required. PPQs shall only be submitted in instances when CPARS information is unavailable (i.e. subcontracted work or initial CPAR report is not finalized)" and section L.9.5.4 Contractor Performance Assessment Reports (CPARS) states, "For each work sample, the Offeror shall provide all CPARS reports that were completed within the last three years, as of the date of this RFP. Offerors shall clearly mark each evaluation report with the associated work sample identifier (i.e. WS1-WS62)." Will the Government clarify whether Offerors will be required to submit CPARS for each work sample?	L.9.5.2. will be updated to clarify and provide examples of acceptable PPI. A CPARS submission is required if its available to the offeror at the time of proposal submission.
576	L-M	9	L.9.5.3. Past Performance Questionnaire (PPQ)	We have a work sample that is being referenced on multiple corporate/business submissions as both a prime contractor and subcontractor to another offeror. To minimize the burden on our referenced customer, can we send them one version of the Past Performance Questionnaire (PPQ) labeled with multiple bid-specific Work Sample Identifiers for them to complete and send to the Government? In other words, instead of sending our customer two PPQs to complete, can we send them one PPQ with multiple identifiers in the Work Sample Identifier field, such as "WS-4 for Company X bid; WS-13 for Company Y bid"?	A Work Sample can satisfy multiple Specialty Areas and each needs to be specifically identified. To fully satisfy any specific Specialty Area (10 points), two separate Work Samples (different contracts) must be provided.

577	L-M	12 of 21	L.9.5.4	This section states "For each work sample, the Offeror shall provide all CPARS reports that were completed within the last three years, as of the date of this RFP." Question: If an offeror's Work Sample Task Order is under an IDIQ contract vehicle and CPARS ratings are only provided at the IDIQ level but the report also contains Task Order-specific comments under the CPAR rating areas (e.g., Quality, Cost Control, Management) will the Government consider these acceptable for the CPARS submission requirement?	Yes. In addition, if CPAR is not available for the task order, then the PPQ may be provided.
578	L-M	12	L.9.5.4	Section L states "For each work sample, the Offeror shall provide all CPARS reports that were completed within the last three years, as of the date of this RFP. Offerors shall clearly mark each evaluation report with the associated work sample identifier (i.e. WS1-WS62)." Can Offerors identify all of the corresponding Work Samples on one CPAR report?	Yes. If multiple work samples pertain to one task order, then one CPAR (on that task order) may be provided, with corresponding list of work samples.
579	L-M	12	L.9.5.4	Section L.9.5.4 states, "For each work sample, the Offeror shall provide all CPARs reports that were completed within the last three years, as of the date of this RFP." Recommend the Government to revise this requirement to only require offerors to submit the most recent CPAR report as that report will accurately reflect current performance and include trend data (scores) from the previous CPAR report.	This has been updated.
580	L-M	12	L.9.5.4	Please confirm that CPARs are acceptable in place of Past Performance Questionnaires as part of the proposal response requirements.	Confirmed.
581	L-M	12 of 21	L.9.5.4 & Attachment 12 PPI	The requirement states "For each work sample, the Offeror shall provide all CPARS reports that were completed within the last three years, as of the date of this RFP. " Attachment 12 PPI states "If Prime is checked above, offerors must submit all completed CPARS reports related to the effort listed above, to include interim and final reports." Question: Will the Government confirm that the CPAR requirement stated in Section L [past three years] takes precedence over the Form's instructions?	Confirmed. "Last three years is correct." The incorrect instructions on Attachment 9 Past Performance Information will be removed from the Final RFP.
582	L-M	12 1	L.9.5.4 *NOTE	Contractor Performance Assessment Reports (CPARS) states "For each work sample, the Offeror shall provide all CPARS reports that were completed within the last three years, as of the date of this RFP." Attachment 12 Past Performance Information Sheet states "If Prime is checked above, offerors must submit all completed CPARS reports related to the effort listed above, to include interim and final reports." Offeror requests clarification as to whether "Last three years" or "All" is correct.	"Last three years is correct." The incorrect instructions on Attachment 9 Past Performance Information will be removed from the Final RFP.
583	L-M	12	L.9.5.4. Contractor Performance Assessment Reports (CPARS)	Can the government please clarify if CPARs are only required for work performed in the prior three years from the date of RFP (C Section L - M, p. 12, L.9.5.4.) or for "all completed CPARS reports related to the effort" (9. Past Performance Info Sheet, p.1, B)? Referenced context: - C Section L - M, p. 12: "L.9.5.4. Contractor Performance Assessment Reports (CPARS). For each work sample, the Offeror shall provide all CPARS reports that were completed within the last three years, as of the date of this RFP. Offerors shall clearly mark each evaluation report with the associated work sample identifier (i.e. WS1-WS62)." - 9. Past Performance Info Sheet, p.1, B: "If Prime is checked above, offerors must submit all completed CPARS reports related to the effort listed above, to include interim and final reports."	"Last three years is correct." The incorrect instructions on Attachment 9 Past Performance Information will be removed from the Final RFP.
584	L-M	12; 1	L.9.5.4; B	Section L instructions regarding CPARS report submission conflicts with instructions in Attachment 9 (completed within last three years vs. all completed CPARS reports). Please clarify which CPARS reports are to be submitted.	"Last three years is correct." The incorrect instructions on Attachment 9 Past Performance Information will be removed from the Final RFP.
585	L-M	12	L.9.6	For the organizational change history, for companies that have been in business for multiple decades, this can be extensive. What are the recency requirements for our organizational change history, i.e. how far back do you need us to go? Recommend 3 years in line with Vol 4 past performances.	The Organizational Change history only extends to merger activity that is directly relevant to the contractor's proposal submission.
586	L-M	12	L.9.6	Please confirm in relation to L.9.6, Organizational Change History, that the requirement only extends to merger activity that is directly relevant to the contractor's proposal submission. Merger activity that has no relevance to a Past Experience and Performance submissions or a contractor's proposed performance, however, should not be included in the submission. Is this an accurate interpretation?	Confirmed.
587	L-M	pg.12	L.9.6	Section L.9.6. Organizational Structure Change History states: "To facilitate this relevancy determination, include in this proposal volume a "roadmap" describing all such changes in the organization of your company, if necessary. " Q: Can the Government confirm that if Offerors have no significant organizational structure changes and do not include a response to this requirement in their proposal, that Offeror's proposal will still be considered compliant?	Confirmed however to help verify this is the offeror's circumstance the Government recommends that offerors include a statement similar to. "Offeror has not experienced a significant organizational structure change since its inception." The Organizational Change history only extends to merger activity that is directly relevant to the contractor's proposal submission.
588	L-M	12 of 22	L.9.6	Does the roadmap requirement apply to the Prime Offeror or does it also apply to subcontractors who submit Work Samples/Past Performance information.	It applies to any entities included in the offeror's proposal whose past performance information may be affected by organizational change as described.
589	L-M	13	L.9.7	Is it correct to assume that since the recency for the past performances included in this volume is 3 years as of the date of the final RFP, that offerors are to provide this specific content information such as CARs for contracts performed within the last 3 years?	Yes.
590	L-M	13	L.9.7	Are Offerors to provide this specific content information such as CARs, and other performance issues for their contracts only or is this intended to also include specific content from subcontractors / teaming partners?	If the offeror submits past performance contract references of a subcontractor/team member (where there are performance issues, CARs,, etc), then the offeror may also submit information on how that subcontractor/team member mitigated risk and overcame the problems therein.
591	L-M	13	L.9.7	As a large business with thousands of contracts within the commercial, state, and federal markets, canvassing our entire contract portfolio for contracts with adverse information such as CARs is a time consuming activity and requires offerors to analyze contracts that have no scope relevance to the AF EC2 IDIQ such as finance, logistics, construction, and other contracts. Recommend the "Specific content" be only required for Federal past performances submitted by Offerors and their teaming partners as part of their Vol 4 Past Performance submission. Commercial contracts do not have CARs, CPARs, or other Federal Gov't methods of performance monitoring.	The specific content section is provided so among others, offerors may submit specific information addressing adverse past performance information.
592	L-M	13	L.9.7	This section includes an acronym "CAR". Would the government please clarify to what this refers?	Corrective Action Request (CAR)
593	L-M	pg.12	L.9.7	L.9.7. Specific Content states: "Additional information may be included to discuss the Offeror's efforts to resolve recent contract performance problems encountered on prior contracts as well as past efforts to identify and manage program risk. " Q: Can the Government confirm that if Offerors have no significant contract performance problems and do not include a response to this requirement in their proposal, that Offeror's proposal will still be considered compliant?	Yes, if no significant contractor performance problems exist, the Offeror's proposal will still be considered compliant. Recommend Offeror's include a statement similar to the following: "Offeror has not experienced recent contract performance problems on prior contracts."
594	L-M	13	L.9.7	Line 6 is missing words - meaning not clear. Recommend the Government review/update as required.	This will be corrected in the Final RFP.
595	L-M	Page 10	L.8.6.1	The RFP states: "The work samples shall consist of only official contract documentation which may include Performance Work Statements (PWS), Statements of Work (SOW), or Contract Data Requirement Lists (CDRLs)." Previous Q&A responses stated: "The Government intends on reviewing and updating the list of documentation(s) that are acceptable. Sections L & M will be revised to ensure clarity and consistency. The updated list of acceptable work same documents will be the maximum options for Offerors while maintaining maximum efficiency for the Government to validate that the Offerors possess the background, experience, and past performance needed to receive an IDIQ award in accordance with the RFP." Many PWSs and SOWs only provide a cursory description of the task requirements with subsequent official documents, e.g., Technical Direction Letters (TDL) or Customer-approved Contractor-generated signed Task Plans providing the detailed task requirements for that Task Order. Will the Government accept these other types of official contract documentation in addition to PWS, SOW and CDRL documents?	Section L.8.6.2 will be revised to provide further clarification of work sample submissions. The work samples shall consist of only official contract documentation. "Official contract documentation" includes key documents integral to contract performance, including contracts, orders, modifications, PWS/SOW/SOO, CDRLs, subcontracting plans, invoices, meeting minutes, progress reports, monthly status reports, or other reports. The contractor may submit other documentation it regards to be integral to the contract (i.e., CPARS, FPDS, memos from COs/government official/prime contractor), but offerors are cautioned that the documentation is validated for past experience (not past performance) and that authenticity (contract-contemporaneous documents) and level of detail are critical considerations of any work sample. The Government cautions offerors to ensure detailed information (through the work sample and attachments (Atch 6). Do not presume that the government will necessarily extrapolate details that are not clearly presented. Submission of relevant excerpts (vice submitting an entire document) is recommended. In Atch 6 and the work sample, spelling out critical acronyms, providing "lay person" explanations, and marking/highlighting (or otherwise distinguishing) key excerpts may also ensure that the Government may consider the work sample and its nexus to the SAs under the IDIQ. The markings/highlighting should be evident that the marking/highlighting were newly-added by the offeror and not part of the original document.
596	PWS Supplement	Row 29	Labor Categories Tab	The PWS Map/Nesting cell seems to be misnumbered. It is numbered 2.5.4, but is in the group of rows for 2.4 and its sub-areas, and should probably 2.4.4.	This will be corrected in the Final RFP.
597	PWS Supplement	Rows 24-30	Labor Categories Tab	The PWs Map/Nesting does not seem to have any rows mapped to PWS 2.4.5; the item currently labeled 2.4.4 likely should be 2.4.5.	This will be corrected in the Final RFP.

598	PWS Supplement	N/A	Labor Categories TAB, Row 29	<p>The 'Labor Categories' TAB provides the LCATS to Tasks linkage and the linkage to the PWS (column D). This is the data from which the Offeror provides the '7. Self-Scoring Matrix.xlsx'. The order of Column A and the TABs is identical except for ROW 29. At row 29 the Column D value of '2.5.4' is out of order viz-a-viz the TABs and does not correspond to a row in the Self-Scoring Matrix' and does not correspond to any paragraph in the PWS. The content of the LCAT file for AN-TGT-002 flows logically from the previous file linked to PWS 2.4.4. There is no PWS 2.5.4.</p> <p>Recommend the PWS value (Column D) for Row 29 be changed to 2.4.4.</p>	This will be corrected in the Final RFP.
599	L-M	17	M.4.2	<p>Section M.4.2 states "A minimum of two (2) work samples can achieve the maximum of 10 points per SA, provided that work sample experience demonstrates having accomplished the work described in the PWS and PWS Supplement, Attachment 2 for that SA."</p> <p>So that Offerors can be responsive to the self-scoring requirements, will the Government provide some examples of how official contract documentation should be used to demonstrate having accomplished the work described in the PWS and PWS supplement?</p>	Yes. Directions and examples will be provided in the Final RFP.
600	L-M	17	M.4.2	<p>Section M.4.2 states "Offerors providing no work samples or submitting work samples within the nature and scope of the SA will be deemed not relevant past experience and receive 0 points.</p> <p>As stated, "work samples within the nature and scope of the SA will be deemed not relevant past experience and receive 0 points."</p> <p>This Offeror believes it statement should read "work samples not within the nature and scope of the SA will be deemed not relevant past experience and receive 0 points.". Will the Government please confirm.</p>	This will be corrected in the Final RFP.
601	L-M	13 of 22	M.1.1	<p>The final sentence in this paragraph seems to imply there will be a partial set-aside for small business. Recent Q&A released by the Government indicated there would not be large/small business pools. Please clarify.</p>	The intent of stating "partial small business set-aside" by the Government was to indicate to industry that the rule of 2 will be applied at the task order (TO) level allowing for 100% and/or socio-economic small business set-asides. The attempt by using "partial set-aside" vice "Full and Open" was to emphasize that small business set-asides are allowed and anticipated for many requirements at the TO level. There is not an estimate at this point of how many TOs will be set-aside or a specific "type of work" that will be set-aside. The SB set-aside will be determined on every task order based on results of market research (IAW the ordering guide).
602	L-M	13	M.1.1	<p>The evaluation criteria states "A portion of the requirement will be set-aside for Small Business and a portion of the requirement may be set-aside for other socio-economic small business set-asides in accordance with agency procedures and the EC2 Ordering Guide."</p> <p>Can the Government please estimate the Small Business set aside in terms of total estimated number of Small Business IDIQ awards or estimated number of Small Business awards as a percentage of the total IDIQ contract awards?</p>	The intent of stating "partial small business set-aside" by the Government was to indicate to industry that the rule of 2 will be applied at the task order (TO) level allowing for 100% and/or socio-economic small business set-asides. The attempt by using "partial set-aside" vice "Full and Open" was to emphasize that small business set-asides are allowed and anticipated for many requirements at the TO level. There is not an estimate at this point of how many TOs will be set-aside or a specific "type of work" that will be set-aside. The SB set-aside will be determined on every task order based on results of market research (IAW the ordering guide).
603	L-M	13	M.1.1	<p>The evaluation criteria states "A portion of the requirement will be set-aside for Small Business and a portion of the requirement may be set-aside for other socio-economic small business set-asides in accordance with agency procedures and the EC2 Ordering Guide."</p> <p>Does this imply that certain Task Order RFPs will be restricted to Small Businesses and perhaps to Small Businesses that qualify in certain socio-economic categories, or will all Task Order awards be Full & Open with Small Business Participation Requirements, or both?</p>	The intent of stating "partial small business set-aside" by the Government was to indicate to industry that the rule of 2 will be applied at the task order (TO) level allowing for 100% and/or socio-economic small business set-asides. The attempt by using "partial set-aside" vice "Full and Open" was to emphasize that small business set-asides are allowed and anticipated for many requirements at the TO level. There is not an estimate at this point of how many TOs will be set-aside or a specific "type of work" that will be set-aside. The SB set-aside will be determined on every task order based on results of market research (IAW the ordering guide).
604	L-M	Section M.1.1, Pg 13	M.1.1	<p>The government states: 'A portion of the requirement will be set-aside for Small Business and a portion of the requirement may be set-aside for other socio-economic small business set-asides in accordance with agency procedures and the EC2 Ordering Guide.' However, in the EC2 Ordering Guide under the heading 'Award Pools,' the government states that 'Pools will not be established for this contract. It's in the Government's best interest to award the IDIQ's on an unrestricted basis and conduct SB set-asides at the TO-level, to the maximum extent practicable. Please clarify the Government's position; whether there will be a set number of socio-economic small business set asides at the IDIQ level, OR whether the set-asides will be reserved at the Task Order level.</p>	The intent of stating "partial small business set-aside" by the Government was to indicate to industry that the rule of 2 will be applied at the task order (TO) level allowing for 100% and/or socio-economic small business set-asides. The attempt by using "partial set-aside" vice "Full and Open" was to emphasize that small business set-asides are allowed and anticipated for many requirements at the TO level. There is not an estimate at this point of how many TOs will be set-aside or a specific "type of work" that will be set-aside. The SB set-aside will be determined on every task order based on results of market research (IAW the ordering guide).
605	L-M	Section M.1.1, Pg 14	M.1.1	<p>If the Government does in fact intend to conduct set-asides at the Task Order level, this offeror's feedback is that firms other than small (but not quite considered large), are at a distinct disadvantage in competition with larger firms. Please consider allowing for set-aside awards at the IDIQ level, similar to other Best In Class Multiple Award Vehicles and/or IDIQs.</p>	The requirement will remain unchanged in the Final RFP.
606	L-M	13 of 21	M.1.2	<p>According to M.1.2(3), the following condition must be met in order for an Offeror to be deemed Highly Qualified: "The Contracting Officer has no reason to believe the Offeror would be likely to offer other than fair and reasonable pricing (price will not be evaluated for contract award)." We recommend removing M.1.2(3) given that price will not be evaluated for contract award.</p>	The requirement will remain unchanged in the Final RFP.
607	L-M	13 of 21	M.1.2	<p>If the Government does not receive at least two (2) Offerors in each of the small business set aside areas, e.g. women-owned small business, service disabled veteran owned small business, that meet the "Highly Qualified" criteria in order to receive an EC2 IDIQ award, how does the Government plan to address that? E.g. pursue a future on-boarding process to ensure adequate compenion for Small Business set-aside task orders?</p>	The intent of stating "partial small business set-aside" by the Government was to indicate to industry that the rule of 2 will be applied at the task order (TO) level allowing for 100% and/or socio-economic small business set-asides. The attempt by using "partial set-aside" vice "Full and Open" was to emphasize that small business set-asides are allowed and anticipated for many requirements at the TO level. There is not an estimate at this point of how many TOs will be set-aside or a specific "type of work" that will be set-aside. The SB set-aside will be determined on every task order based on results of market research (IAW the ordering guide). The PWS in the Final RFP will lay out on-ramp/off-ramp guidance which will include future onboarding process.
608	L-M	13	M.1.2	<p>Basis for Award - Section M.1.2 states that the Government intends to 'make an award to each and all qualifying offerors that submit a technically acceptable proposal' - a proposal that 'conforms to all the material requirements of this RFP including responsibility, past experience, past performance and conformance'; additionally it states that to be deemed 'highly qualified' the offeror must demonstrate they are responsible, technically acceptable to the solicitation requirements, and will offer reasonable pricing. In M.5.3.4.1 the Government states the to be 'Highly Qualified' offerors must receive a 'Substantial Confidence' rating which appears to go beyond 'technically acceptable' (Satisfactory Confidence). Can the Government please clarify the basis for award.</p>	<p>The final RFP Sections L and M will be updated to reflect the following Basis for Award: Basis for Award. This is a best value source selection conducted in accordance with Federal Acquisition Regulation (FAR) 15.3 and DoD Source Selection Procedures, as supplemented. The Government intends to make an award to each and all qualifying offerors. To be considered a "qualifying offeror", the offeror must fully meet or exceed the delineated requirements of the solicitation, with the Government determining:</p> <p>(1) the Offeror is responsible in accordance with FAR 9.104-1;</p> <p>(2) the Offeror's proposal is technically acceptable (90% or higher score in Factor 1, Past Experience, para M.4.3), receives a "Substantial Confidence" rating in Factor 2, Past Performance (para M.5.3,4,1), and conforms to all other solicitation requirements; and</p> <p>(3) the Contracting Officer has no reason to believe the Offeror would be likely to offer other than fair and reasonable pricing. Price is not, however, an evaluated factor in this solicitation.</p>
609	L-M	14	M.1.4	<p>This paragraph indicates the terms for on-ramp/off ramp are included in H Clauses, but those clauses are not included in the current Section H. Will the Government provide on-ramp/off-ramp clauses?</p>	No, the Government will not provide on-ramp/off-ramp clauses. On-Ramp/Off-Ramp details will be included in the PWS in the Final RFP not in Section H.
610	L-M	14 of 21	M.1.4	<p>Since the EC2 IDIQ will be in existence for several years, can the Government confirm that successful awardees of the EC2 IDIQ can On/Off-Ramp subcontractors or corporate affiliates over the life of the EC2 IDIQ at their discretion?</p> <p>An example may be the need to on-ramp a subcontractor that specializes in a unique technology to support a task order or task order response which may not exist at the time of the original IDIQ award since technology changes rapidly. Another example may be to on-ramp a small business in a given category in the event they out-grow the small business size and a replacement is needed to meet small business goals.</p>	The government does not on- or off-ramp subcontractors, team members of a prime contractor. IDIQ awardees (prime contractors) will not be precluded in proposing new teammates/subcontractors at the task order level. The Prime may add or remove Team Members as needed to fulfill requirements in Fair Opportunity Proposal Requests. The Prime has discretion as to how to structure its Team to meet Small Business goals, etc. The Prime may be a Large or Small Business. At the task order level, the government may consider the Prime contractor's team change and may require additional information (for example, past experience and past performance).
611	L-M	14 of 21	M.1.4	<p>Does the Government have criteria defined, or estimated, that provides insight into how many bids and/or wins, with associated dollar thresholds, that an awardee must achieve on an annual or other basis in order to remain on the EC2 IDIQ vehicle and avoid being Off-Ramped? Please describe the actual or estimated criteria.</p>	Detailed off-ramp criteria will be provided in the Final RFP. -- NEED TO DISCUSS NEW TEAM
612	L-M	14	M.1.4	<p>Will the government be including information about on/off ramp opportunities? Section M indicates that this is the case, however, there is no mention of on/off ramps in Section H of the Solicitation. If so, will Awardees be able to bring on new team members during these on/off ramp periods as well?</p>	Detailed off-ramp criteria will be provided in the Final RFP.

613	L-M	14	M.1.4	Can the Government please confirm that the potential reasons for a Prime Contractor to be off-ramped as referenced in Paragraph M.1.4 are limited to those detailed in PWS Paragraph 5.10.3, which are Performance and Inadequate Participation (bid rate is below 2 task order proposals within each ordering period)?	Detailed off-ramp criteria will be provided in the Final RFP PWS.
614	L-M	pg.14, 15	M.1.6, M.2.1	Section M.1.6 Discussions states: "The competitive range may include proposals rated as "Unacceptable" at the sole discretion of the Government." It is the Offeror's understanding that, pursuant to FAR 52.215-1, proposals deemed "unacceptable" cannot be part of a competitive range as they are ineligible for award. This understanding seems to be supported by Section M.2.1 which states: "Failure to comply with any requirement of the solicitation may result in the Offeror being determined unacceptable and ineligible for award." Q: Can the Government please clarify how an Offeror proposal can be rated unacceptable and not be eliminated from further consideration?	This sentence will be deleted in the Final RFP.
615	L-M	11, 20-22	M.1.6.1.2, M.6	This section refers to a ranking of Offerors, which seems to be in conflict with the evaluation methodology described in Section M.6. Would the Government please clarify the use of rankings in the evaluation?	There will be no rankings used in the EC2 evaluation methodology. The final RFP Sections L and M will be updated to reflect the following Basis for Award: Basis for Award. This is a best value source selection conducted in accordance with Federal Acquisition Regulation (FAR) 15.3 and DoD Source Selection Procedures, as supplemented. The Government intends to make an award to each and all qualifying offerors. To be considered a "qualifying offeror", the offeror must fully meet or exceed the delineated requirements of the solicitation, with the Government determining: (1) the Offeror is responsible in accordance with FAR 9.104-1; (2) the Offeror's proposal is technically acceptable (90% or higher score in Factor 1, Past Experience, para M.4.3), receives a "Substantial Confidence" rating in Factor 2, Past Performance (para M.5.3,4,1), and conforms to all other solicitation requirements; and (3) the Contracting Officer has no reason to believe the Offeror would be likely to offer other than fair and reasonable pricing. Price is not, however, an evaluated factor in this solicitation.
616	L-M	14	M.1.7	Can the government verify whether we can team with other contractors at the task order level even they were not listed as part of our team on the IDIQ submission?	The government does not on- or off-ramp subcontractors, team members of a prime contractor. IDIQ awardees (prime contractors) will not be precluded in proposing new teammates/subcontractors at the task order level. The Prime may add or remove Team Members as needed to fulfill requirements in Fair Opportunity Proposal Requests. The Prime has discretion as to how to structure its Team to meet Small Business goals, etc. The Prime may be a Large or Small Business. At the task order level, the government may consider the Prime contractor's team change and may require additional information (for example, past experience and past performance).
617	L-M	14	M.1.7	Will Full and Open EC2 Task Orders require small business teaming against specific socio-economic subcategories? If so, does the government plan to release those required socio-economic subcategories prior to issuance of the final solicitation to enable more effective small business teaming?	No.
618	L-M	Page 14	M.1.7	Is it the Government's intention that all TA's for this IDIQ be non-exclusive?	The government has not provided limitations regarding teaming agreements.
619	L-M	14	M.1.7	This paragraph states "Teaming Arrangements. Teaming arrangements are not restricted. Offerors submitting a proposal as the Prime Offeror in response to this solicitation are permitted to submit a separate proposal under which they would be a Subcontractor, or team member to another prime. Subcontractors are permitted to support multiple primes." If a company is a mentor on more than one Joint Venture, can the company propose as a Prime Offeror also under a Prime/Subcontractor arrangement even though they are a member of a JV?	This section will be revised. For purposes of the IDIQ, the company (JV mentor) can propose and receive award, even if also proposing as a JV mentor or as separate prime offeror. However, at the task order level, there may be further limitations. For example, 13 CFR 125.9 provides that the mentor which has more than one protégé cannot submit competing offers in response to a solicitation for a specific procurement through separate joint ventures with different protégés.
620	L-M	14 of 21	M.1.7	Will the Government consider instituting a hybrid approach enabling Offerors to be in a traditional Prime/subcontractor arrangement or a Large Small Mission Focused Team (LSMFT) arrangement? Also, will the Government consider structuring the LSMFT to consists of at least 1 Large Prime (LSMFT LEAD) and 1 Small Prime not to exceed (NTE) 2 Primes with additional subcontractors mandated to be in an exclusive arrangement under each LSMFT?	No.
621	L-M	14 of 21	M.1.7	Per Section M.1.7, can the Government confirm that Prime Offerors are permitted to support multiple other primes as a subcontractor? We recognize the language in M.1.7 is clear for subcontractors regarding supporting multiple primes, but we are unclear as it relates to Prime Offerors.	Prime offerors are permitted to support multiple other primes as a subcontractor.
622	L-M	14	M.1.7	Since offerors are permitted to respond as prime and sub in separate proposals, and subcontractors are permitted to support multiple primes, are references expected to submit signed PPQs for each proposal separately, or may the offeror include the same sign PPQ with multiple proposals?	Each proposal must "stand on its own" and will be evaluated independently (i.e., regardless of what may be contained in another proposal). Therefore, offerors should request references to submit signed PPQs for each proposal separately.
623	L-M	15 of 21	M.2.3	This section lists a series of requirements (a through h) of various items an Offeror must possess. Question: Does the Government expect the offeror to prepare additional material//documentation for each of the "a" through "h" listed items?	No. The offeror is not required to prepare additional documents specifically for para M.2.3.
624	L-M	pg.15	M.2.3	Section M.2.3 Responsibility Matters / Determination states: "(h) Provide the name, physical mailing address, e-mail address, telephone number, and DUNS number for any subcontractor identified in your proposal." The sentence refers to DUNS, which was replaced on 4 April 2022 by Unique Entity Identifier (UEI) as the primary means of entity identification. Q: Does the Government intend to revise this document, replacing DUNS with UEI?	The DUNS is no longer used. The UEI is now required. This section has been updated.
625	L-M	15	M.2.3	Responsibility Matters: May unpopulated Joint Ventures assert responsibility by each member of the JV submitting Attachment 13?	A Joint Venture may rely on the capabilities, past performance, experience, business systems, and certifications of its partners. It's incumbent upon the JV offeror to affirmatively and specifically note where it is relying on the capabilities and resources of the specified JV partner to meet the requirements of the present acquisition. However, the certification of Atch 13 must be completed by the JV offeror.
626	L-M	15	M.2.3 (h)	Remove request for "DUNS" and replace with "UEI"	The DUNS is no longer used. The UEI is now required. This form has been updated.
627	L-M	15	M.2.3 (h)	This section requires the DUNS number for any subcontractor. Should this request be for the UEI instead?	The DUNS is no longer used. The UEI is now required. This has been updated.
628	L-M	14	M.2.3.h	To be determined responsible, paragraph M.2.3(h) states we must provide the DUNS number for any subcontractor identified in our proposal - requires an update from DUNS to UEI.	The DUNS is no longer used. The UEI is now required. This section has been updated.
629	L-M		M.2.4.1	Can the 2 Work Samples address all task areas in the PWS Supplement? Or must each Work Sample address all Tasks in the PWS Supplement?	The PWS provides the relevant categories and specialty areas. The PWS supplement integrates those SAs (with the task IDs, KSAs, and more). The solicitation does not prescribe that the work sample must explicitly state each and every task ID or task (or KSA). However, where an offeror cites a work sample that is vague, does not address the tasks, or provides little nexus to the SA under the IDIQ, then the government cannot extrapolate and simply may not be able to validate that work sample.
630	L-M		M.2.4.1	Must an offeror address every Task in the PWS Supplement in order for an individual Work Sample to be successfully validated?	No. The PWS provides the relevant categories and specialty areas. The PWS supplement integrates those SAs (with the task IDs, KSAs, and more). The solicitation does not prescribe that the work sample must explicitly state each and every task ID or task (or KSA). However, where an offeror cites a work sample that is vague, does not address the tasks, or provides little nexus to the SA under the IDIQ, then the government cannot extrapolate and simply may not be able to validate that work sample.
631	L-M	16	M.2.6	Insurance Certificate: Offerors shall submit an insurance certificate that demonstrates their company's insurance coverage meeting the requirements of FAR Clause 252.217-7012 Liability and Insurance included in Section I of this solicitation and file the certificate after the SF 33 and any SF 30s. This requirement conflicts with L.1.2.1. VOLUME I – CONTRACT & RESPONSIBILITY DOCUMENTATION, which struck the Insurance Requirement. Can the Gov't clarify whether the Insurance Certificate is required?	This provision will be deleted. The government may require evidence of compliance (FAR clause 52.228-5, Insurance – Work on Government Installations in task order evaluations and contract administration.
632	L-M	16	M.2.6	Insurance Certificate - Does the JV need to obtain this, or one or both members of the JV?	This provision will be deleted. The government may require evidence of compliance (FAR clause 52.228-5, Insurance – Work on Government Installations in task order evaluations and contract administration.
633	L-M	16 of 21	M.2.6. Insurance Certificate	The draft solicitation removed the Insurance Certificate requirement from sections L.6.6. and L.5. Will the Government confirm this evaluation criteria will be removed?	This provision will be deleted. The government may require evidence of compliance (FAR clause 52.228-5, Insurance – Work on Government Installations in task order evaluations and contract administration.

634	L-M	(see pg. 16 of Attach. C Sec. L&M)	M.2.7	Section M.2.7 seems to list requirements for inclusion in Volume I that were not listed in Section L.6. For example, Section M.2.7 includes the requirement "to provide a written statement explaining the Offeror's ability to obtain required resources to perform the contract requirements with a value of at least \$500,000." Recommend that the Government revise this section to move this requirement to Section L.6 or strike entirely.	This will be corrected in Final RFP.
635	L-M	16	M.2.7 & M.2.8	Please confirm that each member of a JV Offeror separately provides this financial responsibility and accounting system information.	A Joint Venture may rely on the capabilities, past performance, experience, business systems, and certifications of its partners. It's incumbent upon the JV offeror to affirmatively and specifically note where it is relying on the capabilities and resources of the specified JV partner to meet the requirements of the present acquisition. For example, if the JV will rely upon the accounting system information of the mentor partner, then it the proposal should clearly state. The certification of Atch 13 must be completed by the JV offeror.
636	L-M	16 of 21	M.2.7. Financial/Other Resources.	Re: Offerors shall provide a written statement explaining the Offeror's ability to obtain required resources to perform the contract requirements with a value of at least \$500,000... If proposing as a mentor-protégé joint venture, does this need to be in the name of the JV, or will one or more members of the JV satisfy the requirement?	An unpopulated Joint Venture may rely on the capabilities, past performance, experience, business systems, and certifications of its partners. It's incumbent upon the JV offeror to affirmatively and specifically note where it is relying on the capabilities and resources of the specified JV partner to meet the requirements of the present acquisition. If the JV offeror will rely upon the financial resources of the mentor, then the JV offeror must clearly state in the proposal.
637	L-M	16	M.2.8	The referenced section indicates that "Offerors shall provide a current (within three (3) years prior to date of proposal submittal) letter or report from Defense Contract Audit Agency (DCAA)/ Defense Contract Management Agency (DCMA) that the Offeror's accounting system has been approved or is adequate for cost-reimbursement contracts. IAW FAR 16.301 , no cost reimbursement contract may be awarded unless the limitations in FAR 16.301-3 are met." The referenced FAR clause states, "The contractor's accounting system is adequate for determining costs applicable to the contract or order." However, at least some DCMA determination letters reference instead DFARS 252.242-7006, Accounting System Administration, instead. This DFARS clause is much more detailed than the referenced FAR clause and encompasses the FAR clause requirement. Would the Government please revise the RFP to indicate that a letter referencing DFARS 252.242-7006 is sufficient to satisfy the requirement in Section M.2.8?	No.
638	L-M	19	M.5.3.2	To establish size/magnitude relevancy of Past Performance the Government will use an estimated minimum of \$500,000. For Past Experience performance cited to validate SAs may be from SAIDIQ or MAIDIQ-issued task orders or from small business partners. To increase small business participation, recommend the Government reduce the estimated minimum to \$150,000.	The estimated minimum value of \$500,000 will remain in the Final RFP.
639	L-M	17 of 21	M.4.1	Regarding Factor 1 - Past Experience, M.4.1 states: "The basis of evaluation will include the Offeror's demonstrated experience and depth of experience in performing the performance objectives identified in Attachment 1, Performance Work Statement (PWS) and Attachment 2, PWS Supplement respectively." Similar to the way other solicitations that feature self-scoring, such as GSA OASIS and NITAAC CIO-SP4, were evaluated, will the Government confirm that its evaluation for EC2 will only be based on the PWS SAs and not the specific tasks in Attachment 2, PWS Supplement?	This section has been updated to read: "The basis of evaluation will include the Offeror's demonstrated experience performing the performance objectives identified in Attachment 1, Performance Work Statement (PWS) and Attachment 2, PWS Supplement respectively."
640	L-M	17	M.4.1	This paragraph states "The basis of evaluation will include the Offeror's demonstrated experience and depth of experience in performing the performance objectives identified in Attachment 1, Performance Work Statement (PWS) and Attachment 2, PWS Supplement respectively. The assessment of the Offeror's relevant experience will be used as a means of evaluating the capability of the Offeror to successfully meet the requirements of the RFP and subsequent task orders. In order to demonstrate their past experience, the Offeror may submit up to two (2) work sample(s) for each scored SA identified in the Self-Scoring Matrix. The Government will only review up to 2 work samples per Specialty Area (SA)." Most PWS will not have the granularity to crosswalk to the KSAs given how many there are. Is there a percentage of the KSAs in the PWS Supplement that must be met for the SA to be considered acceptable or is Attachment 7.+Self-Scoring+Matrix (1) the basis for highlighting the Work Samples?	No. there is no percentage of the KSAs that must be met to be considered acceptable. The PWS provides the relevant categories and specialty areas. The PWS supplement integrates those SAs (with the task IDs, KSAs, and more). The solicitation does not prescribe that the work sample must explicitly state each and every task ID or task (or KSA). However, where an offeror cites a work sample that is vague, does not address the tasks, or provides little nexus to the SA under the IDIQ, then the government cannot extrapolate and simply may not be able to validate that work sample.
641	L-M	17 of 21	M.4.1	Can the Government confirm that the term "Offeror" used in the context of this paragraph refers to the Prime Offeror and their respective team, according to L.7.4 Team Structure (page 8 of 21)?	Confirmed.
642	L-M	17 of 21	M.4.1	Section M.4.1 references "Attachment 2, PWS Supplement". Can the Government confirm that it expects Offerors to use this attachment in Attachment 7. Work Sample Cover Sheet, in Part III: Project Description? We appreciate the Government's guidance on how it expects to see Offeror's utilize Attachment 2.	The PWS provides the relevant categories and specialty areas. The PWS supplement integrates those SAs (with the task IDs, KSAs, and more). The solicitation does not prescribe that the work sample must explicitly state each and every task ID or task (or KSA). However, where an offeror cites a work sample that is vague, does not address the tasks, or provides little nexus to the SA under the IDIQ, then the government cannot extrapolate and simply may not be able to validate that work sample.
643	L-M	17	M.4.1	Section M.4.1 states 'The basis of evaluation will include the Offeror's demonstrated experience and depth of experience in performing the performance objectives in Attachment 1, PWS, and Attachment 2, PWS Supplement.' - how will depth of experience be determined relative to the requirements of the PWS Supplement?	The depth of experience language will be removed from the Final RFP.
644	L-M	17	M.4.1	How is the PWS Supplement intended to be used for evaluation of Past Experience which is being Scored at the Specialty Area level? Is the Specialty Area and Labor Category Title/Role Description the intended basis for scoring? Previously, detailed scoring againstover 1200 elements at the task level for given labor categories were part of detailed scoring instructions in a draft RFP.	The PWS provides the relevant categories and specialty areas. The PWS supplement integrates those SAs (with the task IDs, KSAs, and more). The solicitation does not prescribe that the work sample must explicitly state each and every task ID or task (or KSA). However, where an offeror cites a work sample that is vague, does not address the tasks, or provides little nexus to the SA under the IDIQ, then the government cannot extrapolate and simply may not be able to validate that work sample.
645	L-M	17	M.4.1	The Government states in M.4.1 that the evaluation of Factor 1 Past Performance will be demonstrated through the depth of experience performing the objectives identified in Attachment 1, PWS and Attachment 2, PWS Supplement. The RFP does not include instructions on how to document the PWS Supplement information. Can the Government clarify if the PWS Supplement task areas need to be mapped to contract documents? Given the specificity of the language in the task areas exact alignment to this information may not be directly stated in work sample contract documentation.	The depth of experience language will be removed from the Final RFP.
646	L-M	17	M.4.1 and M.4.2	Can the Government clarify instructions related to Attachment 2, PWS Supplement?	The PWS provides the relevant categories and specialty areas. The PWS supplement integrates those SAs (with the task IDs, KSAs, and more). The solicitation does not prescribe that the work sample must explicitly state each and every task ID or task (or KSA). However, where an offeror cites a work sample that is vague, does not address the tasks, or provides little nexus to the SA under the IDIQ, then the government cannot extrapolate and simply may not be able to validate that work sample.
647	L-M	17 of 21	M.4.2	Section M states "A minimum of two (2) work samples can achieve the maximum of 10 points per SA, provided that work sample experience demonstrates having accomplished the work described in the PWS and PWS Supplement, Attachment 2 for that SA. Relevant project where the offeror and/or proposed Subcontractor/Teaming Partners have demonstrated experience with cyber services that are described in the SA and performed the tasks identified therein will be deemed relevant past experience and achieve the maximum score." Question: For an offeror's Work Sample to "demonstrate having accomplished the work described in the PWS and PWS Supplement, Attachment 2 for that SA" what basis for cross-referencing to the Work Sample's PWS do we use - PWS (Attachment 1) Specialty Area general descriptions or PWS Supplement, Attachment 2 Specialty Area Task IDs? Or do we use both? Question: For an offeror's Work Sample to "demonstrate having accomplished the work described in the PWS and PWS Supplement, Attachment 2 for that SA" does the Government have an established number or range of PWS Specialty Area task descriptions and/or an established number or range of PWS Supplement Task ID Areas (e.g. Task ID T0007) that need to be cross referenced (mapped) within that Work Sample's PWS?	Q1: The offeror should use both. Q2: The offeror should demonstrate, to the maximum extent practicable, their past experience matches the size, scope, and nature of the work described in the PWS and PWS Supplement.
648	L-M	17	M.4.2	Will the except work samples that were performed as a subcontractor as long as they describe the scope of work being claimed was performed by the entity claiming credit?	Work Samples performed as a subcontractor will be accepted.
649	L-M	17	M.4.2	We note that the scorecard is now focused on the 31 SAs rather than the 1,000+ tasks listed under the various labor categories in the PWS Supplement. Would the Government please confirm that the Work Samples should track to the SAs and the Supplement <i>in aggregate</i> , rather than industry providing specific work sample citations for each task in the Supplement such that the USAF must then review references for 1000+ Supplement areas for each proposal?	The offeror's work samples should reflect their past experience to demonstrate experience and depth of experience in performing the performance objectives identified in Attachment 1, PWS, and Attachment 2, PWS Supplement respectively.
650	L-M	17	M.4.2	"...provided that work sample experience demonstrates having accomplished the work described in the...PWS Supplement." Please confirm that the "work" to which this requirement refers is the list of Tasks (versus the skills, knowledge, and abilities lists) associated with each of the LCATS I the PWS Supplement file.	The PWS provides the relevant categories and specialty areas. The PWS supplement integrates those SAs (with the task IDs, KSAs, and more). The solicitation does not prescribe that the work sample must explicitly state each and every task ID or task (or KSA). However, where an offeror cites a work sample that is vague, does not address the tasks, or provides little nexus to the SA under the IDIQ, then the government cannot extrapolate and simply may not be able to validate that work sample.

651	L-M	17	M.4.2	"...provided that work sample experience demonstrates having accomplished the work described in the PWS and PWS Supplement...for that SA." Please clarify how the Government will deem the "work...described in the PWS Supplement" as being demonstrated. Is experience demonstrated when the Work Sample demonstrates have accomplished one, some, a majority, or all of the tasks associated with the SA and LCAT(s)? The Data Administration SA, for example, is associated with 2 LCATS in the PWS Supplement, and those LCATS tasks combined, have 74 tasks, so a positive mapping to all 74 tasks would be necessary to score the 5 (or 10) points for that SA, right?	The PWS provides the relevant categories and specialty areas. The PWS supplement integrates those SAs (with the task IDs, KSAs, and more). The solicitation does not prescribe that the work sample must explicitly state each and every task ID or task (or KSA). However, where an offeror cites a work sample that is vague, does not address the tasks, or provides little nexus to the SA under the IDIQ, then the government cannot extrapolate and simply may not be able to validate that work sample.
652	L-M	(see pg. 17 of Attach. C Sec. L&M)	M.4.2	Recommend that the Government revise the statement to say "Offerors providing no work samples or submitting NO work samples within the nature..."	This will be corrected in the Final RFP.
653	L-M	17	M.4.2	The wording in this paragraph is contradictory to Section L. It states "Offerors providing no work samples or submitting work samples within the nature and scope of the SA....." Recommend revising this sentence to "Offerors providing no work samples or submitting work samples outside the nature and scope of the SA...."	This will be corrected in the Final RFP.
654	L-M	17	M.4.2	Section M.4.2 states that work samples that have 'demonstrated experience with cyber services that are described in the SA and performed the tasks identified therein will be deemed relevant past experience and achieve the maximum score'. Will a work sample that demonstrates 50% of the PWS Supplement tasks be rated higher than a work sample demonstrating 20% in this review?	The depth of experience language will be removed from the Final RFP.
655	L-M	17 of 22	M.4.2	M.4.2 states "A minimum of two (2) work samples can achieve the maximum of 10 points per SA, provided that work sample experience demonstrates having accomplished the work described in the PWS and PWS Supplement, Attachment 2 for that SA." Question: To document this SA experience within the Work Sample and to facilitate the evaluator's ability to map that work to SA-specific PWS Supplement, Attachment 2 Task Identifiers, can the offeror annotate the WS PWS with specific PWS Supplement Task Identifiers (e.g., T0272, T0046)?	Yes.
656	L-M	17 of 21	M.4.2	The PWS and PWS Supplement files for our past experience citations do not capture the breadth of work performed on the contract. Are we permitted to use Monthly Status Reports (MSRs) as documentation to prove that we have demonstrated experience with the cyber services that are described in the Specialty Areas?	Yes. Section L.8.6.2 will be revised to provide further clarification of work sample submissions. The work samples shall consist of only official contract documentation. "Official contract documentation" includes key documents integral to contract performance, including contracts, orders, modifications, PWS/SOW/SOO, CDRLs, subcontracting plans, invoices, meeting minutes, progress reports, monthly status reports, or other reports. The contractor may submit other documentation it regards to be integral to the contract (i.e., CPARS, FPDS, memos from COs/government official/prime contractor), but offerors are cautioned that the documentation is validated for past experience (not past performance) and that authenticity (contract-contemporaneous documents) and level of detail are critical considerations of any work sample. The Government cautions offerors to ensure detailed information (through the work sample and attachments (Atch 6). Do not presume that the government will necessarily extrapolate details that are not clearly presented. Submission of relevant excerpts (vice submitting an entire document) is recommended. In Atch 6 and the work sample, spelling out critical acronyms, providing "lay person" explanations, and marking/highlighting (or otherwise distinguishing) key excerpts may also ensure that the Government may consider the work sample and its nexus to the SAs under the IDIQ. The markings/highlighting should be evident that the marking/highlighting were newly-added by the offeror and not part of the original document.
657	L-M	17	M.4.2	M.4.2 states" a minimum of two work samples can achieve the manximum points per SA, provided that work sample experience demonstrates haiving accomplished the work descreeibed in the PWS and PWS Supplement (Attachment 2). Does each work sample need to demonstrate experience across all task areas in Attachment 2 for a specified SA?	No. The PWS provides the relevant categories and specialty areas. The PWS supplement integrates those SAs (with the task IDs, KSAs, and more). The solicitation does not prescribe that the work sample must explicitly state each and every task ID or task (or KSA). However, where an offeror cites a work sample that is vague, does not address the tasks, or provides little nexus to the SA under the IDIQ, then the government cannot extrapolate and simply may not be able to validate that work sample.
658	L-M	17	M.4.2	Section M.4.2 states "in order to demonstrate relevant past experience, the offeror should deliver a proposal, either expressly or inherently, having performed the performance and task level objectives stated in the PWS and PWS Supplement." Can the government provide additional details regarding a minimum number of SAs required for a Vendor to be eligible for 5 points on one work sample? Will vendors and/or the government have the ability to claim partial credit for meeting a certain percentage of SAs in a work sample? While the self-scoring construct introduced in the Draft Solicitation is considerable simplified from prior versions, given the government's stated objective of evaluating whether a past performance is "relevant," we recommend that the government consider allowing vendors to claim partial credit across PWS elements and/or allowing for the government to award partial credit when conducting the evaluation of a Vendor's self scores. Limiting scores to 0, 5, or 10 for each specialty area is a limiting criteria and could potentially result in otherwise relevant qualifications (i.e. those that meet most SAs) being scored "0" or not relevant.	The PWS provides the relevant categories and specialty areas. The PWS supplement integrates those SAs (with the task IDs, KSAs, and more). The solicitation does not prescribe that the work sample must explicitly state each and every task ID or task (or KSA). However, where an offeror cites a work sample that is vague, does not address the tasks, or provides little nexus to the SA under the IDIQ, then the government cannot extrapolate and simply may not be able to validate that work sample.
659	L-M	17	M.4.2 and M.4.2.1	In M.4.2 the government writes, "...Offerors providing no work samples or submitting work samples within the nature and scope of the SA will be deemed not relevant past experience and receive 0 points." Yet, in M.4.2.1 the Government writes, "...The Government will review the Work Sample to validate that the Offeror's experience is within the scope of the corresponding Specialty Area (SA). If the Offerors experience cannot be validated based on the Work Sample(s), the Government ... may unilaterally downward adjust the score, potentially all the way down to zero (0) points." Can the Government clarify how an offeror will receive zero points for submitting work samples within the nature and scope of the SA since it will be viewed as not relevant (per M.4.2) but per M.4.2.1 validating that work is within the scope is critical to maintaining point scores?	This will be corrected in the Final RFP.
660	L-M	17	M.4.2.	With regard to the Past Experience Work Samples - Please clarify that a contract can be referenced more than one time in the self scoring matrix	A Work Sample can satisfy multiple Specialty Areas and each needs to be specifically identified. To fully satisfy any specific Specialty Area (10 points), two separate Work Samples (different contracts) must be provided.
661	L-M	17	M.4.2.	Please clarify any restrictions on submitting Past Experience Work Samples of teammates, such as a percentage or limited number of references.	Page limitations are provided in Section L. There are no restrictions regarding the number of team members or percentage.
662	L-M	17	M.4.2.1	Reference: "The Government will review the Work Sample to validate that the Offeror's experience is within the scope of the corresponding Specialty Area (SA). If the Offerors experience cannot be validated based on the Work Sample(s), the Government may contact the POCs listed in the Work Sample Cover Sheet or they may unilaterally downward adjust the score, potentially all the way down to zero (0) points." Q: Can the Government please clarify how it will validate the the offerors experience using the Work Samples and Work Sample Cover Sheet? Q: Will the Government use the PWS and Attachment 2 PWS Supplement during the evaluation?	The PWS provides the relevant categories and specialty areas. The PWS supplement integrates those SAs (with the task IDs, KSAs, and more). The solicitation does not prescribe that the work sample must explicitly state each and every task ID or task (or KSA). However, where an offeror cites a work sample that is vague, does not address the tasks, or provides little nexus to the SA under the IDIQ, then the government cannot extrapolate and simply may not be able to validate that work sample.
663	L-M	Page 17	M.4.2.1	When evaluating Past Experience, is the Score basically a Pass/Fail? Will you only earn 0 or 5 points per work sample?	Yes it is pass or fail and a work sample that passes is worth 5 points.
664	L-M	17	M.4.2.1	Based upon the government's review of an Offeror's self scores, we recommend that the government reserve the right to adjust an Offeror's score upward OR downward based upon the government's due diligence review of the Offeror's submission.	The Government will only validate an Offeror's score or adjust it downward.
665	L-M	19	M.4.2.1 and M.5.3.2.1	M.4.2.1 notes that Government will validate whether Work Samples in Past Experience are "within the scope" of the SA, and Past Performance is correlated with the Work Samples. However, M.5.3.2.1 notes that the Government will assess relevancy of Past Performance. If an offeror's submission has progressed to the Past Performance evaluation, our understanding is that the Work Sample has already been deemed to be relevant (within scope) for the SA. Would the Government please clarify how the two relevancy assessments differ?	The past experience and past performance evaluations are distinct. The past experience evaluation reviews the Volume III submission in accordance with M.4. M.4.2 does not provide relevancy ratings. If the offeror obtains a score of 90% or higher, then the proposal (Volume 4) will be considered for past performance. The solicitation provides for a relevancy rating.(M.5.3.2). Considering the recency, relevancy, and performance quality assessment, the Government assigns a performance confidence ring (M.5.3.4.1).
666	L-M	17	M.4.3	Has the government considered two overall qualifying criteria (1 for Large Business - 90% and 1 for Small Business - a smaller %?): Rationale, since Small Business Generally don't have a lot of Prime Contracts and/or not all PPQs requests to government officials may/may not get submitted on the offerers behalf?	Yes, the Government has considered this option. To encourage small business participation, there are no restrictions on teaming arrangements IAW M.1.7.
667	L-M	17	M.4.3	Section M.4.3 states that 'an offeror must achieve a 90% or higher overall score' following review of the self scoring matrix. Will this score be considered in the overall confidence rating?	No, it will not be considered in Factor 2.

668	L-M	17 of 22	M.4.3.1	<p>This section requires that "Offerors that are Joint Ventures, including Mentor-Protégé Joint Ventures, must submit information to fully meet all requirements of the solicitation, including any capabilities, past performance, experience, business systems and certifications of the Joint Venture and that of individual partners of the Joint Venture."</p> <p>Question: Will the Government confirm that there is not a requirement to submit specific documentation on "certifications"?</p>	<p>Confirmed. No specific certifications are req"L.7.6 will be revised. The JV offeror must complete the certification at Atch 13. 13 CFR 125.8 also requires that offerors must provide a certificate of compliance prior to performance.</p> <p>----- (d) Certification of compliance. Prior to the performance of any contract set aside or reserved for small business by a joint venture between a protégé small business and a mentor authorized by § 125.9, the small business partner to the joint venture must submit a written certification to the contracting officer and SBA, signed by an authorized official of each partner to the joint venture, stating as follows: (1) The parties have entered into a joint venture agreement that fully complies with paragraph (b) of this section; (2) The parties will perform the contract in compliance with the joint venture agreement and with the performance of work requirements set forth in paragraph (c) of this section.</p> <p>"aired beyond such documentation specifically described and required by the solicitation.</p>
669	L-M	17	M.4.3.1	If the offeror is a JV under the ASMPP will the government accept evidence of business systems and certifications as long as it is provided by one of the individual partners?	An unpopulated Joint Venture may rely on the capabilities, past performance, experience, business systems, and certifications of its partners. It's incumbent upon the JV offeror to affirmatively and specifically note where it is relying on the capabilities and resources of the specified JV partner to meet the requirements of the present acquisition.
670	L-M	17	M.4.3.1	Will the government accept JV protégé partner that meets the six (6) SA to have been perfokmred as a subcontractor?	Yes.
671	L-M	17	M.4.3.1	The RFP states, "Offerors that are Joint Ventures, including Mentor-Protégé Joint Ventures, must submit information to fully meet all requirements of the solicitation, including any capabilities, past performance, experience, business systems and certifications of the Joint Venture and that of individual partners of the Joint Venture." Will the Government confirm that any of responsibility requirements can be met by either the Mentor or the Protégé in line with SBA regulations (13 C.F.R. § 125.8[e])?	An unpopulated Joint Venture may rely on the capabilities, past performance, experience, business systems, and certifications of its partners. It's incumbent upon the JV offeror to affirmatively and specifically note where it is relying on the capabilities and resources of the specified JV partner to meet the requirements of the present acquisition. The JV offeror must complete the certification at Atch 13.
672	L-M	17	M.4.3.1.	This paragraph states "Of the JV submissions in the thirty-one defined categories/specialty areas, the JV must demonstrate the contributions/ experience of the protégé member in a minimum of six of the defined categories/specialty areas." Nothing herein requires that a protégé partner's contribution or experience, solely or individually, meet the same requirements as non-protégé offerors. " Six SAs by the protégé forces a disadvantage for the protégé against Large Business if Large Businesses are not required to provide the same. Recommend increasing the SAs to 10 and applying that to all bidders.	The government considered but will retain the existing language.
673	L-M	18	M.5.2	Due to the Unrestricted Teaming Agreement there is a potential for multiple Past Performance Information / Past Performance Questionares to the same government offices which may become overbearing from a resource perspective. Has the government considered potentially reducing this burden on resources by using methods highlighted in M.5.1 to confirm performance versus methods outlined in M.5.2	The Government reserves the right to obtain "other sources" past performance information. It is the contractor's responsibility to meet the requirements of past performance. The government will rely upon CPAR (See M.5.1). Where CPAR is not available, then PPQs must be provided.
674	L-M	18	M.5.2	Due to the Unrestricted Teaming Agreement there is a potential for multiple Past Performance Information / Past Performance Questionares to the same government offices which may become overbearing from a resource perspective. Has the government considered potentially extending the RFP submission date to ensure PPQ/PPIs can be obtained in a timely manner (understanding Government Offices may need time to work each request?)	The Government will provide a reasonable amount of time for offerors to collect, and government entities to provide, responses to past performance information.
675	L-M	18	M.5.2	<p>Section M.5.2 states "A complete Past Performance Submission consists of a 1) Past Performance Information Sheet (Attachment 9), and either a 2) Past Performance Questionnaire (Attachment 10) or a 3) Contractor Performance Assessment Report." Cost Plus Award Fee (CPAF) contracts/task orders have Award Fee Evaluation Boards (EVABs) that are akin to CPARS."</p> <p>Will offerors be allowed to submit EVABs for CPAF contracts/task orders in lieu of PPQs?</p>	Yes. The Final RFP will be updated to reflect this. CPARS must be submitted; only if CPAR is unavailable can offeror provide EVAB or PPQ.
676	L-M	18	M.5.2	<p>Section M.5.2 states "Past Performance Submissions must reflect work accomplished by a legal entity included in Volume II, Team Structure with a properly executed Teaming Agreement as required by Volume II, Teaming Agreement."</p> <p>As referenced in various sections of the draft solicitation, the definition of a legal entity is not clear. This Offeror has subsidiary companies that are rolled up to a parent company. Theses companies operate under a single internal operational unit led by our President and Chief Executive Officer, This chain of command provides a unified operational management structure that all operate under consolidated accounting, purchasing, and HR/personnel systems, as well as common policies and corporate guidelines. As such, teaming agreements do not exist and are not appropriate for these subsidiary companies.</p> <p>Note: On the Past Performance Information Sheet, the Government uses the term "corporate division" which might be most appropriate for the subsidiary companies described above.</p> <p>Will the Government please clarify the language in the solicitation in a manner that only requires the offeror to explain the relationship between the subsidiary companies and the parent organization as is typically done in the Organizational Structure Change History?</p>	This provision will be revised. The Government will not require submission of a JV agreement or teaming agreement. However, the offeror will complete Attachment 3, EC2 Team Structure, which will delineate the companies that will participate in the IDIQ and in what areas.
677	L-M	18	M.5.2	<p>"Only Past Performance Submissions that match Work Samples will be acceptable submissions."</p> <p>We understand that past performance submissions are limited to those matching the Work Samples/Past Experience. Please clarify <i>how many</i> past performance submissions are required.</p>	The contracts, (from which past experience work samples were derived) must be provided for past performance evaluation. No other contracts may be provided for the past performance evaluation. For example, in past experience, an offeror may have had a task order that addressed 15 of the SA work samples. That task order will be submitted for past performance evaluation.
678	L-M	18	M.5.2	A complete Past Performance Submission consists of a 1) Past Performance Information Sheet (Attachment 9), and either a 2) Past Performance Questionnaire (Attachment 10) or a 3) Contractor Performance Assessment Report. Question: One of our customers completes an annual Contractor Performance Evaluation (CPE) that rates quality, schedule, cost control, business relations, management of key personnel, and utilization of small business on a scale of 1-5. This format parallels a CPAR and is digitally signed by the COR and CO, but is not completed and stored on CPARS or PPIRS. May we submit this CPE in lieu of a CPAR or is a Past Performance Questionnaire (PPQ) required?	If CPARS is not available (M.5.1), then the offeror is required to submit a PPQ (which provides a consistent format for past performance evaluation). If the offeror has a document (CPE) that captures all the information in the PPQ, then the government has no objection. However, the offeror bears the risk if the offeror's CPE lacks certain details that would have otherwise been included in the PPQ.
679	L-M	18 of 21	M.5.2	If an offeror is citing subcontractor work performed on a Government contract, should the offeror send the PPQ to the Government POC or to the Prime contractor on the work?	Either option is acceptable.
680	L-M	(see pg. 18-19 of Attach. C Sec. L&M)	M.5.2 & M.5.3.2 - M.5.3.2.1	The only documents that the solicitation allows to be submitted for the Government to evaluate past performance for each contract are a Past Performance Questionnaire OR a CPAR (if available). Neither of these documents are good sources of data for the Government to analyze the complexity of a contract, as a CPAR may or may not describe complexity (depending on the Government author), and the current format of the PPQ has no section that specifically addresses complexity. This may make it difficult for the Government to objectively evaluate complexity. Will the Government modify the format of the PPQ by adding instructions in "SECTION III: NARRATIVE SUMMARY" for the author to specifically address the complexity of the contract? Will the Government eliminate the requirement for Offerors to submit a CPAR when available, and instead rely on the modified PPQ for the evaluation?	The government will require the CPAR (M.5.1). In the absence, the PPQ will be submitted. Section I provides for a description (which can include the nature of the requirement and complexity thereof). Section III also provides for the narrative summary. The government will not make changes to the PPQ form."
681	L-M	18/4	M.5.2 and Q18	Answers to question from the RFI state, "the Government does not expect to require Offerors to submit CPARS." Section M.5.2 of the C Section L-M instructions states, "A complete Past Performance Submission consists of a 1) Past Performance Information Sheet (Attachment 9), and either a 2) Past Performance Questionnaire (Attachment 10) or a 3) Contractor Performance Assessment Report." Will the Government please clarify if CPARS will be required in response to Factor 2 - Past Performance, and will the page limit for that section be increased to allow for the addition of CPARS?	IAW L.9.5.4. Contractor Performance Assessment Reports (CPARS). For each work sample, the Offeror shall provide the most recent CPARS report completed within the last three years, as of the date of this RFP's issuance. Offerors shall clearly mark each evaluation report with the associated work sample identifier (i.e. WS1-WS62). The page limitation has been changed to no page limit.
682	L-M	18	M.5.3	This paragraph states that offerors will receive a relevancy rating of relevant or not relevant. This is contradictory to paragraph M.5.3.2 and the 4 relevancy rating definitions for Very Relevant, Relevant, Somewhat Relevant and Not Relevant. Request the Government clarify how relevancy will be rated during evaluation.	This will be updated to be consistent before final RFP release.
683	L-M	18	M.5.3	Please clarify whether the Past Performance Confidence Assessment rating will be performed for each Past Performance submission or for all of the offerors Past Performance submissions as a collective whole. The current language implies that each Past Performance submission will be given a rating and if one of them receives a rating below Substantial Confidence, the proposal will not be eligible for an award. We do not think that this is the government's intent since there is the potential to submit 62 Past Performance submissions and having one submission at less than Substantial Confidence is probably not justification to reject the proposal.	Past Performance Confidence Assessment rating is an overall rating of all Past Performance submissions rather than one rating per Past Performance submission.

684	L-M	18	M.5.3	The government states that any offeror below Substantial Confidence will not be eligible for award. Given the description of the evaluation, this eliminates any offer below the highest rating. We recommend that the minimum confidence level for an IDIQ award should be set at the should be set at the Satisfactory Confidence level. This does not introduce a significant level of additional risk for the government. Based on Confidence Rating descriptions in Section M, offerors at Substantial and Satisfactory Confidence Levels could reasonably expect to perform on the EC2 IDIQ.	Past Performance Confidence Assessment rating is an overall rating of all Past Performance submissions rather than one rating per Past Performance submission.
685	L-M	19	M.5.3 and M.5.3.2.1	M.5.3 states, that "... each recent past performance submission will receive a relevancy rating and receive a relevant or not relevant rating." Meanwhile, M.5.3.2.1 includes multiple relevancy ratings: Very Relevant, Relevant, Somewhat Relevant, and Not Relevant. Would the Government please clarify how relevancy will be evaluated?	The evaluation procedures to determine relevancy are explained at M5.3.2 and have been updated.
686	L-M	(see pg. 18 of Attach. C Sec. L&M)	M.5.3.1	Section M.5.3.1 states that "Past Performance information will either be determined "Recent" or "Not Recent." This indicates that the Government will use a binary grading to determine whether a particular Past Performance will be deemed recent. The last sentence of Section M.5.3.1 states, however, that "More recent performance will have a greater impact on the Past Performance Confidence Assessment than less recent efforts," which seems to conflict with the first statement. Can the Government clarify how recency will be evaluated so that Offerors can properly consider recency when selecting appropriate past performance?	The statement, "More recent performance will have a greater impact on the Past Performance Confidence Assessment than less recent efforts." will be deleted in the Final RFP.
687	L-M	18	M.5.3.1	Recency Assessment - Section M.5.3.1 states 'more recent performance will have a greater impact on the Past Performance Confidence Assessment than less recent efforts'. As only bilateral scoring of Recent or Not Recent is mentioned, how will scoring be conducted for recency for the confidence review? Given the Government's requirements that all work samples be from the last 3 years, wouldn't all samples meeting that threshold be considered 'recent'?	The statement, "More recent performance will have a greater impact on the Past Performance Confidence Assessment than less recent efforts." will be deleted in the Final RFP.
688	L-M	18	M.5.3.1	This section states "Recency is defined as active contract performance at least six months in duration and performance been accomplished within the last three (3) years preceding the date of issuance of this solicitation. Contracts that were started prior to this time, but still in effect with active performance as of 3 years from the date of this solicitation will be considered recent." Since it's not unusual for a proposal submission date to be extended, and in some cases by a substantial amount of time, making an otherwise recent project no longer recent, we recommend the Government change the language from "the date of this solicitation" to "the proposal due date."	The recency threshold will remain at 3 years in the Final RFP.
689	L-M	18	M.5.3.1	Will the government entertain extending the recency assessment for projects accomplished within five (5) years preceding the date of issuance of the solicitation? The following reasons are offered as rationale: the EC2 solicitation timeline has shifted to the right and prospective offerors awaiting release of EC2 as early as last year may have lost the opportunity to use past performance references/work samples that have only timed out recently. Moreover, many cyber acquisitions have been delayed over the last three years through the COVID pandemic. For these reasons, a five (5) year recency assessment will allow for a greater pool of competitors seeking to propose on EC2.	The recency threshold will remain at 3 years in the Final RFP.
690	L-M	18 of 21	M.5.3.1	Request the government change the past poerformance recency assessment from 3 to 5 years. Per the requirements of section M, we recognize the Government's request for past performance outlining similar services offered during the past three years. Effective 6 January 2020, the United States Small Business Administration (SBA) modified its method for calculating annual revenues used to prescribe size standards for small businesses. The regulation changed the calculation of annual revenues from a three-year averaging period to a five-year averaging period, with a two-year transition period (during which firms may choose a three or five-year period). The intent of the law is to allow small business contractors more time to prepare for transition to the full and open market after they exceed the size standard. In keeping with SBA's intent, request the Government consider a five-year period for evaluating past performance, which aligns with SBA size standard guidance, resulting in increased small business competition for the EC2.	The recency threshold will remain at 3 years in the Final RFP.
691	L-M		M.5.3.1	Must all Past Performance references be an active on-going contract? If so, how could a Past Performance reference be considered "more recent"	The statement, "More recent performance will have a greater impact on the Past Performance Confidence Assessment than less recent efforts." will be deleted in the Final RFP.
692	L-M	10 of 21 18 of 21	M.5.3.1	Will the government revise the relevancy period to allow for contracts completed within the last FIVE years from the date of this RFP's date of issuance?	The relevancy will remain the same in the Final RFP.
693	L-M	19	M.5.3.2	"Relevancy Assessment...Specifically, relevancy is defines as contracts of similar, scope, magnitude, and complexity of the average task order requirement". Question: Please define the average task order requirement in this context as there have been no task order requirements published.	There is no preset criteria. This provides the offeror with the maximum opportunity to demonstrate and offer their best, most relevant work experiences. Likewise, this offers the Government the ability to consider all aspects of the offeror's past experiences.
694	L-M	19	M.5.3.2	The RFP specifies that, "Regarding size and magnitude/size of past performances the Government will use an estimated minimum value for each SA of \$500,000." Would the Government please confirm that the Government will use an estimated \$500,000 total contract value of the work sample for the past performance to be considered relevant?	There is no preset criteria. This provides the offeror with the maximum opportunity to demonstrate and offer their best, most relevant work experiences. Likewise, this offers the Government the ability to consider all aspects of the offeror's past experiences.
695	L-M	pg.19	M.5.3.2	Section M.5.3.2. Relevancy Assessment states: "Regarding size and magnitude/size of past performances the Government will use an estimated minimum value for each SA of \$500,000." Q: Can the Government please clarify if their intent was to state "Regarding size and magnitude/size of past performances the Government will use an estimated minimum value for each past performance submission of \$500,000?"	There is no preset criteria. This provides the offeror with the maximum opportunity to demonstrate and offer their best, most relevant work experiences. Likewise, this offers the Government the ability to consider all aspects of the offeror's past experiences.
696	L-M	19	M.5.3.2	Section M.5.3.2 states "Relevancy AssessmE2:E27ent. The Government will conduct an in-depth evaluation of all recent performance information to determine whether how closely the services performed under those contracts relate to the services described in the PWS and the PWS Attachment 1. Specifically, relevant is defined as contracts of similar scope, magnitude, and complexities of the average task order requirement? Will the Government please clarify if "average task order requirement" is referring to average task order requirements of future EC2 task orders or average task order requirements of the Offeror's past performance submissions? Will this Government identify parameters for an average task order requirement?	There is no preset criteria. This provides the offeror with the maximum opportunity to demonstrate and offer their best, most relevant work experiences. Likewise, this offers the Government the ability to consider all aspects of the offeror's past experiences.
697	L-M	(see pg. 19 of Attach. C Sec. L&M)	M.5.3.2	In stating that "Regarding magnitude/size of past performances the Government will use an estimated minimum value for each SA of \$500,000," does this mean that any past performance over \$500,000 value would be deemed relevant with respect to magnitude? Can the Government clarify how relevancy will be evaluated so that Offerors can properly consider relevancy when selecting appropriate past performance?	There is no preset criteria. This provides the offeror with the maximum opportunity to demonstrate and offer their best, most relevant work experiences. Likewise, this offers the Government the ability to consider all aspects of the offeror's past experiences.
698	L-M	19	M.5.3.2	Is the "estimated minimum value for each SA of \$500,000" an annual value or a total contract value? How will relevant size be determined for a PP submittal that applies to multiple SAs? For example, if a single PP submittal cover 5 SAs, will the minimum relevant size be \$2,500,000 (5 SAs * \$500,000 per SA)?	The \$500,000 is the estimated total contract value not considering when funds were paid or disbursed, but rather to each past performance experience work sample. This will be updated in the Final RFP.
699	L-M	19	M.5.3.2	Relevancy Assessment - Section M.5.3.2 states that relevancy will be determined by an 'evaluation of all recent performance information to determine whether how closely the services performed under those contracts relate to the services described in the PWS and the PWS Attachment 1' and will use scope, magnitude, and complexity as factors. If a work sample covers some port of the task area is it considered 'relevant' or is there a minimum criteria to be rated 'relevant'? Please define the complexity of task orders that you will be comparing to the bidder's work sample. Please provide the build up of the rating from 'Not Relevant' to 'Very Relevant'.	There is no preset criteria. This provides the offeror with the maximum opportunity to demonstrate and offer their best, most relevant work experiences. Likewise, this offers the Government the ability to consider all aspects of the offeror's past experiences.
700	L-M	19	M.5.3.2	Section L.8.4.3 on page 9 states, 'The proposal shall contain sufficient data to substantiate the points claimed by the Offeror.' Should the Offeror highlight relevant areas of the contractual document/work sample?	That would help the technical evaluators relate the past experiences in the work sample to the scope/performance objectives listed in the PWS and PWS Supplement.
701	L-M	19	M.5.3.2	How will TOs, where the scale and complexity of the task is greater than the technical past performance required to onboard to the IDIQ, be evaluated; has the Government considered performance risk in terms of the small business "rule of two"? Clarifying example: The cyber tasks on contract with small businesses today across the 16th Air Force require high degrees of technical proficiency from those small businesses, albeit with a very manageable footprint in terms of program and workforce management. As EC2 begins to reach enterprise customers, the ability to meet demands of scale and complexity in areas like highly cleared work and global place of performance considerations (SOFA, Host country workforce management, etc) will become key risk management factors for the government to consider	The Government has considered these factors and will conduct market research and assess requirement's complexity before making SB set-aside decisions.
702	L-M		M.5.3.2	It is very clear how Scope and Magnitude/size will be evaluated, but how will complexity be evaluated?	There is no preset criteria. This provides the offeror with the maximum opportunity to demonstrate and offer their best, most relevant work experiences. Likewise, this offers the Government the ability to consider all aspects of the offeror's past experiences.

703	L-M	(see pg. 19 of Attach. C Sec. L&M)	M.5.3.2 - M.5.3.2.1	Regarding the determination of relevancy for each of the past performance samples that are submitted by Offerors, the solicitation defines "relevant" (in M.5.3.2) as being similar in scope, magnitude, and complexity. The solicitation provides some criteria for how scope and magnitude will be considered, but "complexity" is left open and undefined. Recommend that the Government provide some definition of "complexity" to eliminate subjectivity.	There is no preset criteria. This provides the offeror with the maximum opportunity to demonstrate and offer their best, most relevant work experiences. Likewise, this offers the Government the ability to consider all aspects of the offeror's past experiences.
704	L-M	17	M.5.3.2.	"Regarding magnitude/size of past performances the Government will use an estimated minimum value for each SA of \$500,000. " This dollar value is set so low there is no assurance that the magnitude of Tasks coming out of EC2 can legitimately be supported. Recommend an estimated minimum value of at least \$1M to ensure commiserate magnitude.	There is no preset criteria. This provides the offeror with the maximum opportunity to demonstrate and offer their best, most relevant work experiences. Likewise, this offers the Government the ability to consider all aspects of the offeror's past experiences.
705	L-M	19 of 21	M.5.3.2.1	Reference rating the "Relevancy" of a Past Performance contract, Section M states ". Offerors shall provide adequate past performance information on completed or ongoing contracts (including Federal, State, local governmental and commercial contracts) to be considered most relevant in demonstrating the ability of the offeror to perform the proposed work as identified in the PWS and PWS Attachment 1. The Government will evaluate relevancy and assign a relevancy rating for each recent PPI contract reference in accordance with the following criteria: VERY RELEVANT = Present/past performance effort involved essentially the same scope and magnitude of effort and complexities this solicitation requires. RELEVANT = Present/past performance effort involved similar scope and magnitude of effort and complexities this solicitation requires." Question: For an offeror's contract (Work Sample) to be rated as "Present/past performance effort involved essentially the same scope and magnitude of effort and complexities this solicitation requires" or "involved similar scope and magnitude" does the Government have an established number or range of PWS Specialty Area task descriptions and/or an established number or range of PWS Supplement Task Areas (e.g. Task ID T0007) required by that contract (Work Sample)?	There is no preset criteria. This provides the offeror with the maximum opportunity to demonstrate and offer their best, most relevant work experiences. Likewise, this offers the Government the ability to consider all aspects of the offeror's past experiences.
706	L-M	19	M.5.3.2.1	In the table provided, should the Definition be changed from "solicitation" to "Specialty Area?" Is each past performance being evaluated against the entire solicitation or just the Specialty Areas claimed?	No. Each contract reference will receive a separate relevancy rating.
707	L-M		M.5.3.2.1	Can you confirm that the references to PWS and PWS Attachment 1 are referring to the same document?	Confirmed.
708	L-M	Relevancy Assessment Table Table 2 - Performance Confidence Ratings	M.5.3.2.1	Do all Past Performance references need to be scored Very relevant in order to obtain a Substantial Confidence Rating?	Relevancy is one aspect of the performance confidence rating. The solicitation does not preclude a substantial confidence rating simply because all past performance references were not determined "very relevant".
709	L-M	19	M.5.3.2.1	Did the Government intend to reference the PWS and PWS Supplement in this paragraph?	Yes.
710	L-M	17,	M.5.3.2.1; M.5.3.4.1	Qualification for an Offeror seems to be based on the Self-Score and validation, but Section M established an Adjectival Rating (i.e., Relevance and Confidence Assessment) for an Offeror's Past Performance submission. How will the Adjectival Rating be incorporated into the overall evaluation process?	The Past Performance confidence rating is based on an integrated assessment of the Offeror's overall recency, relevance, and quality of service for work provided by the Offeror or obtained by the Government.
711	L-M	19	M.5.3.3	Will the Performance Quality Assessment be considered a Pass/Fail Assessment?	No, The Government will evaluate performance quality and assign a performance quality rating for each recent PPI contract reference in accordance with the rating chart at M.5.3.3.
712	L-M	19	M.5.3.3	Performance Quality Assessment - Section 5.3.3 supports CPARS submissions with scores of satisfactory or above and only downgrades offerors for 'adverse findings'. Will a CPARS of satisfactory be graded lower in the performance confidence ratings than a very good or exceptional CPARS? Will the government be taking an average of the CPARS/PPQ ratings from 1 to 5 for evaluation? Generally we advise the Government to score all CPARS satisfactory or above the same as many clients view satisfactory as a solid rating.	No, The Government will evaluate performance quality and assign a performance quality rating for each recent PPI contract reference in accordance with the rating chart at M.5.3.3.
713	L-M	19	M.5.3.3	It is unclear whether the Performance Quality Assessment is scored as either "Positive" or "Adverse", or as something else. The text says it "may result in positive or adverse findings." Is that the scoring criteria, or does that contribute to some other kind of Quality Assessment rating? If there are other possible Quality Assessment ratings, please define.	A Performance Quality Assessment Adjectival Rating table will be provided in the Final RFP.
714	L-M	19	M.5.3.4	This paragraph indicates that there are pools of offerors. This seems to contradict the newest information related to this acquisition Request the Government remove references to pools.	This is incorrect and will be corrected in the Final RFP.
715	L-M	19	M.5.3.4	This section says " <i>Lastly, the Government will assign a single Past Performance confidence rating to the Offerors with a qualifying Government-validated score within each pool</i> ". Please clarify what is meant by " <i>qualifying Government-validated score within each pool</i> ".	This is incorrect and will be corrected in the Final RFP.
716	L-M	20	M.5.3.4	Past Performance Confidence Assessment - How do the ratings in M.5.3.1 through M.5.3.3 go into the Performance Confidence rating? Please provide the build up for a 'substantial confidence' rating.	The Past Performance confidence rating is based on an integrated assessment of the Offeror's overall recency, relevance, and quality of service for work provided by the Offeror or obtained by the Government. A Performance Confidence Adjectival Rating table will be provided in the Final RFP.
717	L-M		M.5.3.4	What is meant by "pool"?	This is incorrect and will be corrected in the Final RFP.
718	L-M	19	M.5.3.4.1	While a Performance Quality Assessment is a factor in the Past Performance evaluation, it does not appear to be included as part of the Past Performance Confidence Ratings (M.5.3.4.1.). The table only indicates "Based on the Offeror's recent/relevant performance record, the Government has a high expectation that the Offeror will..." Please advise how quality will be included in the overall assessment.	A Performance Quality Assessment Adjectival Rating table will be provided in the Final RFP.
719	L-M	19	M.5.3.4.1	If relevancy is not a pass/fail assessment, would the Government please clarify how Very Relevant, Relevant, Somewhat Relevant, and Not Relevant ratings will align with Substantial, Satisfactory, Limited, No Confidence, and Neutral Confidence rating outlined in the M.5.3.4.1. Table 2 Performance Confident Ratings.	The solicitation does not preclude a substantial confidence rating simply because all past performance references were not determined "very relevant".
720	L-M	20	M.5.3.4.1, M.6.1.3	There is a wide range of variability on how different federal agencies and contract offices assign scores on CPARS. Some have policies that they give no scores higher than Satisfactory. Given the wide variability in how CPAR ratings are assigned, would the Government confirm that having some CPARS with Satisfactory ratings would not preclude a finding of Substantial Confidence in the Past Performance evaluation?	Understood. A Satisfactory rating does not preclude a finding of Substantial Confidence. The Government will carefully evaluate all Work Samples and CPARS ratings or PPQs.
721	L-M	20	M.6.1.2	Section M.6.1.2. states, "To advance past Step 2, the Government-validated Past Experience Score must demonstrate qualifying experience in at least 90% overall of the EC2 Specialty Areas (SA), which equates to at least twenty-eight (28) of the thirty one (31) SA as defined in Section L." Because we are able to earn partial points (i.e., 5/10 points in a SA), can the government please translate the SA requirements to points?	There are 31 SAs defined within the EC2 PWS. No SA has more weight than any other and is therefore worth the same amount of points across the board.
722	L-M	20	M.6.1.2	This section says " <i>To advance past Step 2, the Government-validated Past Experience Score must demonstrate qualifying experience in at least 90% overall of the EC2 Specialty Areas (SA), which equates to at least twenty-eight (28) of the thirty one (31) SA as defined in Section L</i> ". Can the government clarify what is meant by " <i>equates to at least twenty-eight (28) of the thirty one (31) SA</i> "? Per section L.8.4.2 " <i>An offeror must achieve a 90% or higher overall score to be deemed Qualified</i> " which would allow several Specialty Areas to have a zero score and still yield a total score, as calculated by the Self-Scoring matrix, of over 90%.	At 10 points per SA (two validated Work Samples), each of the 31 SAs are worth 3.23 points. 3.23* 28 equals 90.44%. There are several other scoring combinations that can achieve the overall 90% score, considering a single Work Sample (5-point) submission for an individual SA.
723	L-M	20	M.6.1.2. Step Two (2):	"To advance past Step 2, the Government-validated Past Experience Score must demonstrate qualifying experience in at least 90% overall of the EC2 Specialty Areas (SA), which equates to at least twenty-eight (28) of the thirty one (31) SA as defined in Section L." Question: Please define qualifying experience in this reference as it relates to the demonstration of 90% overall score of the EC2 SAs.	Please read M.4.1., M.4.2, M.4.2.1 and M.4.3.
724	L-M	page 21	M.6.1.3	With the requirement for offerors to receive a SUBSTANTIAL rating on Past Performance to be eligible for award and the potential need to submit multiple Past Performance citations from both the Prime and Subcontractors, would the Government please expand on their evaluation methodology for Past Performance to provide a better understanding on how the Government will review, weight and assign a confidence rating to an offeror?	The Past Performance confidence rating is based on an integrated assessment of the Offeror's overall recency, relevance, and quality of service for work provided by the Offeror or obtained by the Government. A Performance Confidence Adjectival Rating table will be provided in the Final RFP.
725	L-M	N/A	N/A	Question: Will the Government require large businesses to submit a Small Business Subcontracting Plan?	Large Business Prime Contractors will submit a Small Business Subcontracting Plan as part of the EC2 IDIQ proposal. Subcontracting Goals will be provided in the Final RFP IAW FAR 19.705-2 (e) A contract <u>may not have</u> more than one subcontracting plan. However, an Ordering Contracting Officer may establish separate subcontracting goals for each order under an IDIQ contract
726	L-M	N/A	N/A	Question: Will the Government require large businesses to submit a Small Business Subcontracting Plan?	Yes.
727	A Solicitation	1	N/A	Section J - List of Documents, Exhibits and other Attachments has labeled Attachment Numbers different than noted on six Attachments. (Section J - Attachments 5, 6, 8, 9, 10, and 12). Can the Government correct either Section J or the noted Attachment numbers on the applicable Attachments so that there is no confusion following the instructions outlined in Section L?	Yes. These will be corrected in the Final RFP.

728	Team Structure	1	N/A	Will Offerors be able to enter multiple subject areas in Column F for a specific team member?	Yes, multiple Specialty Areas should be added to column F as applicable.
729	Team Structure	1	N/A	Column G is not mentioned in the Section L instructions for completing this form. What content is to be entered into Column G (Verification of Prime Status [i.e. prime contract references for Team Member])? If contractual documentation is required for verification, would the Government please confirm that such documentation is not subject to the 5-page limit for this section?	This column has been deleted.
730	Team Structure	1	N/A	Would the Government confirm that this table should not include Offerors' affiliates that may supply qualifications for the proposal, and that it should only include the Offeror and its subcontractors?	Entities included in the team structure are described at L.7.4 and will need to be listed in order to be in compliance with L.8.7.5 and M.5.2.
731	Past Performance Information Sheet	1	N/A	Item C on the referenced form says, "Describe the nature and portion (percentage) of the work to be performed on the EC2 effort by the company referenced on this PPI and whether performing as the Prime, subcontractor, or a corporate division related to the prime (define relationship)." Since no pricing information is required and there is no way to know what task orders will be competed and won by an Offeror, it's not clear how Offerors will be able to complete this item. Would the Government please clarify what it requires for Item C?	This section will be removed in the Final RFP.
732	Past Performance Information Sheet	1	N/A	How should offerors indicate on this form that a given contract has no CPARS and the customer will fill out a PPQ instead?	This form has been updated to allow "Type of PPI Submitted".
733	Team Structure	1	N/A	Column D currently requires a DUNS number. Would the Government confirm that this will be changed to UEI?	The DUNS is no longer used. The UEI is now required. This form will be updated in the Final RFP.
734	Offeror Company Information	1	N/A	This table currently requires a DUNS number. Would the Government confirm that this will be changed to UEI?	The DUNS is no longer used. The UEI is now required. This form has been updated.
735	PWS Supplement	N/A	N/A	With the self-scoring matrix now based on 310 points (31 specialty area descriptions) instead of 1220 points (LCAT tasks), how should Offeror's use Attachment 2 - PWS Supplement - Task Descriptions?	Suggested/informational only. To be used as assistance in the self-scoring and by the Government to develop TOs.
736	Cross-Reference Matrix	N/A	N/A	Can the Government please confirm that cross-referenced Work Samples ONLY need to be mapped to Specialty Areas and their associated descriptions (ex.: 2.1.1 Data Administration; The contractor shall develop and administer databases and/or data management systems that allow for the storage, query, protection, and utilization of data.)?	Confirmed, it maps to the Specialty Area.
737	Work Sample Cover Sheet	1	N/A	Part 1: Work Sample Identification table refers to "PERCENTAGE OF SOC-E PROGRAM AREAS COVERED UNDER WORK SAMPLE." Can the Government please clarify and confirm that this should read EC2 Specialty Areas covered under Work Sample?	This was an error and will be corrected in the Final RFP.
738	Misc	N/A	N/A	Please ensure the attachments 1-14 provided with the draft solicitation are reviewed/edited to ensure their file names, attachment references as shown in the attachment and as referenced within the Solicitation, Section L & M and in the other attachments are corrected to ensure continuity across all documents. There are many attachments with file names such as 1, 2, 3... that contain in the attachment a different attachment # when compared to the file name for that document. Also, in Section L, many attachments are referred to only by the name of the document while omitting the "Attachment #". To not maintain uniformity across all documents with reference to attachment file names and headers inside of the documents will lead to confusion and to wide-ranging decisions as to the intended document.	This has been corrected.
739	Cross-Reference Matrix	N/A	N/A	The solicitation states, "L.8.6.3. There is a limit of 2 work samples per Specialty Area (SA)." However, the cross-reference matrix only provides one line entry to provide information for one work sample. Will the Government please update the cross-reference matrix that provides two entry lines per Specialty Area?	This will be added in the Final RFP.
740	A Solicitation	N/A	N/A	What is the anticipated cost of the work to be performed in OCONUS locations in terms of percentage of obligated Task Order dollars when compared to the estimated basic IDIQ contract maximum dollar Ceiling?	The Government is unable to estimate the cost of work performed in OCONUS locations in terms of percentage of obligated Task Order dollars when compared to the estimated basic IDIQ contract maximum dollar ceiling at this time.
741	Past Performance Information Sheet	N/A	N/A	Does the Government want the DUNS number only on the Past Performance Information Sheet, UEI number in lieu of the DUNS number or both DUNS number and UEI number?	The DUNS is no longer used. The UEI is now required. This form will be updated in the Final RFP.
742	Cross Reference Matrix	N/A	N/A	Can the government please add an explanation column in the Cross Reference Matrix to provide our rationale for scoring?	The rationale for scoring Past Experience is explained at M.4.1. - M.4.3.
743	Ordering Guide	N/A	N/A	Ordering Guide. ACC AMIC has invested several years and tremendous effort into the EC2 vehicle, which to our understanding, was being used to consolidate requirements among several different distinct contracts into one uniform IDIQ. Has the Gov't considered making this a Mandatory Use vehicle for anything and everything cyber related for the AF Enterprise? Suggest that this be incorporated into the Ordering Guide and other relevant documents (contract, PWS, etc.) to align the EC2 IDIQ with the Gov'ts stated intentions.	The EC2 is not, and has never been a consolidation. There is currently no plan to make EC2 a mandatory use vehicle.
744	Ordering Guide	N/A	N/A	Will the government make the EC2 ID/IQ vehicle available to other potential customers outside of the Department of the Air Force (i.e. other services in the Department of Defense)?	Not at this time.
745	A Solicitation	(see Attach. B Sec. J)	N/A	The page lengths of several of the listed Attachments do not appear to be correct. Specifically, Attachments 3, 10, and 11.	This will be corrected in the Final RFP.
746	Team Structure	N/A	N/A	The Government has used the term 'DUNS' as a column heading when it likely means 'UEI'. Recommend a correction.	The DUNS is no longer used. The UEI is now required. This form will be updated in the Final RFP.
747	Team Structure	N/A	N/A	Can the Government please clarify the last column heading "Verification of Prime Status (i.e., prime contract references for Team Member)"? This does not seem to be relevant or explained in the RFP requirements and may be an artifact from a previous version or different solicitation.	This column has been deleted.
748	Subcontractor Teaming Partner Consent Letter	1	N/A	Attachment 5 is incorrectly labeled as Attachment 14 in the header.	This will be corrected in the Final RFP.
749	Subcontractor Teaming Partner Consent Letter	1	N/A	The Solicitation number listed in this document should be 'FA877322R0005'.	This will be corrected in the Final RFP.
750	Work Sample Cover Sheet	1,3	N/A	Attachment 6 is incorrectly labeled as Attachment 8 in the header and on the instructions page.	This is corrected.
751	Work Sample Cover Sheet	1,3	N/A	There are references to 'SOC-E' instead of 'EC2' on pages 1 and 3.	This was an error and will be corrected in the Final RFP.
752	Work Sample Cover Sheet	3	N/A	There is a reference to 'WS1-WS15' which should be listed as 'WS1-WS62'.	This is corrected.
753	Cross-Reference Matrix	1	N/A	Attachment 8 is incorrectly labeled as Attachment 10 in the header.	This will be corrected in the Final RFP.
754	Cross-Reference Matrix	1	N/A	In Attachment 8 – Cross Reference Matrix, will the Government allow Offerors to add rows between the current Specialty Areas to provide a second work sample on its own row for clarity?	An additional row will be added in the Final RFP.
755	Past Performance Information Sheet	1	N/A	Attachment 9 is incorrectly labeled as Attachment 12 in the header.	This will be corrected in the Final RFP.
756	Past Performance Information Sheet	2	N/A	There is an incorrect header on page 2 referring to "FOPR Attachment 2..."	This will be corrected in the Final RFP.
757	Past Performance Questionnaire	1	N/A	Attachment 10 is incorrectly labeled as Attachment 13 in the header.	This will be corrected in the Final RFP.
758	Past Performance Questionnaire	1	N/A	There is a reference to 'WS1-WS15' which should be listed as 'WS1-WS62'.	This is an example not the total of Work Samples.
759	Question-Answer Matrix	1	N/A	Attachment 12 is incorrectly labeled as Attachment 15 in the header.	This will be corrected in the Final RFP.
760	Cross-Reference Matrix	Tab, Cross Reference Matrix	N/A	Would the Government please consider amending the Cross-Reference Matrix template to allow there to be two Work Samples under each Specialty Area, thus a total of 62 Work Samples?	This will be amended in the Final RFP.
761	PWS	4	N/A	The provisions provided in the Solicitation document do not appear to align with the scope of work in the PWS. The provisions appear to align more with logistics/transportation support rather than cybersecurity support. Will the provisions be updated to align with the PWS?	Yes, provisions will be updated in the Final RFP as indicated by prescriptions.
762	Cross-Reference Matrix	N/A	N/A	The current format of 8. Cross Reference Matrix is such that a significant amount of information will need to be included in a single cell for each SA in column E. This cell will contain information pertaining to two past performance examples referencing anywhere from 9 to over 100 task descriptions. Can the government confirm that contractors are to map to as many of the task descriptions as possible and include the information in the cells on 8. Cross Reference Matrix	1 row is available for each Work Sample.
763	Cross-Reference Matrix	1	N/A	The Cross-Reference Matrix is numbered as Attachment 8 per Section J; however, within the document, it is titled as Attachment 10. Can the Government please provide revised documents with updated attachment references to ensure traceability and compliance mapping for proposal submission.	This will be corrected in the Final RFP.
764	Cross Reference Matrix	1	N/A	Each Specialty Area may have up to two (2) documents mapped. In the Cross-Reference Matrix, the Government has provided one row per specialty area for entry. Can the Government please confirm if offerors are permitted to add rows to this matrix to allow for additional rows for each specialty area to accommodate text limitations per row within the excel matrix?	This will be corrected in the Final RFP and 2 rows will be available.
765	Cross Reference Matrix	1	N/A	Can the Government please clarify the reference requirements in the cross matrix should include: Work Sample Identifier, EC2 Specialty Area, Document Title, Document Date, Page Number, Paragraph Number, Table Number (if applicable), and Block (if applicable). Will the Government accept PoP start date for the Document Date as not all SOW/PWS documents have a date listed?	Yes, the Period of Performance start date is the correct date.
766	Cross Reference Matrix	1	N/A	Reference in matrix requires document title, can the Government please confirm that this is the name of the Government Program?	Yes, the document title should reflect the Government program name.

767	Subcontractor Teaming Partner Consent Letter	1	N/A	The Subcontractor Teaming Partner Consent Letter is numbered as Attachment 5 per Section J; however, within the document, it is titled as Attachment 14. Can the Government please provide revised documents with updated attachment references to ensure traceability and compliance mapping for proposal submission.	This will be corrected in the Final RFP.
768	Work Sample Cover Sheet	1	N/A	The Work Sample Cover Sheet is numbered as Attachment 6 per Section J; however, within the document, it is titled as Attachment 8. Can the Government please provide revised documents with updated attachment references to ensure traceability and compliance mapping for proposal submission.	This was an error and will be corrected in the Final RFP.
769	Past Performance Info Sheet	1	N/A	The Past Performance Info Sheet is numbered as Attachment 9 per Section J; however, within the document, it is titled as Attachment 12. Can the Government please provide revised documents with updated attachment references to ensure traceability and compliance mapping for proposal submission.	This will be corrected in the Final RFP.
770	Past Performance Questionnaire	1	N/A	The Past Performance Questionnaire is numbered as Attachment 10 per Section J; however, within the document, it is titled as Attachment 13. Can the Government please provide revised documents with updated attachment references to ensure traceability and compliance mapping for proposal submission.	This will be corrected in the Final RFP.
771	Questions and Answer Matrix	1	N/A	The Questions and Answer Matrix is numbered as Attachment 12 per Section J; however, within the document, it is titled as Attachment 15. Can the Government please provide revised documents with updated attachment references to ensure traceability and compliance mapping for proposal submission.	This will be corrected in the Final RFP.
772	Misc	N/A	N/A	How many awards does the government anticipate as a result of the solicitation and associated responses?	The Government intends to make an award to each and all qualifying offerors. As such, the government does not anticipate a particular number of awards.
773	Misc	N/A	N/A	Please confirm that clearance requirements will be dependant on the task orders issued.	Confirmed.
774	Misc	N/A	N/A	Please confirm that this is a multiple award contract	Confirmed. This is a multiple award IDIQ contract.
775	PWS	N/A	N/A	Please confirm that each task order will outline/confirm the Government's preferred methodology/policy/NIST for cybersecurity operations.	Confirmed.
776	PWS	N/A	N/A	Please confirm that each task order will outline/confirm the Government's preferred methodology/policy/NIST for software development lifecycle management.	Confirmed.
777	PWS	N/A	N/A	Please confirm that each task order will outline/confirm the Government's preferred methodology/policy/NIST for risk management.	Confirmed.
778	Offeror Company Information	N/A	N/A	Since the Contractor's Unique Entity Identifier (UEI) must be included on the cover pages for each volume, per Section L, Paragraphs L.4.2.2, should that information also be included on the Offeror's Company Information Sheet as well?	The DUNS is no longer used. The UEI is now required. This form has been updated.
779	Past Performance Questionnaire	1	N/A	Is the total contract value meant to cover the ceiling or the funded value?	The funded value.
780	Misc	N/A	N/A	Please share the Government's estimated value for each Category and/or Specialty Area as it would enhance all offerors teaming approach and ability to manage team member's expectations? We recognize that these estimates are non-binding and not a guarantee.	The Government is unable to provide estimates at this time.
781	Misc	N/A	N/A	Please post a recording of the pre-solicitation conference for all vendors. Rationale: Minimizes confusion and provides vendors the ability to share the precise presentation within their individual organizations leading to more complete and compliant proposals.	This will be posted on SAM.gov prior to the release of the Final RFP.
782	Work Sample Cover Sheet	1	n/a	Can the Government please clarify what is required and how to complete the following: "PERCENTAGE OF SOC-E PROGRAM AREAS COVERED UNDER WORK SAMPLE"? SOC-E Program Areas are not specified in the PWS.	This was an error and will be removed in the Final RFP.
783	Work Sample Cover Sheet	1	n/a	Can the Government please clarify the relevance of the groupings provided under the "Primary Scope of Work" section? Are there descriptions for the following groups: Program Management, Operations & Maintenance, Install/Warehouse, SOC-Enterprise Services/Helpdesk?	This was an error and will be corrected in the Final RFP.
784	Pre-RFP Conference	8 of 37	N/A	Noted that the date of 1 July 2022 for RFP release is subject to change but will the government consider release of the RFP after the July 4th holiday?	Yes, the release of the RFP will be after the 4th of July holiday.
785	Team Structure	NA	NA	Column D refers to DUNS, which was replaced on 4 April 2022 by Unique Entity Identifier (UEI) as the primary means of entity identification. Q: Does the Government intend to revise this document, replacing DUNS with UEI?	The DUNS is no longer used. The UEI is now required. This form will be updated in the Final RFP.
786	Offeror Company Information	1	NA	The table in this attachment refers to DUNS, which was replaced on 4 April 2022 by Unique Entity Identifier (UEI) as the primary means of entity identification. Q: Does the Government intend to revise this document, replacing DUNS with UEI?	The DUNS is no longer used. The UEI is now required. This form has been updated.
787	Work Sample Cover Sheet	1	NA	The table for this document asks for the following information: "PERCENTAGE OF SOC-E PROGRAM AREAS COVERED UNDER WORK SAMPLE" Q: Can the Government define the meaning of SOC-E programs, so Offerors can accurately comply with the requirement?	This was an error and will be corrected in the Final RFP.
788	Misc	NA	NA	Q: Is Enterprise Cyber Capabilities (EC2) a new requirement, is it a continuation of an existing requirement, or is it a consolidation of other requirements?	The EC2 IDIQ is a new requirement.
789	Misc	NA	NA	Q: If Enterprise Cyber Capabilities (EC2) is either a continuation of an existing requirement or a consolidation of other requirements, can the Government name the incumbent contractors?	The EC2 IDIQ is a new requirement.
790	Past Performance Information	1	NA	Please correct the title of the Past Performance Information sheet from "Attachment 12" to "Attachment 9".	This will be corrected in the Final RFP.
791	Past Performance Information	2	NA	Please correct the title of the Past Performance Information sheet, page 2, from "FOPR Attachment 2 Evaluation Criteria and Methodology" to "Past Performance Information".	This will be corrected in the Final RFP.
792	A Solicitation	9	NA	Section F Overall Contract Delivery Period: should Line Item 0002 be "09 May 2028 To 08 May 2033"?	No. CLINs will be added for the Option Period in Final RFP.
793	Team Structure	NA	NA	Please clarify (in L.7.4) what information should be provided in Column G of the Team Structure worksheet. The heading for Column G implies that team members must have a "prime contract reference." Is a prime "contract reference" synonymous with a prime Past Experience Work Sample?	This column has been deleted.
794	Work Sample Cover Sheet	1	NA	Please correct the title of the Cover Sheet from "Attachment 8" to "Attachment 6".	This is corrected
795	Work Sample Cover Sheet	1	NA	Please modify the block heading, "PERCENTAGE OF SOC-E PROGRAM AREAS COVERED UNDER WORK SAMPLE:" to say, "PERCENTAGE OF EC2 SPECIALTY AREAS COVERED UNDER WORK SAMPLE:"	This was an error and will be corrected in the Final RFP.
796	Work Sample Cover Sheet	1	NA	Please clarify how Offerors should calculate the percentage for completing the block, "PERCENTAGE OF SPECIALTY AREAS COVERED UNDER WORK SAMPLE:" Are each of the Specialty Areas equally valued/weighted, and therefore each SA represents 3.2258 percent of the overall EC2 scope? If the Offeror has two Work Samples aligned to the SA, is each related Work Sample therefore worth 1.6129%, and a single Work Sample for the SA is 3.2258%?	Yes. This math is correct.
797	Work Sample Cover Sheet	1	NA	Please clarify the Government's objective for the data field "PERCENTAGE OF SOC-E PROGRAM AREAS COVERED UNDER WORK SAMPLE:" on this form, so that Offerors, when presented with any uncertainty about how to calculate it, will understand the goal of the request. This data field appears to be redundant to Cells E44 and G44 on the Self-Scoring Matrix.	This was an error and will be corrected in the Final RFP.
798	Questions and Answer Matrix	1	na	The document header is labelled Attachment 15. Is that a typo or is the document title a typo?	This will be corrected in the Final RFP.
799	Team Structure	1	NA	In RFP Attachment 4, for the far right column that indicates "Verification of Prime Status (i.e., prime contract references for Team Member)," what information is expected to be included? Does the Government want offerors to list all prime offeror and each subcontract partner references included in Volumes III and IV of which we served in a prime contractor capacity?	This column has been deleted.
800	Pre-RFP Conference - EC2	Slide 8	NA	Per the table indicating the date for "Issue Request for Proposal" of July 1, 2022 shared in the Pre-Solicitation Conference on May 17th, we respectfully ask the Government to delay the Final RFP release until at least July 5th to avoid impacts to the July 4th holiday for both the Government's and Offeror's personnel. We appreciate the consideration.	The release of the RFP will be after the 4th of July holiday.
801	Cross-Reference Matrix	Tab "Cross Reference Matrix"	NA	We recommend the Government provide instructions for how to address/fill out each column of Attachment 8, perhaps similar to the instructions provided for Attachment 6 Work Sample Cover Sheet. We recognize that instructions for Column E are provided in the file "C Section L - M", page 10 of 21, Section L.8.5, but no other column instructions appear to be provided.	The Government will consider this for the Final RFP
802	Past Performance Info Sheet	1	Note	*NOTE: If Prime is checked above, offerors must submit all completed CPARS reports related to the effort listed above, to include interim and final reports. CPARS reports shall be in sequential order from the performance start date and attached to the referenced PPI. CPARS reports are exempt from the page count. Comment: L.9.5.4 requires only CPARS that were completed within the last three years, as of the date of this RFP. Question: Will the Government please revise the PPI Sheet to also state "all CPARS that were completed within the last three years"?	This will be updated in the Final RFP.
803	Cross-Reference Matrix	1	Part 1	Can the Government clarify what percentage of SOC-E Program is?	This will be corrected in the Final RFP. SOC-E language should not have been included.

804	Work Sample Cover Sheet	1 and 3	Part 1	The Work Sample Cover Sheet requires Offeror to include Primary Scope of Work and the instructions on Page 3 state "Enter one or more of the following: Program Management, Operation and Maintenance, Install/Warehouse, SOC-Enterprise Helpdesk." Will the Government correct this information and the Work Sample Cover sheet to align with the EC2 contract scope?	This was an error and will be corrected in the Final RFP.
805	Work Sample Cover Sheet	1 and 3	Part 1	The Work Sample Cover Sheet requires the Offeror to include the Percentage of DOC-E Program Areas Covered Under the Work Sample. Page 3 states: "Identify the percentage of work supporting the DOC-E Program Areas." Will the Government correct this information and the Work Sample Cover Sheet to align with the EC2 contract? Can the Government clarify what is required for this requirement?	This was an error and will be corrected in the Final RFP.
806	Work Sample Cover Sheet	1, 3	Part 1 (Table, Row 11)	The table in Part 1: Work Sample Identification, row 11, states "PERCENTAGE OF SOC-E PROGRAM AREAS COVERED UNDER WORK SAMPLE". We are unclear on the reference to "SOC-E". We speculate that the Government intended to use "EC2" here. - Please note that the "Instructions to Attachment 8 - Work Sample Cover Sheet" on page 3 will need similar updates based on this since they also reference "SOC-E", since it provides instructions to the Row 11 and also Row 10 "Primary Scope of Work".	This was an error and will be corrected in the Final RFP.
807	Work Sample Cover Sheet		Part 1 Instructions	In the work sample cover sheet, would the Government clarify what the SOC-E program areas are and how to calculate the percentage?	This was an error and will be corrected in the Final RFP.
808	Work Sample Cover Sheet		Part 1 Instructions	The Primary Scope of Work choices don't seem to align with this PWS. Would the Government please clarify acceptable entries for primary scope of work?	This will be corrected in the Final RFP.
809	Work Sample Cover Sheet	1 and 3	Part I	Regarding Part I: Work Sample Identification in the Work Sample Cover Sheet (Attachment 6 per draft Section J), will the Government clarify what information Offerors shall provide in response to: "percentage of SOC-E program areas covered under work sample." Please provide a definition for SOC-E.	This section will be removed in the Final RFP.
810	Work Sample Cover Sheet	1	Part I	Can the Government please clarify if the last row on the Part I table is supposed to reflect the percentage (%) of Specialty Areas (SAs) covered vs. SOC-E Program Areas?	This will be corrected in the Final RFP.
811	Work Sample Cover Sheet	1	Part I	Can the Government please clarify what the SOC-E Program Areas reference is referring to?	This was an error and will be corrected in the Final RFP.
812	Work Sample Cover Sheet	3	Part I	This section state "Work samples shall be numbered WS1-WS15. Insert the applicable work sample number. Since there are 31 defined categories/specialty areas and the offeror is allowed 2 work samples per specialty area, should this section read "Work samples shall be numbered WS1-WS62."?	This will be corrected in the Final RFP.
813	Work Sample Cover Sheet	3	Part I	Instructions for Work Sample Identifier state "Work Samples shall be numbered WS1-WS15." Shouldn't work samples be identified as WS1 to a maximum of WS62 or is this a typographical error? The current wording implies there is a max of 15 Work Samples to spread amongst all SAs.	This will be corrected in the Final RFP.
814	Work Sample Cover Sheet	3	Part I	Work Sample Identifier -It appears that only one WS identifier (and thus only one cover sheet and one Past Performance Information Sheet) is expected per contract reference, even if the contract covers multiple SAs. Please confirm.	IAW L.8.7.1. Work Sample Cover Sheet. A Work Sample Cover Sheet (Attachment 6), shall be completed for each work sample submitted.
815	Work Sample Cover Sheet		Part I	Reference: Primary Scope of Work -Enter one or more of the following: Program Management, Operations & Maintenance, Install/Warehouse, SOC-Enterprise Services/Helpdesk Q: The Scope of Work identified in this attachment does not align with the Service Areas or PWS 2.0, can the Government confirm that this is correct?	This was an error and will be corrected in the Final RFP.
816	Work Sample Cover Sheet	3	Part I	Reference: Attachment 6 - Percentage of SOC-E Program Areas Covered under Work Sample Q: It is assumed SOC-E Program Areas is same as EC2 Categories/Specialty Areas referenced in Self Scoring Sheet and L.8.6.3. Please confirm	This will be corrected in the Final RFP.
817	Work Sample Cover Sheet	1 of 3	PART I	When providing the WORK SAMPLE VALUE, is the government looking for the total contract value with all options?	Yes. Total contract value.
818	L-M	3	L.9.5.4	Reference:Work Sample Identifier - "Work samples shall be numbered WS1-WS15" and in section L.9.5.4 it references (i.e. WS1-WS62) Q: The numbering indicates we are limited to either 15 work samples or 62, please confirm that is correct.	In the Final RFP, this will be updated/changed to provide the i.e.. WS62.
819	Work Sample Cover Sheet	1	Part I, 10th & 11th rows	The fields "PRIMARY SCOPE OF WORK" and "PERCENTAGE OF SOC-E PROGRAM AREAS COVERED UNDER WORK SAMPLE" both include the term "SOC-Enterprise" (or "SOC-E"), which does not appear anywhere else in the solicitation. Please confirm "SOC" stands for "Security Operations Center" and provide or point us to details about the SOC-E program areas needed to complete the two fields above in the Work Sample Cover Sheet.	This will be corrected in the Final RFP.
820	Work Sample Cover Sheet	3	PART I: WORK SAMPLE IDENTIFICATION	This form appears to have some content from another RFP. The possible Work Sample numbers, as well as the Primary Scope of Work and the Percentage of SOC-E Program Areas Covered Under Work Sample do not match the RFP instructions. Would the Government please specify what those items (and the acceptable content) will be for EC2?	This will be corrected in the Final RFP.
821	Work Sample Cover Sheet	3	Part I: Work Sample Identification	The requirement asks offerors to identify "the percentage of work supporting SOC-E Program Areas." Can the Government be more specific as to what the SOC-E Program Areas are?	This will be corrected in the Final RFP.
822	Work Sample Cover Sheet	1	L.8.6.1	RFP Section L.8.6.1 states that "For subcontractor work samples, the Offeror shall provide at least two (2) POCs for the prime company," however, Attachment 6 only has one obvious place to list a prime company's POC (PART II, 3. Prime Company Point of Contact). For the second prime company POC is it permissible to utilize the box 'PART II, 2. Contracting Officer's Representative or Relevant Customer Point of Contact'?	This will be corrected in the Final RFP.
823	Work Sample Cover Sheet	1	Part II	Is the Contractor required to provide the Contracting Officer and Contracting Officer's Representative contact information only when the work sample is for Contractor or a Teaming Partner as a subcontractor? Otherwise, we may not have access to that information.	The offeror is required to provide the Contracting Officer and Contracting Officer's Representative for the referenced work sample.
824	Work Sample Cover Sheet	3	PART III: WORK SAMPLE DESCRIPTION (500 Character Limit)	Attachment 8 indicates that the "Work Sample Description" field will not be evaluated. Since it will not be evaluated, please clarify the type of information that offerors should include in this field?	This was an error and will be corrected in the Final RFP.
825	Work Sample Cover Sheet	3	<u>Percentage of SOC-E Program Areas Covered Under Work Sample</u>	Text: "Percentage of SOC-E Program Areas Covered Under Work Sample: Identify the percentage of work supporting SOC-E Program Areas. " Question: What is a "SOC-E Program Area"? These are for another bid that is not EC2, as they do not appear to match the PWS for EC2? Recommendation: Please update the form to match those elements outlined in the PWS. Thank you.	This was an error and will be corrected in the Final RFP.
826	Work Sample Cover Sheet	PART I: WORK SAMPLE IDENTIFICATION	PERCENTAGE OF SOC-E PROGRAM AREAS COVERED UNDER WORK SAMPLE:	Question: Will the Government please clarify what "Percentage of SOC-E program areas covered...." means. This requirement does not appear to be relevant to the IDIQ. Recommend the Government remove this requirement.	This will be corrected in the Final RFP.
827	L-M	please see question	please see question	The attachment numbers in the names of all the attachment files from Update 11 match the corresponding attachment numbers used throughout the instructions in C+Section+L+M.docx . However, the contents of some of those files refer to a different attachment number. For example, the header on the first page of the Attachment 5 file says, " <i>Attachment 14 – Subcontractor/Teaming Partner Consent Letter</i> ". To prevent confusion, please adjust this header to read " <i>Attachment 5 – Subcontractor/Teaming Partner Consent Letter</i> " so it matches the number in the filename and solicitation instructions. We recommend the following changes to fix attachment number discrepancies: - In Section L.8.4.1 , change " <i>Attachment 9</i> " to " <i>Attachment 7</i> ". - In Attachment 5 , change " <i>14</i> " to " <i>5</i> " in the page header as described above. - In Attachment 6 , change " <i>8</i> " to " <i>6</i> " in the title. - In Attachment 8 , change " <i>10</i> " to " <i>8</i> " in Row 1. - In Attachment 9 , change " <i>12</i> " to " <i>9</i> " in the title and in the header on the second page, remove or update " <i>FOPR Attachment 2 - Evaluation Methodology and Criteria FA4890-20-R-0016</i> ". - In Attachment 10 , change " <i>13</i> " to " <i>10</i> " in the title. - In Attachment 12 , change " <i>15</i> " to " <i>12</i> " in Row 1.	This will be updated in the Final RFP.

828	Past Performance Info Sheet	1	PPI	The Government is requesting, "If subcontractor, teaming partner or joint venture, please calculate the percentage of work performed based on total contract value." However, as a subcontractor we will not have knowledge of what the full prime contract value (as this is not typically provided by a prime contractor) and therefore cannot provide this information to the Government. Would the Government remove this requirement for past performance on which an offeror was a subcontractor?	Subcontractors who do not have visibility to the Total Funded Contract dollar Value should list the dollar value of their contract with a prime.
829	Past Performance Questionnaire--needs to be moved	1	PPQ- Section I Contract Type	There is a choice between Independent Contract or IDIQ. However, since no IDIQs are allowed as contract references, only Task Orders, should the choice be between Independent Contract or Task Order? And if so, can the Government confirm that Independent Contract means a C contract? If this is not a correct assumption, can the Government please define what box should be checked when a Task Order on an IDIQ is used as a Past Performance?	Yes. This will be corrected in the Final RFP.
830	Work Sample Cover Sheet	3	<u>Primary Scope of Work</u>	Text: "Primary Scope of Work: Enter one or more of the following: Program Management, Operations & Maintenance, Install/Warehouse, SOC-Enterprise Services/Helpdesk" Question: Were these primary scopes of work for another bid that is not EC2, as they do not appear to match the PWS for EC2? Recommendation: Please update the form to match those primary scopes of work that are outlined in the PWS. Thank you.	This was an error and will be corrected in the Final RFP.
831	Work Sample Cover Sheet	2	Project Description	500 characters does not provide enough space for an adequate Project Description. Suggest Chaning this to 500 words or more.	The Government has considered this and is confident 500 characters (in addition to the work sample document(s)) is enough to describe an individual work sample.
832	Misc	9	Q42	From a "Highly Qualified Offeror's" perspective, does the government intend to reserve spots for Small Business and if so what is the Governments Small Business goals for EC2?	The Government is not reserving spots for small businesses. The Government intends to make an award to each and all qualifying offerors.
833	Misc	13	Q66	Responses to Question 66 stilll doesn't seem explicitly clear with respect to Large Business - are Large Business open to Prime or is this limited to SB? Reference Question (Q66): Q66: Attachment 5 Section L, Paragraph 1.13.9, Teaming Arrangements. This paragraph prohibits submitting as a Prime and a Subcontractor on another team. Does this apply to only the Small Business procurement or does it include the unrestricted procurement as well? Can you submit as a Prime under the small business procurement and as a Subcontractor to a large Prime under the Unrestricted contract? Conversely can a Large submit as an unrestricted Prime and as a subcontractor to a Small Business Prime? The Q&A from 20OCT21 does not assist in clarifying this paragraph.	Yes, a large business can be a prime or a subcontractor in a teaming arrangement.
834	A Solicitation	22	ref: 52.227-17	To ensure that offerors understand which data right clauses apply to which requirements, please identify the specific CLINS, specific paragraphs of the PWS scope of work and/or deliverables which apply to FAR 52.227-17 (vs FAR 52.2217-14).	FAR Clause 52.227-17 will be removed in the Final RFP.
835	Pre-RFP Conference Slide Deck	7	Requiring Activity or Local Acquisition Office	Please identify whether the Requiring Activity or the Local Acquisition Office will be responsible for conducting the Market Research (MR) supporting the Total Small Business Set Aside Determinations. If both organizations participate in the MR, please identify which organization is the lead organization regarding MR and making the Total Small Business Set Aside Determination.	This is determined at the Task Order level not at the IDIQ level and is not directed in the EC2 Ordering Guide.
836	Cross-Reference Matrix	"Cross Reference Matrix" tab	Row 1	Please note that Row 1 in this attachment is calling itself "Attachment 10" versus the correct "Attachment 8". If this was meant to be some type of reference to Attachment 10 Past Performance Questionnaire, it it unclear.	This will be corrected in the Final RFP.
837	Questions and Answer Matrix	"Questions" tab	Row 1	Please note that Row 1 in this attachment is calling itself "Attachment 15" versus the correct "Attachment 12".	This will be corrected in the Final RFP.
838	A Solicitation	Cover Page	Section 9	Would the Government please clarify the expected proposal due date? The cover page has a date of 5 Oct 2022 in section 9. Is this intended to represent the proposal due date or the start date of an award?	This date will be updated with the actual proposal due date upon issuance of the Final RFP.
839	A Solicitation	1	Section 9	Can the government clarify if 12:00pm 5 Oct 2022 will be the RFP date for submissions?	This will be corrected/updated upon final RFP release.
840	RFP -- Section B	3	Section B	Do applicants have to complete the CDRLs?	No.
841	A Solicitation	3	Section B	How much travel can be expected on this contract? What percentage of TOs will include OCONUS travel?	The Government is unable to estimate how much travel or a percentage of TO OCONUS travel at this time.
842	A Solicitation	3	Section B	Can the government please amend this section to include Time and Materials (T&M) contract type on EC2? (Section B Item 0001 and 0002 indicate Firm Fixed Price (FFP) and Cost Plus (Cost-Plus Fixed Fee (CPFF), Cost-Plus-Incentive Fee (CPIF) or Cost-Plus Award Fee (CPAF)) options, but not Time and Materials (T&M).	Ordering Contracting Officers may use any appropriate contract type. These will include Fixed Price, all types, Cost-reimbursement, all types, Time-and-material, Labor-hour, or hybrids of any of these types. The CLIN structure in the Final RFP will reflect this.
843	A Solicitation	3 and 9	Section B and F	Will the PoP be a five-year base period followed by an option of five-year period? If so, would the Government consider providing the option year CLINs in Sections B and F of the Solicitation?	Yes. Option Year CLINs will be added in the Final RFP
844	Past Performance Questionnaire	3, 4	Section II and Section III	The PPQ SECTION II: EVALUATION indicates, "Please discuss all ratings except "Satisfactory" or "Neutral." Later in SECTION III: NARRATIVE SUMMARY, the instructions state, "Please discuss all ratings except "Satisfactory" or "Unsatisfactory." We assume that all Exceptional or Very Good ratings must be supported by a quality discussion of the support provided?	Yes.
845	A Solicitation	1	Section J List of Documents, Exhibits and Other Attachments	In Section J it lists as Attachment 9 Past Performance Information Sheet and Attachment 10 as the Past Performance Questionnaire yet the Past Performance Information attachment has it titled as Attachment 12 and the Past Performance questionnaire document has it titled as Attachment 13. Will the Government be updating Section J List of Documents, Exhibits and Other Attachments to match the actual document attachment title?	Yes, this will be corrected in the Final RFP.
846	L-M	2	Section L&M	Section L&M language states, "partial set-aside...portion of the requirement set aside for SB, and a portion for other socio-economic SBs" seems to imply this is a total Small Business Set Aside. Will the Government confirm that Other Than Small Business can also bid?	Other Than Small Business can also propose on the EC2 IDIQ.
847	L-M	17 or 22	M.4.2.1	"The Government will review the Work Sample to validate that the Offeror's experience is within the scope of the corresponding Specialty Area (SA)." - Please verify that the provided work sample needs to fit in the specialty area but does not need to necessarily cover 100% of all the potential subtasks in that specialty area to receive the 5 points.	The PWS provides the relevant categories and specialty areas. The PWS supplement integrates those SAs (with the task IDs, KSAs, and more). The solicitation does not prescribe that the work sample must explicitly state each and every task ID or task (or KSA). However, where an offeror cites a work sample that is vague, does not address the tasks, or provides little nexus to the SA under the IDIQ, then the government cannot extrapolate and simply may not be able to validate that work sample.
848	L-M	N/A	Sections L & M	Will the Government consider limiting the number of awardees to no greater than seven (7) awardees that are either traditional Prime or Large Small Mission Focused Teams under a highest technically rated offeror (HTRO) evaluation criteria?	No, the requirement will remain the same in the Final RFP.
849	L-M	N/A	Sections L & M	Will the Government consider requiring the Prime contractor to have a least one work sample that is greater than 30FTEs as a Pass/Fail Criteria to demonstrate ability to manage/staff a workforce greater than 30FTEs?	No, the requirement will remain the same in the Final RFP.
850	L-M	N/A	Sections L & M	Will the Government require the Prime or LSMFT Primes provide at least 1 work sample for at least 25 of 31 SA?	No, the requirement will remain the same in the Final RFP.
851	L-M	N/A	Sections L & M	Will the Government consider requiring each team to have at least one contractor site office/SCIF space on the traditional team or LSMFT at the TS/SCI level as a Pass Fail Criteria?	No, the requirement will remain the same in the Final RFP.
852	L-M	N/A	Sections L & M	Will the Government require adding a Cost Volume/Factor evaluating on the basis of realism and reasonableness? Can the Government in the Cost Volume enable offerors to provide CPFF rates on a master rate card corresponding with the proposed LCAT descriptions for CR CLINS to execute the stated domains of cyber work?	No, the requirement will remain the same in the Final RFP.
853	L-M	N/A	Sections L & M	Will the Government enable each offeror/LSMFT to provide a master list of labor categories with requirements/qualifications as a proposal deliverable that corresponds to ability to execute the span of cyber services and provide corresponding rates in the cost volume?	No, the requirement will remain the same in the Final RFP.
854	L-M	N/A	Sections L & M	Will the Government consider including three (3) executable task orders with corresponding SOW/PWS in addition to the IDIQ vehicle that Offerors individually price in alignment with an specified LOE for the desired period of performance from 1-3 mission stakeholders?	No, the requirement will remain the same in the Final RFP.
855	L-M	N/A	Sections L & M	Will the Government consider a PMO level of effort (LOE) CLIN with 3-5 Key Personnel and additional Essential Personnel (e.g., Program Manager, Chief Cyber Architect, Cyber Engineer, Cyber SME, Cyber Training Lead) (LOE)?	No, the requirement will remain the same in the Final RFP.
856	L-M	N/A	Sections L & M	Will the Government consider enabling offerors to provide work substantiation through a TS/SCI (CLASSIFIED) submission in order to provide the necessary support information on relevant CLASSIFIED work samples? Or will the Government consider a Hybrid submission that is part (UNCLASSIFIED) and part (CLASSIFIED) to enable the necessary work sample substantiation (e.g., PWS, SOW, DD254, etc) to demonstrate relevant cyber experience in the specified cyber domains?	No. Classified proposal information shall not be submitted and will not be evaluated. The burden of proof is defined at L.8.5. The Government will evaluate unclassified proposal information only and determine if the past experience is relevant IAW M.4.1.

857	L-M	N/A	Sections L & M	Will the Government consider incorporating the following factors in the small business set aside criteria: possess a TS/SCI SCIF contractor site facility possess a past performance citation that has over 30 FTEs, and validation that at least two small businesses are capable of executing the upcoming task order scope?	Specifics will be provided in Task Order not the EC2 IDIQ.
858	L-M	5	Table 1	Section 5 - Table 1 states that there is a 2-page limit for Responsibility Information, excluding the responses for Financial/Other Resources, Accounting Systems, and OCI. The two remaining topics that must be covered under Responsibility Information are Insurance Certification and Certification Regarding Responsibility Matters (Attachment 13). The supplied Attachment 13 is 2-pages long. The page limit does not provide space for the Insurance Certificate. Please Advise.	Page limitations will be revised. The insurance provision will be deleted. The government may require evidence of compliance (FAR clause 52.228-5, Insurance – Work on Government Installations in task order evaluations and contract administration.
859	L-M	6 and 8	Table 1-Proposal Organization	Per the table provided on page 6, teaming agreements are limited to 30 pages. Section L.7.5 states the Offeror shall provide teaming agreement summary between the Prime Offeror and each team member. Will the Government consider excluding teaming agreements from the page count? A 30-page restriction could easily be exceeded with a large team. Similar solicitations typically exclude teaming agreements from the page count.	The solicitation will be revised to remove providing the teaming agreement (and Joint Venture agreement). However, the offeror must list the companies/entities that (commitment by agreement or other legal obligation) will be supporting the offeror in the IDIQ (Atch 3).
860	PWS Supplement	Cells D29 and D30	Target Network Analyst; Multi-Disciplined Language Analyst	Please confirm that the PWS Map/Nesting for Target Network Analyst (AN_TGT_002) maps to PWS section 2.4.4. Please confirm that the PWS Map/Nesting for Multi-Disciplined Language Analyst (AN_LNG_001) maps to PWS section 2.4.5.	This will be corrected in the Final RFP.
861	Ordering Guide	5	Task Order Features	The Task Order Features section in the EC2 Ordering Guide states that the IDIQ provides up to a 5 year (60 month) period of performance. Assuming the Option Period for the IDIQ is exercised, can Task Orders be extended beyond a 60 month PoP without having to be recompeted?	This will be updated for the Final RFP.
862	Ordering Guide	5	Task Order Features, 5th bullet	Can the government please amend this section to include Time and Materials (T&M) contract type on EC2 (Task Order Features, 5th bullet references "Allows for all contract types, including hybrids (i.e., CPFF, FFP, FFP-LOE)", but does not reference Time and Materials (T&M)?	This will be updated for the Final RFP.
863	Ordering Guide	5	Task Order Features, 6th bullet	Can the Government please clarify if the Government will allow Task Orders to be released and responded to at the TS/SCI level?	Work performed in resulting TOs may be TS/SCI, and if required they will be responded to at the TS/SCI level.
864	Ordering Guide	21	Task Order Process	Will Exhibit A: Task Order Award Process be updated from IAC to EC2? Will the 4th step be renamed to Set-Aside Determination? Will the 4th and 5th steps be swapped as a thorough review of the requirements to include market research should precede a set-aside determination?	This will be corrected in the Final RFP.
865	Ordering Guide	18	Technical Acceptable/Unacceptable (LPTA)	Given the complexity of the EC2 scope, can the Government describe the circumstances under which LPTA would be appropriate and not be in conflict with DFARS 215.101-2-70(a)(1) and the John S. McCain National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2019?	The Ordering Contracting Officer will determine the appropriate source selection method based on the Task Order requirement and will ensure regulatory and legal conflicts are resolved prior to releasing Fair Opportunity Proposal Requests.
866	Ordering Guide	7	Technical Competence, last bullet	Can the government please clarify the relationship between contract awardees and "Establish a shared terminology between hiring managers and human resources (HR) staff for the recruiting, retention, and training of a highly-specialized workforce."? This appears to be an internal and inherently governmental component.	Low turnover rates of Contractor employees is mutually beneficial to both the Government and the Contractor Company. This verbiage refers to fostering a Contractor work environment that fosters retention and low Contractor employee turnover rates through Contractor Company led incentives.
867	Past Performance Information Sheet	1	Title	The Attachment title is incorrectly identified as Attachment 12. Please provide an updated Attachment.	This will be corrected in the Final RFP.
868	Past Performance Questionnaire	1	Title	Is this Attachment 10 or is it Attachment 13 as listed in the document?	The PPQ is Attachment 10. This will be corrected in the Final RFP.
869	L-M	pg 8 of 22	Verification of Prime Status; L.7.4 Team Structure	In the number 4. "Team Structure" file, how is Column G called "Verification of Prime Status (i.e. prime contract references for Team Member)" used? L.7.4 contains the instructions for columns A through F but not Column G. Please specify the instructions for column G and confirm if the Offeror fills column G or is it filled by the Government during evaluation?.	This column/requirement has been removed.
870	Work Sample Cover Sheet	1	Work Sample Identification	Work Sample Value may be difficult to calculate when the specialty area refers to only a small part of the overall contract. In this case is it acceptable to use the total contract value?	Total contract value is required.
871	Work Sample Cover Sheet	1	Work Sample Identification	What is meant by "Percentage of SOC- E Program Areas Covered under the Work Sample"?	This was an error and will be corrected in the Final RFP.
872	Work Sample Cover Sheet	1	Work Sample Identification	Is Percentage of SOCE Program Area to be replaced by Speciality Area?	This was an error and will be corrected in the Final RFP.
873	Work Sample Cover Sheet	1	Work Sample Identification	Should Primary Scope of Work be replaced with EC2 Category?	Primary Scope of Work is replaced with Specialty Area Reference #.
874	Work Sample Cover Sheet	1	Work Sample Identification	Work Sample Value may be difficult to calculate when using a large contract as a reference. In this instance should the total contract value be used?	Total contract value is required.
875	Work Sample Cover Sheet	3	Work Sample Identifier	Text: " <u>Work Sample Identifier</u> : Works samples shall be numbered WS1-WS15. Insert the applicable work sample number." Question: Did the Governmetn mean numbered "WS1 - WS62" as there are 62 WSs allowed for in the "C Section L - M" document? Recommendation: Please update as needed to match what is in Sections L and M. Thank you.	This will be corrected in the Final RFP.