PACTS III Questions and Responses

Question #	Date Question Submitted	Document	Page. No	Section	Question/Comment	Government Response
1		RFI		3(A)(2)	There is one particular question that we believe is unfair to ask SDVOSB or any company for that matter. That question is: "If so, how many months do you estimate to acquire a secret clearance?" As you are aware, a company cannot obtain a facility clearance (FCL) until it has a contract in hand that requires it to have an FCL and the awarding agency sponsors the contractor. The timeline to process a contractor's FCL is entirely in the hands of the government – outside the control of the contractor. There is no way for the contractor to estimate how long it will take them to obtain a Secret clearance. There are excellent small businesses including SDVOSBs who can add tremendous value to DHS and provide outstanding and cost-effective support on PACTS III vehicle – the only thing holding them back is a facility clearance. We commend you for thinking about this question and considering keeping this procurement accessible to companies who are eligible for facility clearance, they just need to be sponsored. However, we respectfully request that you remove this question on timelines. No contractor will be able to answer this truthfully because they have no control over the process.	Thank you for your email that expresses concern for one of the questions we have chose to include in our RFI. The document "# 70SBUR22I00000032" that is posted on sam.gov is a Request for Information (RFI); not a formal solicitation. The purpose of this RFI is to gather responses to the questions that are included in it. These responses will in turn help us form the strategy for a potential follow-on contract to acquire services similar to PACTS II. I do not believe it is necessary to remove this question from the RFI since the public is not under any obligation to provide a response to it if they so choose. If your company is not able to provide a response to that particular question then you are not mandated to by any means. However, I do invite you to respond to any other questions you feel comfortable with if you would like.
2		RFI			Is the Government considering allowing qualified set-asides other than SDVOSBs to respond to this upcoming RFI release to determine if another set aside, such as WOSB or even SB, may be considered for final use of another set aside at RFP release? Or has the acquisition strategy already been determined to be released only to SDVOSB qualified companies?	At this time, a SDVOSB vehicle is what is being contemplated, however there is nothing precluding other than SDVOSBs from responding to the public RFI.
3		RFI			I'm trying to find the RFI for PACTS III and was hoping you could help. I'm on the PACTS III page on Sam.gov but the Attachments/Links section is just giving me the spinning blue wheel. Are you able to either point me to another location or send me the RFI please?	I did just check the page on SAM.gov and the attachments are able to load, perhaps it is just your browser. Either way, attached is a copy of the documents for the RFI.
4		RFI			Our company has SDVOSB JV named Company "X" and our entity has Facility clearances but the JV doesn't have it. So our question is, does this require any Facility Clearance at the time of proposal submission or is there any limitation/restrictions for JV submission?	The document "70SBUR22I00000032" that is posted on sam.gov is a Request for Information (RFI); not a formal solicitation. The purpose of this RFI is to gather responses to the questions that are included in it. These responses will in turn help us form the strategy for a potential follow-on contract to acquire services similar to PACTS II. Since we have not formulated our strategy for this possibly follow-on contract, I am unable to answer your question since it has not yet been determined.
5		RFI		3(A)(6)	I have a quick question regarding the PACTS III Sources Sought that was released. Question 6 requests past performance "for the NAICS codes listed in question #1 above within the last three years." If the past performance was not under one of those NAICS, rather 611519, but elements of the contract clearly had program and site management requirements and including dozens of SCA employees, can we write our performance and cite the NAICS codes difference while drawing parallels to 541611?	If your company can provide services similar to what is currently being provided under PACTS II using a NAICS code that is not listed, then please state that NAICS code in question 1. For question 6, describe your past performance for the NAICS code you listed for question 1. If you are not familiar with PACTS II, it consist of two primary functional categories that include the services described below. Functional Category 1 (Primary NAICS: 541611) Program Management Services - Administrative management, general management consulting services, process, physical distribution, and logistics consulting services Technical Services - engineering services, environment, technical, and other scientific consulting services. Functional Category 2 (Primary NAICS: 561110) Administrative and operations services, financial planning, personnel, billing, and recordkeeping Court reporting and stenotype services
6		RFI			I am working on a response for the RFI 70SBUR22I00000032 (PACTS III) that is due on June 17, 2022. There isn't a draft PWS attached to the notice in SAM.gov and I am trying to answer all of your questions without understanding the scope of this effort. Would you please send me a copy of the draft PWS or post it in SAM.gov so I can access it there and complete your RFI?	We do not have a draft PWS. At this time, we anticipate the scope of PACTS III to be similar to PACTS II which includes the two functional categories described below. Functional Category 1 (Primary NAICS: 541611) Program Management Services - Administrative management, general management consulting services, process, physical distribution, and logistics consulting services Technical Services - engineering services, environment, technical, and other scientific consulting services. Functional Category 2 (Primary NAICS: 561110) Administrative and operations services, financial planning, personnel, billing, and recordkeeping Court reporting and stenotype services
7		RFI			After reviewing the RFI, I have a few questions that will likely be answered in an Industry Day. That would lead to the first basic question, is such an Industry Day for PACT 3 forthcoming before pre-solicitation. I see the agency is asking for our preference of a BOA, BPA, or IDIQ. However, without first knowing what the agency will require to procure - that question is a little tricky. Each acquisition strategy has its pro's and con's. Without knowing specifically the services DHS would like to place on this vehicle, I'm a little challenged to give a good response. Can you shed any light on the matter?	We do intend on having an Industry Day for this requirement in the future. The services we would like to procure for PACTS III may be similar to the ones that are currently on PACTS II. These include two functional categories as described below: Functional Category 1 (Primary NAICS: 541611) Program Management Services - Administrative management, general management consulting services, process, physical distribution, and logistics consulting services Technical Services - engineering services, environment, technical, and other scientific consulting services. Functional Category 2 (Primary NAICS: 561110) Administrative and operations services, financial planning, personnel, billing, and recordkeeping Court reporting and stenotype services
8		RFI			Since we have not responded to this opportunity in the past, we would like to request 45-minute MS Teams call to learn more about your timing and anticipated needs. In addition to confirming receipt of this response, could you please tell us the best person to coordinate this discussion with?	Thank you for providing your response to our RFI. We appreciate you taking the time to answer our questions. The timing and anticipated needs of our requirement are not firm; therefore, I would like to refrain from meeting at this time. If and when we firm that information up, I will reach out to my team with your request. Additionally, for your awareness we do intend on having an Industry Day. This forum will enable you to collect more information on our requirement as it takes shape.
9		RFI			Is this a new requirement or contract renewal? If re-compete, what is the current contract number and who is the incumbent?	This requirement is intended to be a follow-on to the existing PACTS II contract which expires on 2/28/25. The document found https://www.dhs.gov/sites/default/files/publications/PACTS-II_0.pdf includes all the vendors that are currently on PACTS II and their associated contract numbers. Note that the following vendors are no longer part of PACTS II: - Functional Category 1: R3 Government Solutions Inc. - Functional Category 2: Szanca Solutions
10		RFI			Will the Government be changing the Solicitation Number upon RFP release?	Yes
11		RFI			Will the Government consider a set-aside for (8a, HUBZone, EDWOSB, etc.)?	The government will take this into consideration, with decision provided in final RFP release.
12		RFI			When does the Government plan to release the RFP?	Undetermined at this time, but will be made publicly available at the time of APFS record release.
13		RFI			Will the Government be making the award for this requirement in FY22?	This is not a FY22 requirement. Details on award timeframe will be made publicly available at the time of APFS record release.
14		RFI			Would it be possible for the government to consider this for a non-competitive 8(a) procurement? Lastly, we are looking to support any other requirement that may fall under the Simplified Acquisition Threshold.	Anticipated set aside information for PACTS III will be published on the APFS. The size of this requirement is not intended to be under the simplified acquisition threshold.
15		RFI			Was there a J&A and contract extension issued to the current PACTS II contract? If so, until when?	Any PACTS II questions will need to be directed to the PACTS II team that conducted the acquisition. PACTSII_ADMIN@hq.dhs.gov is the email address.
16		RFI			Will the PACTS III solicitation be issued within the next 12 months?	Solicitation date for PACTS III has not been determined yet. However, once published, the APFS record will provide this information.
17		RFI			We have been contacted by several organizations regarding the upcoming DHS PACTS III contract. After further review, we are definitely interested in the requirements and developing our team to pursue, however, we did not respond to the RFI in order to meet the cutoff date. Do you anticipate this being limited to only the respondees or still open to all SDVOSB bidders?	We do not anticipate the final RFP being limited to only those who responded to the RFI.
18		RFI			Do you have a few minutes to answer some general questions?	Due to the number of contractors interested in PACTS III, we are unable to hold individual meetings at this time. However, we are still conducting market research and any information related to an industry day will be publicly provided.
19	7/19/2022	General			I am reaching out to see if there are any updates on the status of the PACTS III contract. Our company responded to the June RFI, and I have been asked to check on projected timelines moving forward. Any additional information would be truly appreciated.	We do not have publicly available projected timelines at this time. However, once the APFS record is published, updates to the timeline will be available to industry.
20	7/20/2022				In reviewing the PACTS II, I see that the ordering period has been extended into 2025, do you anticipate that a solicitation for PACTS III will be released around Q4 2023 or later?	Timelines have not been made publicly available as of yet, however they will be captured in the APFS record that will be published soon.
21	7/22/2022	General			Would it be possible for the PACTS III procurement to include a NAICS code with a higher revenue size standard than the currently listed NAICS code of 541611 at $21.5 million dollars in annual receipts?	We appreciate your recommendation and the response to our RFI and will take it into consideration.
22	7/22/2022	General			Is the timeline of this being released on or about December 2022 correct or do you anticipate it being pushed into the 1st or 2nd quarter(s) of calendar year 2023?	The solicitation date for PACTS III has not been determined yet. However, once published, the APFS record will provide this information.
23	7/22/2022	General			Do you see this as being a truly "best value" acquisition strategy or do you anticipate this being more oriented toward "Lowest Price/Technically Acceptable" type of procurement? We hope this will be a true Best Value effort.	We are not able to answer this question since we are still conducting and analyzing market research and this portion of the strategy has not yet been determined. We recommend that once published, you review the final solicitation which will detail this information for you.
24	7/29/2022	General			Contractor "X" remains interested in the upcoming PACTS III solicitation, to that end, we are curious as to whether PACTS III will be solicited this fiscal year or in fiscal year 2023? Any insights would be greatly appreciated.	The timeline for PACTS III has not been publicly announced at this time. However, updates on solicitation release will be provided once the Acquisition Planning Forecast System (APFS) number is released.
25	8/1/2022	General			Please provide us an update on subject acquisition	There is no publicly available update at this time. Updates will be available when APFS record has been publicized.
26	8/8/2022	RFI			Is the government engaging with industry on this opportunity, or are there upcoming industry days planned for this future vehicle?	We do intend on having an Industry Day for this requirement in the future. The date has not yet been determined but will be announced to the public once it is known.
27	8/8/2022	RFI			I just wanted to reach out regarding the PACTS III RFI from back in June. I understand that the current contracts were extended out to 2025 and I haven't seen anything posted recently on the re-compete on APFS. Based on this, I was just wondering if this is being looked at for FY23 or maybe even FY24? It seems like those contract extensions do provide a little time so I just wasn't sure if any kind of timeline had been established.	The APFS record has not been release yet. Once it is the details on the award timeframe will be made publicly available through the APFS record.
28	8/8/2022	General			Will draft documents be published, if so, when?	Yes, we do intend on releasing draft documents. Once it is the details on the award timeframe will be made publicly available through the APFS record.
29	8/8/2022	General			Will there be two functional categories for this procurement or will the configuration be different?	We are not able to answer this question since we are still conducting and analyzing market research and this portion of the strategy has not yet been determined. We recommend that once published, you review the final solicitation which will detail this information for you.
30	8/8/2022	General			What is the anticipated release date for the solicitation?	The APFS record has not been release yet. Once it is the details on the award timeframe will be made publicly available through the APFS record.
31	8/8/2022	General			What is the anticipated start date for PACTS III?	The APFS record has not been release yet. Once it is the details on the award timeframe will be made publicly available through the APFS record.
32	8/10/2022	General			Can you please clarify if the government intends to issue PACTS III in this or next Government Fiscal Year? Our research indicates that PACTS II was extended and PACTS III will not be recompeted until 2025. Is this accurate?	The timeline for PACTS III has not been publicly announced at this time. However, updates on the award timeline will be provided once the Acquisition Planning Forecast System (APFS) number is released.
33	8/11/2022	General			Will it be this fiscal year though?	The information you are requesting is provided in the APFS record, F2022059380. Please direct all future PACTS III related questions to PACTSIII@uscis.dhs.gov.
34	8/12/2022	General			We submitted a response to the PACTS III RFI and circling back to see if DHS has determined next steps and if there is a pending RFP?	The information you are requesting is provided in the APFS record, F2022059380. Please direct all future PACTS III related questions to PACTSIII@uscis.dhs.gov.
35	8/15/2022	General			I am emailing to ask if DHS's PACTS III will have any upcoming industry day(s) preceding its release.	You can find the answer to your question by referencing the Questions and Answers that were posted on SAM.gov on August 12, 2022.
36	8/18/2022	General			I've been doing research into recompete efforts for large-scale acquisition programs, and saw that PACTS II will be recompeted soon. The Q&A that I was able to find on SAM was very helpful, but I'm wondering if there is a timeline you're working with to have further information posted on APFS? Even a very rough estimate of that (next month vs next calendar year, for example) would be appreciated, so I know when to check back for further research.	This information will be provide once the APFS record is released to industry in the near future. Additionally, as noted in the intent to recompete letter posted on SAM.gov, please direct all future PACTS III related questions to PACTSIII@uscis.dhs.gov.
37	8/19/2022	General			Following up on the RFI submission in June (below) for the PACTS III requirement, it would be terrific if the anticipated final solicitation and contract award dates could be posted at https://sam.gov/opp/cc5e27b320344c6187bfbac759928bda/view or shared via response to this e-mail.	This information will be provide once the APFS record is released to industry in the near future. Additionally, as noted in the intent to recompete letter posted on SAM.gov, please direct all future PACTS III related questions to PACTSIII@uscis.dhs.gov.
38	8/19/2022	General			Good morning! In reference to the PACTS III Program, and for resource planning purposes, do you have a ballpark estimate of when (FY Otr.) you anticipate releasing the PACTS III RFP? We're just trying to do some resource planning.	This information will be provide once the APFS record is released to industry in the near future. Additionally, as noted in the intent to recompete letter posted on SAM.gov, please direct all future PACTS III related questions to PACTSIII@uscis.dhs.gov.
39	8/24/2022	General			Good Afternoon! We are interested in the subject opportunity. We are requesting a update on the status.	This information will be provide once the APFS record is released to industry in the near future. Additionally, as noted in the intent to recompete letter posted on SAM.gov, please direct all future PACTS III related questions to PACTSIII@uscis.dhs.gov.
40	8/25/2022	General			This email is regarding teaming arrangements for PACTS III. Noting that USCIS anticipates PACTS III to also be a total set-aside for SDVOSBs, will the government allow for large businesses to serve as subcontractors to qualified SDVOSBs?	We are not able to answer this question since we are still conducting and analyzing market research and this portion of the strategy has not yet been determined. We recommend that once published, you review the final solicitation which will detail this information for you.
41	10/17/2022	General			I am doing research into this upcoming opportunity and would like to know if this is an opportunity where SDVOSBs form teams to meet the submission requirements or is this an opportunity that only allows for the Prime so submit without any subcontractors?	We are not able to answer this question since we are still conducting and analyzing market research and this portion of the strategy has not yet been determined. We recommend that once published, you review the final solicitation which will detail this information for you.
42	10/13/2022	General			I was wondering if any additional market research will be conducted prior to the planned RFP release in Jun 23? I realize this is the third time this IDIQ has been entered into service and I am late to learn of the opportunity. Any information on upcoming events is very much appreciated.	The information you are requesting is provided in the APFS record, F2022059380.
43	9/8/2022	General			In reading the August 12, 2002 Prospective PACTS III Offerors letter we want to confirm the Final request for proposal has not been issued yet? Do you have a projected final proposal date?	The information you are requesting is provided in the APFS record, F2022059380.
44	9/9/2022	General			We have been tracking the DHS opportunity with an intent to bid. To successfully prepare and respond to this opportunity, we would appreciate if you provided us with the following information: • When will the opportunity be released? • What vehicle will it be released on? PACTS II • Will it be set aside for any socio-economic category?	The information you are requesting is provided in the APFS record, F2022059380.
45	10/19/2022	General			Is it still the government's intent to compete the PACTS III acquisition as a SDVOSB or will it be opened to other socioeconomic categories such as WOSB?	All of the information that we are able to share at the moment is available on APFS (F2022059380). Please be sure to check this record on a regular basis as we intend to make updates as soon as we have more information to share with industry.
46	11/4/2022	General			Please provide any DHS PACTS III solicitation updates that are available at this time.	All of the information that we are able to share at the moment is available on APFS (F2022059380). Please be sure to check this record on a regular basis as we intend to make updates as soon as we have more information to share with industry.

47	11/28/2022	General			Any update on PACTS III timeline? The briefed timeline was a Draft RFP out this month. Any update on timeline would be super helpful, as you can imagine the crunch around the New Year tight and we want to ensure we have the resources in place to adequately respond to the PACTS III requirements.	All of the information that we are able to share at the moment is available on APFS (F2022059380) or SAM.gov (PACTS III Special Notice). Please be sure to check these records on a regular basis as we intend to make updates as soon as we have more information to share with industry. Additionally, please direct all future PACTS III related questions to PACTSIII@uscis.dhs.gov to ensure a timely response.
48	12/21/2022	General			I was wondering if there are any plans for an industry day for PACTS III or any more information that will be put out for PACTS III?	All of the information that we are able to share at the moment is available on APFS (F2022059380) or SAM.gov (PACTS III Special Notice). Please be sure to check these records on a regular basis as we intend to make updates as soon as we have more information to share with industry.
49	1/6/2023	General			Request any available information on the Virtual Industry Day anticipated for 01 March 2023. Thank you!	All of the information that we are able to share at the moment is available on APFS (F2022059380) or SAM.gov (PACTS III Special Notice). Please be sure to check these records on a regular basis as we intend to make updates as soon as we have more information to share with industry.
50	1/3/2023	General			I hope this email finds everyone well after the holiday season! Happy New Year! We responded to the RFI released on 12/19. We are very interested in performing this work. I'm hoping to learn more about this opportunity and how wecan support this mission. Is there a time where we can speak further?	Due to the number of contractors interested in PACTS III, we are unable to hold individual meetings at this time. All of the information that we are able to share at the moment is available on APFS (F2022059380) or SAM.gov (PACTS III Special Notice). Please be sure to check these records on a regular basis as we intend to make updates as soon as we have more information to share with industry.
51	1/13/2023	General			Hope this finds you well. When is PACTS III being released or the tentative date of release? Also, is "on-ramping" available for PACTS II? Any clarification you can provide at your convenience will be greatly appreciated. Thank you in advance, looking forward to it.	All of the information that we are able to share at the moment is available on APFS (F2022059380) or SAM.gov (PACTS III Special Notice). Please be sure to check these records on a regular basis as we intend to make updates as soon as we have more information to share with industry.
52	1/19/2023	General			If possible, may I get an update as to the status of the potentially forthcoming RFP for PACTS III?	All of the information that we are able to share at the moment is available on APFS (F2022059380) or SAM.gov (PACTS III Special Notice). Please be sure to check these records on a regular basis as we intend to make updates as soon as we have more information to share with industry. Additionally, please direct all future PACTS III related questions to PACTSIII@uscis.dhs.gov to ensure a timely response.
53	1/10/2023	General			After reviewing the above forecast, I am unable to pull this RFP from SAMs, in which I would be able to review prior Primes and request partnership opportunities if possible. Are there any other avenues where I can locate these RFPs?? Thank you for your time in this matter.	The RFP for PACTS III has not been released yet. All of the information that we are able to share at the moment is available on APFS (F2022059380) or SAM.gov (PACTS III Special Notice). Please be sure to check these records on a regular basis as we intend to make updates as soon as we have more information to share with industry. Also, please refer to the Government's response to question #9 on SAM.gov for a list of vendors that are currently on PACTS II and their associated contract numbers. Thank you!
54	1/23/2023	General			Can you please provide the registration for the DHS PACTS virtual Industry Day? I am definitely interested in attending. Thank you in advance.	All of the information that we are able to share at the moment is available on APFS (F2022059380) or SAM.gov (PACTS III Special Notice). Please be sure to check these records on a regular basis as we intend to make updates as soon as we have more information to share with industry. Thank you!
55	1/23/2023	General			I am looking into the PACTS III effort in an attempt to identify if you still anticipate utilizing a SDVOSB set-aside for this effort, as well as if an estimated value of $1.5B is correct for this effort?	All of the information that we are able to share at the moment is available on APFS (F2022059380) or SAM.gov (PACTS III Special Notice). Please be sure to check these records on a regular basis as we intend to make updates as soon as we have more information to share with industry. Thank you!
56	1/20/2023	General			Can you please let me know when does the Govt plan to release RFP on this opp.?	All of the information that we are able to share at the moment is available on APFS (F2022059380) or SAM.gov (PACTS III Special Notice). Please be sure to check these records on a regular basis as we intend to make updates as soon as we have more information to share with industry. Additionally, please direct all future PACTS III related questions to PACTSIII@uscis.dhs.gov to ensure a timely response.
57	1/24/2023	General			I am following up about the PACTS III effort in an attempt to identify if an RFP release date in June 2023 is still anticipated. I am also looking to identify which procurement vehicle to monitor, as well as if you anticipate utilizing any set-asides for this effort.	All of the information that we are able to share at the moment is available on APFS (F2022059380) or SAM.gov (PACTS III Special Notice). Please be sure to check these records on a regular basis as we intend to make updates as soon as we have more information to share with industry. Additionally, please direct all future PACTS III related questions to PACTSIII@uscis.dhs.gov to ensure a timely response.
58	1/26/2023	General			Do you have 15-30 minutes of availability to meet virtually sometime next week? It would be great to hear from you/your team on some of the lessons learned from earlier iterations of PACTS and what you're looking for from bidders on PACTS III. It would be a great learning experience for us.	Due to the number of contractors interested in PACTS III, we are unable to hold individual meetings at this time. All of the information that we are able to share at the moment is available on APFS (F2022059380) or SAM.gov (PACTS III Special Notice). Please be sure to check these records on a regular basis as we intend to make updates as soon as we have more information to share with industry. Thank you!
59	1/26/2023	General			There is a rumor floating around Industry that their will be a weighing criteria applied to Past Performance. A bulk of our services are rendered across the Defense Department with a single DHS contract awarded on the FSS. Can you confirm that there will be a weight critierion whereby Past Performance conducted with the Department or it's components will be more valuable than performance conducted external to DHS? If you're uncomfortable discussing this at this time, will the draft solicitation anticipated on 23 February include a draft Instructions to Offerors and Evaluation Criteria?	All of the information that we are able to share at the moment is available on APFS (F2022059380) or SAM.gov (PACTS III Special Notice). Please be sure to check these records on a regular basis as we intend to make updates as soon as we have more information to share with industry.
60	2/8/2023	General			I wanted to confirm that PROGRAMMATICS ADMINISTRATIVE CLERICAL AND TECHNICAL SERVICES III (PACTS III) is still set to come out in June 2023 as SDVOB and if there is a contract vehicle yet? I would also appreciate if you could send a PWS or contract for this opportunity. I'd also like to set up a time to meet and learn more about how we can support this contract. Thank you for your time, and I hope to speak with you soon,	Due to the number of contractors interested in PACTS III, we are unable to hold individual meetings at this time. All of the information that we are able to share at the moment is available on APFS (F2022059380) or SAM.gov (PACTS III Special Notice). Please be sure to check these records on a regular basis as we intend to make updates as soon as we have more information to share with industry. Thank you!
61	2/13/2023	General			Has the Government decided how Small Business status would be determined for this release? Alamo City is a SDVOSB but will likely be losing our SB status later this year. Would we be off-ramped or would we be able to continue to compete on individual task orders? Any help would be appreciated.	All of the information that we are able to share at the moment is available on APFS (F2022059380) or SAM.gov (PACTS III Special Notice). Please be sure to check these records on a regular basis as we intend to make updates as soon as we have more information to share with industry.
62	2/13/2023	General			Will the procurement strategy be LPTA?	All of the information that we are able to share at the moment is available on APFS (F2022059380) or SAM.gov (PACTS III Special Notice). Please be sure to check these records on a regular basis as we intend to make updates as soon as we have more information to share with industry.
63	2/13/2023	General			Will the government be providing instructions on how to register for the March 16, 2023 Virtual Industry Day?	All of the information that we are able to share at the moment is available on APFS (F2022059380) or SAM.gov (PACTS III Special Notice). Please be sure to check these records on a regular basis as we intend to make updates as soon as we have more information to share with industry.
64	2/14/2023	General			We are a Service Disabled Veteran Owned Small Business (SDVOSB) and is interested in attending the DHS PACTS III Industry Day. Are companies required to register to attend? If so, would you kindly provide the register information?	All of the information that we are able to share at the moment is available on APFS (F2022059380) or SAM.gov (PACTS III Special Notice). Please be sure to check these records on a regular basis as we intend to make updates as soon as we have more information to share with industry.
65	2/14/2023	General			How do I register?	All of the information that we are able to share at the moment is available on APFS (F2022059380) or SAM.gov (PACTS III Special Notice). Please be sure to check these records on a regular basis as we intend to make updates as soon as we have more information to share with industry.
66	2/15/2023	General			How do I register for the Industry day on 03/16/2023?	All of the information that we are able to share at the moment is available on APFS (F2022059380) or SAM.gov (PACTS III Special Notice). Please be sure to check these records on a regular basis as we intend to make updates as soon as we have more information to share with industry.
67	2/14/2023	General			Unsure if you are building a list of interested parties, but would like to be included should a list be created in the future. Thank you.	All of the information that we are able to share at the moment is available on APFS (F2022059380) or SAM.gov (PACTS III Special Notice). Please be sure to check these records on a regular basis as we intend to make updates as soon as we have more information to share with industry.
68	2/16/2023	General			We are interested in attending the PACT III Industry Day next month. Can you please direct us to the appropriate details. Also if there are any email list servs that DHS maintains for interested offerers, please add me to the list.	All of the information that we are able to share at the moment is available on APFS (F2022059380) or SAM.gov (PACTS III Special Notice). Please be sure to check these records on a regular basis as we intend to make updates as soon as we have more information to share with industry.
69	2/17/2023	General			We have been following PACTS III, we would like to know where we can register for the virtual industry day. We look forward to your response. Thank you.	All of the information that we are able to share at the moment is available on APFS (F2022059380) or SAM.gov (PACTS III Special Notice). Please be sure to check these records on a regular basis as we intend to make updates as soon as we have more information to share with industry.
70	2/17/2023	General			To help potential bidders evaluate the upcoming PACTS III solicitation, it would be helpful to understand some historical metrics related to PACTS II. For example: -Total number of task orders awarded on PACTS II, to-date (by FC1 and FC2) -Average number of bids per solicitation on PACTS II -Total value of task order awarded on PACTS II, to-date (by FC1 and FC2) -Average value of task orders awarded on PACTS II, to-date (by FC 1 and FC 2) Is this aggregate vehicle information publicly available? If so, where? If not, could you please share the information in response to this email and/or incorporate into the Industry Day presentation?	All of the information that we are able to share at the moment is available on APFS (F2022059380) or SAM.gov (PACTS III Special Notice). Please be sure to check these records on a regular basis as we intend to make updates as soon as we have more information to share with industry.
71	2/18/2023	General			I sent an email last week to inquire about how to register for industry day. Could you kindly provide the information?	All of the information that we are able to share at the moment is available on APFS (F2022059380) or SAM.gov (PACTS III Special Notice). Please be sure to check these records on a regular basis as we intend to make updates as soon as we have more information to share with industry.
72	2/20/2023	General			I am looking to register for the March 16th, 2023 PACTS III Industry Day. The link that I found is not working. Could someone please provide me information on how/ where to register?	All of the information that we are able to share at the moment is available on APFS (F2022059380) or SAM.gov (PACTS III Special Notice). Please be sure to check these records on a regular basis as we intend to make updates as soon as we have more information to share with industry.
73	2/21/2023	General			I have been doing some research on the third generation of the PACTS vehicle and would like to know if the registration link is out for the virtual industry day happening on March 16th.	All of the information that we are able to share at the moment is available on APFS (F2022059380) or SAM.gov (PACTS III Special Notice). Please be sure to check these records on a regular basis as we intend to make updates as soon as we have more information to share with industry.
74	2/22/2023	General			I am writing to inquire about the status of the anticipated PACTS III Virtual Industry Day tentatively scheduled for 16 March, 2023. I cannot locate instructions for registration. Has this event been scheduled and, if so, could you point me in the right direction for information on how to register. Thank you.	All of the information that we are able to share at the moment is available on APFS (F2022059380) or SAM.gov (PACTS III Special Notice). Please be sure to check these records on a regular basis as we intend to make updates as soon as we have more information to share with industry.
75	2/22/2023	General			Where might we find information on the upcoming PACTS III Industry Day so we can sign up to attend? Perhaps there is a link or a website you can provide?	All of the information that we are able to share at the moment is available on APFS (F2022059380) or SAM.gov (PACTS III Special Notice). Please be sure to check these records on a regular basis as we intend to make updates as soon as we have more information to share with industry.
76	2/22/2023	General			May we ask if we need to register for the Industry Day in March? We did not see any information on that but wanted to make sure we're not missing something.	All of the information that we are able to share at the moment is available on APFS (F2022059380) or SAM.gov (PACTS III Special Notice). Please be sure to check these records on a regular basis as we intend to make updates as soon as we have more information to share with industry.
77	2/22/2023	General			I would like to request an in-person meetin or an MS Teams meeting with you at your earliest convenience. Purpose of the meeting is to introduce our company to you and to discuss what capabilities we can bring to the new PACTS III project. Please let me know what date/time would be convenient for you.	Due to the number of contractors interested in PACTS III, we are unable to hold individual meetings at this time. All of the information that we are able to share at the moment is available on APFS (F2022059380) or SAM.gov (PACTS III Special Notice). Please be sure to check these records on a regular basis as we intend to make updates as soon as we have more information to share with industry. Additionally, please direct all future PACTS III related questions to PACTSIII@uscis.dhs.gov to ensure a timely response. Thank you!
78	2/23/2023	General			When is the Industry Day for PACT III and can you please provide the registration site.	All of the information that we are able to share at the moment is available on APFS (F2022059380) or SAM.gov (PACTS III Special Notice). Please be sure to check these records on a regular basis as we intend to make updates as soon as we have more information to share with industry.
79	2/23/2023	General			Where can I find a link to attend the industry day occurring on 03/16/2023?	All of the information that we are able to share at the moment is available on APFS (F2022059380) or SAM.gov (PACTS III Special Notice). Please be sure to check these records on a regular basis as we intend to make updates as soon as we have more information to share with industry.
80	2/23/2023	General			When is the Industry day for PACTS 3 and will it be virtual or in-person?	All of the information that we are able to share at the moment is available on APFS (F2022059380) or SAM.gov (PACTS III Special Notice). Please be sure to check these records on a regular basis as we intend to make updates as soon as we have more information to share with industry.
81	2/24/2023	General			Interested in finding out when is the Industry Day in March is for this Vehicle? Also wondering if it is In-Person or Virtual?	All of the information that we are able to share at the moment is available on APFS (F2022059380) or SAM.gov (PACTS III Special Notice). Please be sure to check these records on a regular basis as we intend to make updates as soon as we have more information to share with industry.
82	2/28/2023	General			Our company is interested in bidding on PACTS III. We have a couple of quick questions. 1.Has the draft RFP been released? If so, how may we obtain a copy? 2.How can we register for the PACTS III Virtual Industry Day scheduled in March of this year?	All of the information that we are able to share at the moment is available on APFS (F2022059380) or SAM.gov (PACTS III Special Notice). Please be sure to check these records on a regular basis as we intend to make updates as soon as we have more information to share with industry. Thank you! Additionally, please direct all future PACTS III related questions to PACTSIII@uscis.dhs.gov to ensure a timely response. Thank you!
83	2/27/2023	General			Has there been any new info on the details of this Industry Day? Any insight you have would be greatly appreciated. Thank you for your time and consideration.	All of the information that we are able to share at the moment is available on APFS (F2022059380) or SAM.gov (PACTS III Special Notice). Please be sure to check these records on a regular basis as we intend to make updates as soon as we have more information to share with industry.
84	2/27/2023	General			According to the most recent Notice to Industry, the Virtual Industry Day for PACTSIII is scheduled for March 16, 2023. Please confirm that this is still the date announced in the January 25, 2023 Notice to Industry. If not, what is the new date for the Industry Day?	All of the information that we are able to share at the moment is available on APFS (F2022059380) or SAM.gov (PACTS III Special Notice). Please be sure to check these records on a regular basis as we intend to make updates as soon as we have more information to share with industry.

85	2/28/2023	General			We have attached our Capability Statement which highlights our core capabilities. Would it be possible to get 15 minutes on your calendar in the next couple of weeks?	Due to the number of contractors interested in PACTS III, we are unable to hold individual meetings at this time. All of the information that we are able to share at the moment is available on APFS (F2022059380) or SAM.gov (PACTS III Special Notice). Please be sure to check these records on a regular basis as we intend to make updates as soon as we have more information to share with industry. Thank you!
86	3/1/2023	General			Our organization has been tracking the release of the draft RFP for PACTS III. There was an estimated timeline given for February 23, 2023. Is there an update on this? Also, has the date for Industry Day been confirmed yet? Event Estimated Date Draft Request for Proposal posted to SAM.gov - February 23, 2023 Virtual Industry Day* March 16, 2023 *Information regarding registration for the virtual industry day has not been posted as Of the date of this notice and will be made available on SAM.gov. I look forward to your response and thank you in advance.	All of the information that we are able to share at the moment is available on APFS (F2022059380) or SAM.gov (PACTS III Special Notice). Please be sure to check these records on a regular basis as we intend to make updates as soon as we have more information to share with industry.
87	3/2/2023	General			I see that the industry day was 03/01. I did not receive a link to participate. Pls kindly advise.	All of the information that we are able to share at the moment is available on APFS (F2022059380) or SAM.gov (PACTS III Special Notice). Please be sure to check these records on a regular basis as we intend to make updates as soon as we have more information to share with industry.
88	3/3/2023	General			I would like to attend the planned PACTS III Industry Day March 16. Please let me know what I need to do to register. Thank you!	All of the information that we are able to share at the moment is available on APFS (F2022059380) or SAM.gov (PACTS III Special Notice). Please be sure to check these records on a regular basis as we intend to make updates as soon as we have more information to share with industry.
89	3/9/2023	General			Regarding the Industry Day, has the government confirmed the date of the meeting?	All of the information that we are able to share at the moment is available on APFS (F2022059380) or SAM.gov (PACTS III Special Notice). Please be sure to check these records on a regular basis as we intend to make updates as soon as we have more information to share with industry.
90	3/6/2023	General			I see that industry day is planned for 3/16/2023. I am unable to find the link or information on how you sign up to participate. Can you please point me in the right direction.	Per the notice posted on sam.gov on 3/3/23, "The PACTS III Industry Day is anticipated to be towards the end of March 2023. Once the DHS has a firm date, industry will be notified with details (including registration information), by posting on this thread and APFS". Here is the link for your reference: https://sam.gov/opp/1750008c4f3b49b3aeff013316870fbe/view
91	3/6/2023	General			Quick question – is there a due date associated with the surveymonkey survey?	Great question! All responses to the surveymonkey survey are due no later than 5:00 pm Eastern Time on March 21, 2023.
92	3/7/2023	General			Is there a mailing/email list one can subscribe to insure notice(s) (e.g. Industry Day) are noted?	We suggest you sign up for notifications on Acquisition Planning Forecast System (APFS) and sam.gov to ensure you receive updates on the PACTS III procurement.
93	3/7/2023	General			Will the industry day be held virtually?	Yes, the industry day will be held virtually. More information is forthcoming.
94	3/8/2023	General			Has the PACTS 3 Draft RFP been released? I don't see that it has on SAM.GOV and the release has not been indicated in APFS.	Yes, the PACTS III draft RFP has been posted. It can be accessed here: https://sam.gov/opp/1750008c4f3b49b3aeff013316870fbe/view
95	3/8/2023	General			I am writing to recommend that the Government consider limiting the scoring criteria on the number of project submissions. The current criteria listed may create unnecessary work for the evaluation team. Therefore, we suggest that the Government should consider looking at the CBP ESB scoring criteria and matching the same. We believe that this approach will not only reduce the workload of the evaluation team but also ensure that the scoring criteria are fair and consistent. Thank you for your attention to this matter, and we look forward to hearing from you soon.	Thank you for sharing your suggestion with us.
96	3/9/2023	General			I will assume that since nothing has been posted, the Industry Day will not occur on March 16 as originally posted.	Yes, that is correct. The Industry day will not be occurring on March 16, 2023. Per the notice posted on sam.gov on 3/3/23, "The PACTS III Industry Day is anticipated to be towards the end of March 2023. Once the DHS has a firm date, industry will be notified with details (including registration information), by posting on this thread and APFS". Here is the link for your reference: https://sam.gov/opp/1750008c4f3b49b3aeff013316870fbe/view
97	3/10/2023				Please provide the link for the Industry Quarterly Conference Calls and the link to register for the upcoming Virtual Industry Day scheduled for 30 Mar 23.	We recommend you perform a search on sam.gov to locate the link for the next Industry Quarterly Conference Call. Please see the description in our posting located at SAM.gov and our response to question number 96 on the Questions and Answers attachment dated 3/10/23 for more information pertaining to the PACTS III Industry Day.
98	3/10/2023				If a Joint Venture comprised of SDVOSB, 8a, and Woman-owned members, submits a proposal as an SDVOSB for Functional Category (FC) 1, may the JV submit the same proposal under FC 1 under their 8a member, and also under their WO member? To confirm, would the JV have to submit three separate proposals?	Based on the draft RFP, 52.212-1 Addendum, paragraph 1.1, the JV will only submit one proposal for each Functional Category it would like to be considered for. Additionally, "If the Offeror elects to be considered for more than one of the four (4) socioeconomic tracks, the same one (1) proposal will be used and evaluated only amongst the other Offerors within the respective socioeconomic tracks". Per 52.212-1 Addendum, paragraph 3.1(e), the offeror shall "identify which small business socioeconomic track(s) the offeror's proposal is being submitted for within the aforementioned functional category". Please note this is the draft RFP language and may be subject to change pending the release of the final RFP.
99	3/10/2023				Will the government please post a pdf of all of the survey questions? This will allow respondents to review all questions prior to starting the survey and have all required documentation in hand.	Thank you for your suggestion. We will engage with our SurveyMonkey team to see if this is an option.
100	3/12/2023				The link for the survey on is not working.	Try to copy the link and paste it in a different browser. It did not work for us when we tried it in Microsoft Edge but it worked using Google Chrome.
101	3/14/2023				We are interested in attending the PACTS III Industry Day briefing scheduled for March 16th. What time will it start? How do we log-in?	Please see the description in our posting located at SAM.gov and our response to question number 96 on the Questions and Answers attachment dated 3/10/23 for the answer to your question.
102	3/14/2023	General			Please let me know how to register for the upcoming Industry day.	Please the description of our posting located at SAM.gov and our response to question number 96 on the Questions and Answers attachment dated 3/10/23.
103	3/15/2023				Please advise how to sign up for the PACTS III Industry Day.	Please see the description in our posting located at SAM.gov and our response to question number 96 on the Questions and Answers attachment dated 3/10/23 for the answer to your question.
104	3/15/2023				The referenced Att. 11 excludes PSC R423 SUPPORT- PROFESSIONAL: INTELLIGENCE as a qualifying code. Given the DHS mission charter has substantial requirements for the type of services that are frequently generically coded under this series and typically sourced as an engineering/technical service, we ask the government to consider including R423 as a qualifying code.	Thank you for your suggestion.
105	3/16/2023				Please let me know when would be good day and time to call for an Introductory call and capability briefing.	Due to the number of contractors interested in PACTS III, we are unable to hold individual meetings at this time. All of the information that we are able to share at the moment is available on APFS (F2022059380) or SAM.gov (PACTS III Special Notice). Please be sure to check these records on a regular basis as we intend to make updates as soon as we have more information to share with industry.
106	3/16/2023				As we approaching the end of March, has a date for the industry day been confirmed? Will it be virtual or in person?	Please see the description in our posting located at SAM.gov and our responses to questions 93 and 96 on the Questions and Answers attachment dated 3/10/23 for the answers to your questions.
107	3/20/2023	Attachment 11			References a list of all relevant NAICS and PSCs can be found within Attachment 11. Attachment 11 was not included with the solicitation package. Please provide Attachment 11.	I was not able to provide the hyperlink in the attached excel document so I am responding here. Attachment 11 is the 10th attachment from the top located in the posting here. I have also attached it to this email for your convenience.
108	3/20/2023	Survey			I was able to download the survey but as I was attempting the process of completing the survey I ran into a problem. I completed all sections leading to section 7 when it would not advance to complete FCs 2 and 3. What should I do?	We checked the survey and it is working correctly. Please note that all the questions for the first FC you choose must be answered in order to move onto the set of questions for the next FC. If you only need to submit answers for FC2 and FC3, then you should select FC2 for question 4. If you are using a touchscreen device, you may not be hitting the dropdown button completely for question 5, which would also prevent you from advancing. We would recommend trying again from a different device. Please let us know if you have completed the survey so we can delete your responses to the original one. Please complete the survey using the attached pdf and return to this email.
109		General			Can subcontractors provide past performance?	We are not accepting any past performance information in the proposal submission at this time. Please note this is the draft RFP language and may be subject to change pending the release of the final RFP.
110		General			For a functional category, can a company submit a proposal as a prime and joint venture?	Yes. Please note 52.212-1 Addendum para. 4.3.1.1(e) which states, for experience to be relevant is cannot be claimed more than once for each Functional Category.
111		Project Verification Form			In Project Verification Form, if a NAICS code doesn't match the NAICS code FC, but the scope of work matches FC1, FC2, or FC3, what is the option to still use that project?	Follow the guidance provided in 52.212-1 Addendum 4.3.2.1 (c). This information will be evaluated based on 52.212-2, para. 3.2.2.1.1(c)(i)&(iii).
112		Project Verification Form			In Project Verification Form, if a PSC code doesn't match a PSC code listed in Attachment 11, but the scope of work matches FC1, FC2, or FC3, what is the option to still use that project?	Follow the guidance provided in 52.212-1 Addendum 4.3.2.1 (c). This information will be evaluated based on 52.212-2, para. 3.2.2.1.1(c)(ii)&(iii).
113		General			Can an offeror submit bids for multiple set-asides within an FC?	Based on the draft RFP, 52.212-1 Addendum, paragraph 1.1, an offeror can only submit one proposal for each Functional Category it would like to be considered for. Additionally, "If the Offeror elects to be considered for more than one of the four (4) socioeconomic tracks, the same one (1) proposal will be used and evaluated only amongst the other Offerors within the respective socioeconomic tracks". Per 52.212-1 Addendum, paragraph 3.1(e), the offeror shall "identify which small business socioeconomic track(s) the offeror's proposal is being submitted for within the aforementioned functional category". Please note this is the draft RFP language and may be subject to change pending the release of the final RFP.
114		General			Can the government consider increasing the period of performance (recency) to five years instead of 2 years?	Thank you for your suggestion.
115	3/15/2023	Draft RFP	64	Part V - Solicitation Provisions, Instructions & Evaluation 1.1 Structure and Objectives	The draft RFP indicates "One proposal constitutes, one or a set of self-scoring sheets including claims from one of the following: an individual business, a Joint Venture, a Teaming Arrangement or Mentor Protégé." Can a Joint Venture have teaming arrangements with other small businesses and submit their qualifying experience information as part of the Joint Venture's bid?	A Joint Venture is recognized by the SBA as a stand-alone entity. Per the statement in the draft RFP mentioned in your question, one proposal can only come from **one** of the following: an individual business, a Joint Venture, a Teaming Arrangement or Mentor Protégé. A Joint Venture (JV) is recognized by the SBA as a stand-alone entity. Therefore, if a JV includes members that are not part of the JV, then it would violate the one proposal rule since the proposal would be submitted from more than one of the types listed above.
116	3/15/2023	Draft RFP	64	Part V - Solicitation Provisions, Instructions & Evaluation 1.1 Structure and Objectives	The draft RFP indicates "One proposal constitutes, one or a set of self-scoring sheets including claims from one of the following: an individual business, a Joint Venture, a Teaming Arrangement or Mentor Protégé." Will the government limit the number of teaming partners to ensure proposals primarily reflect the prime's ability to perform and reduce the risk associated with prime management of large teams?	The DHS has no intention of limiting the number of teaming partners. Contract awardees will be required to comply with FAR 52.219-14.
117	3/15/2023	Draft RFP	64 72	Part V - Solicitation Provisions, Instructions & Evaluation 1.1 Structure and Objectives 3.0 Volume I - Executive Summary	The draft RFP indicates "One proposal constitutes, one or a set of self-scoring sheets including claims from one of the following: an individual business, a Joint Venture, a Teaming Arrangement or Mentor Protégé" on page 64. The draft also indicates "FAR 52.207-6 is applicable to this solicitation; therefore, small business teaming arrangements are the only types acceptable" on page 72. Will the government level the small-business competitive landscape by precluding protégé companies in a mentor-protégé relationship from using large-business mentor company qualifications?	Mentor-Protégé is an agreement with the SBA between a mentor and a protégé. This relationship is governed through the SBA regulations; therefore, we cannot preclude protégé companies in a mentor-protégé relationship from using large-business mentor companies.
118	3/15/2023	Attachment 13: Self-Scoring Sheet Instructions	N/A	N/A	Limiting first-tier subcontractor bids to the value of their subcontract inordinately favors current BIC primes and is counterproductive to the government's goal of promoting small business community growth. In determining the appropriate contract value strata and providing column E's "Total Obligated Value" in the self-scoring sheet as a first-tier subcontractor, should bidders use the value of the prime contract or the value of their subcontract?	Offerors must use the value of its subcontract as that is the best representation of what the offeror was paid to complete the work it is claiming.
119	3/15/2023	Attachment 13: Self-Scoring Sheet Instructions	N/A	N/A	Are the point strata to be used for each project based upon total contract value, assuming all option periods will be exercised, or only the total obligated value of each contract at the time of proposal submission?	All points are based on total obligated value of each project at the time of proposal submission (Draft RFP 52.212-1 Addendum para 4.3.1.1 (b))
120	3/16/2023	Draft RFP	75	52.212-1, Addendum, Para. 4.3.1.1 (d)	If the offer has provided services for a contract that is complete, but the period of performance was less than 6 months, will it count as a relevant experience (assuming it meets all other required criteria)?	No, it would not count since the performance was not at least six (6) consecutive months (Ref. draft RFP 52.212-1 Addendum, para. 4.3.1.1 (d))
121	3/16/2023	Draft RFP	75	52.212-1, Addendum, Para. 4.3.1.1 (f)	If the offeror elects to team with a Large business for the applicable NAICS, can it use the Large business' past experience? We understand that in the case of an SBA Mentor-Protégé Arrangement this is acceptable, but want to confirm in the case of a standard Teaming Arrangement.	All members of teaming arrangements must be small under the NAICS code associated with each Functional Category it is proposing (Ref. FAR 7.107-6 and FAR provision 52.207-6)
122	3/16/2023	Draft RFP	75	52.212-1, Addendum, Para. 4.3.1.1 (f)	If the offeror elects to team with multiple business (may include a mix of large and small), can it use all of their collective past experience?	Projects from all members of a team may submit their past experience as long as it meets the requirements outlined in the solicitation. (Ref. draft RFP 52.212-1 para. 4.3.1.1(f)).
123	3/15/2023	Draft RFP	73	4.2 Self-Scoring Sheet, paragraph 3	This section states "For the Facility Clearance, the offeror shall only receive the set of points that correspond to having a "Secret" or "Top Secret" facility clearance." Would the government please change the points associated with possessing a Top Secret Facility Clearance from 20 points to 40 points, as DHS should award more points to offerors that possess a Top Secret Facility Clearance so they have more companies with a Top Secret Clearance. If more points are not added, DHS runs the risk of not having any prime offerors that possess a Top Secret FCL, thus, not being able to solicit Top Secret requirements under this contract.	Thank you for your suggestion.
124	3/15/2023	Draft RFP	73	4.2 Self-Scoring Sheet, paragraph 3	Please confirm that EVERY member of a Joint Venture must possess a Facility Clearance to be awarded points for a Secret or Top Secret Facility Clearance.	Every member of the JV must have a Facility Clearance. This is consistent with the statute behind the regulation.
125	3/15/2023	Draft RFP	75	4.3.1.1 Project Relevancey, item (e)	Please confirm that points will only be granted from the prime offeror, not a subcontractor of the prime offeror, for Relevant Projects.	Per draft RFP 52.212-1 Addendum para.4.3, "All projects must qualify and be verifiable based on the following information for the offeror to receive credit". For a project to qualify as Experience it must meet the definitions of relevant and recent (para. 4.3.1). Per para. 4.3.1.1 (e), a project qualifies as relevant if, "it is from the offeror providing the service as a **Prime or First-Tier Subcontractor** to a public and/or private customer".

126	3/15/2023	Draft RFP	75	4.3.1.1 Project Relevancey, item (f)	As this is a small business set-aside, the government has to confirm that the small business prime has the past experience performing the solicited work. Additionally, the solicitation states that "There is no limitation to the number of qualifying projects an offeror can claim under the Experience subfactor." Thus, the solicitation, as written, encourages the use of a Joint Venture with a SBA Mentor-Protege Arrangement to utilize the near unlimited number of relevant projects of the large business mentor to win a seat on the contract. **This is unfair to small businesses that are not in a SBA mentor-protege relationship and does not reassure the government that the prime offeror has the past experience to be successful on this contract.** As written, this contract will just be a pass through for large busiensses in a Mentor-Protege arrangement. Thus, please restrict the relevant projects from only the small business primes, not the mentor in a mentor-protégé relationship.	SBA established their **Joint Venture and** Mentor-Protégé program through their regulations. Recent technical changes to the SBA's statute state that the qualifications of all of the members of a Joint Venture **and Mentor-Protégé** must be considered.
127	3/15/2023	Draft RFP	76	4.3.2.1 Verification of Project Experience Submission, item (ii)	Do both the NAICS and PSC codes need to be one of those associated with the applicable Functional Category as defined in Attachment 11 - Functional Categories Corresponding NAICS and PSC or can it be either the NAICS or the PSC code?	Yes, both the NAICS and PSC codes need to be one of those associated with the applicable Functional Category. Please reference draft RFP 52.212-2, para. 3.2.2.1.1 "Element 4: Within Scope of PACTS III" para. (b) and (c).
128	3/15/2023	Draft RFP	75	4.3.1.2 Project Recency	This section states that projects are considered recent if within two years of issuance of the solicitation. In order for all contractors to start preparing for proposal responses, would the government specify that the release of this draft solicitation (3/8/2023) is the start date of the two year lookback (e.g., projects can be used that ended or are on going as of 3/8/2021)?	Thank you for your suggestion. At this time, we intend on using the date the final RFP is issued.
129	3/15/2023	Draft RFP	73	4.3.1.1 Project Relevancey, item (f)	The solicitation states that "There is no limitation to the number of qualifying projects an offeror can claim under the Experience subfactor." This encourages member-protégé and super JVs to provide the most projects as possible. The government could make this solicitation more fair to all small businesses if it limited the number of relevent projects to 10 per each of the six project size categories (e.g., project value).	Thank you for your recommendation.
130	3/11/2023	Draft RFP		N/A	Are Task Ordes issued under individual functional areas?	Yes. See Draft RFP, Part III Terms and Conditions, para. 18.1
131	3/11/2023	Draft RFP	64	1. 0 PACTS III Structure and Objectives	Do we submit a proposal for each Functional Area and Socio-Economic tracks?	Based on the draft RFP, 52.212-1 Addendum, paragraph 1.1, the offeror will only submit one proposal for each Functional Category it would like to be considered for. Additionally, "If the Offeror elects to be considered for more than one of the four (4) socioeconomic tracks, the same one (1) proposal will be used and evaluated only amongst the other Offerors within the respective socioeconomic tracks". Per 52.212-1 Addendum, paragraph 3.1(e), the offeror shall "identify which small business socioeconomic track(s) the offeror's proposal is being submitted for within the aforementioned functional category". Please note this is the draft RFP language and may be subject to change pending the release of the final RFP.
132	3/11/2023	Draft RFP	64	1. 0 PACTS III Structure and Objectives	Do you have to qualify in each functional area to submit a response to a Task Order issued under the track.	Yes, See Draft RFP, Part III Terms and Conditions, para. 18.3
133	3/11/2023	Draft RFP	69	1. 0 PACTS III Structure and Objectives	Are TO issued separtely for each FA?	Yes. See Draft RFP, Part III Terms and Conditions, para. 18.1
134	3/11/2023	Draft RFP	69	2.5.7 Proposal Submission	Can you submit the same proposal for all three FCs?	No. Proposals will include projects and "for a project to qualify as Experience it must meet the definitions of relevant and recent" (Ref. draft RFP 52.212-1 Addendum, paras. 4.3 and 4.3.1.1(a)).
135	3/11/2023	Draft RFP	74	4.3.1.1 Project Relevancy	Can you claim a project for multiple Functional categories?	Per 52.212-2 Addendum, para. 3.2.2.1.1 and 3.2.2.1.2, a project must be in-scope of the Functional Category/NAICS in order for the offeror to receive points. Due to the large difference between each Functional Category it would be difficult to state that one project meets the scope of more than one Functional Category. The intent is that once one project is used, it cannot be used again, in any capacity.
136	3/11/2023	Draft RFP	75	4.3.2.1 Project Verification Experience	If the past performance was issued under Company X, whose NAICS code is 541330, will the TO that is 100% Administrtive Support qualify for FC1 or FC2	Projects must be similar to the services outlined in the SOW pertaining to the Functional Category the offeror is submitting its offer for (Ref. 52.212-1 Addendum 4.3.1.1.1(a)). If the Offeror believes the NAICS/PSC code assigned to the contract was not correct then it shall follow the instructions provided in FAR 52-212-1 Addendum, para 4.3.2.1 (a)(2) and 4.3.2.1 (c)(i-iii).
137	3/11/2023	Draft RFP	75	4.3.2.1 Project Verification Experience	Can you claim the TO NAICS as that is what the actual work order is applied to. For eg. The TO work is Administrtive Support using SCA workers, the NAICS code is 541330 and the PSC code is R699	The DHS does not understand this question. Please rephrase and submit.
138	3/11/2023	Draft RFP	75	4.3.2.1 Project Verification Experience	How do you provide relevancy of Projects completetd as a First Tier Subcontractor, since these projects do not appear in FPDS.	Follow the guidance provided in draft RFP 52.212-1 Addendum, para. 4.3.2.2. This documentation will be evaluated in accordance with draft RFP 52.212-2 Addendum, para. 3.2.2.1.2
139	3/11/2023	Draft RFP	75	4.3.2.1 Project Verification Experience	Assuming the proposal submission date of 10.1.2023, would a relevant project won on March 1, 2023 meet the relevancy criteria?	Per draft RFP 52.212-1 Addendum, para. 4.3.1, for a project to qualify as Experience it must meet the definitions of relevant and recent. Of which, para. 4.3.1.1 (d) states, the project is relevant if "The offeror has provided at least six (6) consecutive months of performance by **the date proposals are due**". Additionally, para. 4.3.1.2 states, the project is recent if, "The performance has started within two years (730 calendar days) since **issuance of this solicitation**". Using your example, if the project met all the criteria for relevant as defined under para. 4.3.1.1, the project would be considered relevant since the time period from when the project was won (March 1, 2023) to when proposal are due (October 1, 2023) is at least six months. However, the DHS would need to verify that there was break in this timeframe to ensure it met the requirement of being "consecutive". Furthermore, just as long as we issue the final RFP by February 28, 2025, the project would be considered recent since the performance started (March 1, 2023) within two years of February 28, 2025.
140	3/15/2023				In a teaming arrangement - can we be part of a team if we do not have NAICS 561110 - but our Prime contractor does have the specified NAICS 561110	FAR Provision 52.207 is included in the draft RFP. Therefore, IAW 52.207 (a)(1)(ii), if the offeror is a teaming arrangement and not a JV, all members of the teaming arrangement must be small based on the NAICS code size standard that is assigned to the functional category the teaming arrangement is proposing to.
141	3/17/2023	Attachment+4_Contractor+Labor+Category+Pricing		Draft RFP section 5.1 Labor Category Price Proposal	Please verify that "best price" applies to both the prime and subcontractor pricing. That is, subcontractor rates with the prime's added fee must also be at or below the "best price" level.	The offeror's best price shall be fully burdened ceiling rates for the base and option periods. The fully burdened ceiling rates shall include all direct labor and indirect costs applicable to that labor category (such as fringe benefits, overhead, and G&A), and profit. Reference Section 5.1, Labor Category Price Proposal for more information.
142	3/17/2023			Draft RFP section 4.2. Self-Scoring Sheet	The 4th paragraph in this section states: "There is no limitation to the number of qualifying projects an offeror can claim under the Experience subfactor for each Functional Category". This seems to allow an offeror to form a huge team on the order of 25 - 50 teammates each with a qualifying project, so as to raise their self-scoring sheet score to the maximum extent possible for award, but then not involve them in future task order bidding. Does DHS really want to permit this type of gamesmanship or perhaps there should be limitations on the number of qualifying projects allowed?	Thank you for your recommendation.
143	3/17/2023			Draft RFP section 4.3.1.2 Project Recency	This section requires project performance to have occurred within the past two years to be considered recent. This is quite limiting for the trypcal SDVOSB. Is it possible please to make the term 5 years which is normal for most other RFPs?	Thank you for your suggestion.
144	3/17/2023			Draft RFP section 1.1 Source Selection Methodology	Since the current PACTS II contract has 39 SDVOSB Primes, would DHS consider raising the number of expected awardees for the SDVOSB track to provide greater opportunity for a non-incumbent to be selected and provide new solution alternatives?	Thank you for your suggestion.
145	3/17/2023			Draft RFP section 1.1 Structure and Objectives	The draft RFP only allows projects awarded (e.g. SF-26) in NAICS codes 541611, 561110, 541330. Due to the expansive scope of many current government contracts, would the government permit projects from other awarded NAICS codes to be allowed provided a substantial portion of the actual work under these projects was in NAICS codes 541611, 561110, or 541330, as verified by measures described in section 4.3.2 Verification?	Projects must be similar to the services outlined in the SOW pertaining to the Functional Category the offeror is submitting its offer for (Ref. 52.212-1 Addendum 4.3.1.1(a)). If the Offeror believes the NAICS/PSC code assigned to the contract was not correct then it shall follow the instructions provided in FAR 52-212-1 Addendum, para 4.3.2.1 (a)(ii) and 4.3.2.1 (c). This information will be evaluated based on 52.212-2, para. 3.2.2.1.1, Element 4.
146	3/17/2023			FAR 52.212-3 Offeror Representations and Certifications-Commercial Products and Commercial Services (Dec 2022). 38 CFR 74.12	To ensure the accurate SDVOSB status of an Offeror, will the government require current and active SBA or U.S. Department of Veterans Affairs (VA) Center for Verification and Evaluation (CVE) SDVOSB certification documentation to submit with each proposal for the SDVOSB track? On November 29, 2022, the Small Business Administration (SBA) published a Final Rule, requiring all Veteran-Owned Small Business Concerns (VOSBs) and Service-Disabled Veteran-Owned Small Business Concerns (SDVOSBs) to obtain SBA certification of their size status to participate in any federal government agency VOSB or SDVOSB sole source or set-aside contracts on or after January 1, 2023. 38 CFR 74.12 is germane.	Effective 1/1/23, to be eligible for award as a VOSB or SDVOSB, the vendor must pursue SBA certification of the VOSB/SDVOSB size status. Companies can continue to self-certify if they had an application pending with the SBA. **Small businesses that do not have an application pending with the SBA on or before 12/31/23** will not be eligible to self-certify for SDVOSB sole source or set asides on and after 1/1/24. Since VOSB/SDVOSB type businesses can self-certify without providing proof of an application pending until after 12/31/23 and we intend on having proposals due prior to 12/31/23, then an offeror is not required to submit any additional information that states it is a VOSB/SDVOSB.
147	3/17/2023			Draft RFP Section 3.1(k); Section 1.1. FAR 52.207-6	Please confirm that the intent of the government is to limit teammates (proposed subcontractors) to the same SB size standards as the offeror, as designated in Table 1 (pg. 65), when using the phrase, " Note: FAR 52.207-6 is applicable to this solicitation; therefore small business teaming arrangements are the only types acceptable."	FAR Provision 52.207 is included in the draft RFP due to the prescription at 7.107-6 being applicable. Therefore, IAW 52.207 (a)(1)(ii), if the offeror is a teaming arrangement and not a JV, all members of the teaming arrangement must be small based on the NAICS code size standard that is assigned to the functional category the teaming arrangement is proposing to.
148	3/17/2023	Draft RFP & SF1449	3	SF1449 - Box 6	When does the government anticipate releasing the final RFP?	The DHS is currently projecting the final RFP will be released in August 2023
149	3/17/2023	Draft RFP & SF1449	73	2.5	Please confirm any cover pages and/or title pages will not count against page count for each volume that has a page limit.	Cover pages and/or titles count towards the page limitations identified in 52.212-1 Addendum, Table 5. Proposal Organization.
150	3/17/2023	Draft RFP & SF1449	74	2.5.6	Please confirm that any tables, figures, graphics may have font size smaller than 12-point	Per 52.212-1 Addendum, para. 2.5.6, "Page size shall be 8.5 x 11 inches and the text size shall be no less than 12-point Times New Roman font". Tables, figures, graphics cannot deviate from this requirement.
151	3/17/2023	Draft RFP & SF1449	75	3.1	Please confirm that the Volume I cover sheet (Attachment 18) does not count towards page count.	Per 52.212-1 Addendum, para. 2.5 the Volume I cover sheet (Attachment 18) does count towards the page limit identified in 52.212-1 Addendum, Table 5. Proposal Organization.
152	3/17/2023	Draft RFP & SF1449	78	4.2	The solicitation states that if an Offeror has a TOP SECRET clearance, it will only be eligible for those points, not inclusive of SECRET. As an Offeror with a TOP SECRET facility clearance will be more competitive (i.e. it can bid on both SECRET & TOP SECRET opportunities, shouldn't that point value for TOP SECRET be greater than SECRET?	Thank you for your recommendation.
153	3/17/2023	Draft RFP & SF1449	79	4.3	As verified points will be awarded to each verified project experience example and that experience of subcontractors, defined under the Contractor Teaming Arrangement, an Offeror could add an infinite number of teaming partners and continue to add further examples of performance. Recommend establishing a maximum number of the most relevant experience to receive a maximum number of points.	Thank you for your recommendation.
154	3/17/2023	Draft RFP & SF1449	79	4.3	If a PWS/SOW spans both 541611 & 541330 NAICS of FC1 & FC3 respectively, please confirm an offeror can use the same contract/project experience for both functional categories.	Projects must be similar to the services outlined in the SOW pertaining to the Functional Category the offeror is submitting its offer for (Ref. 52.212-1 Addendum 4.3.1.1(a)). If the Offeror believes the NAICS/PSC code assigned to the contract was not correct then it shall follow the instructions provided in FAR 52-212-1 Addendum, para 4.3.2.1 (a)(ii) and 4.3.2.1 (c). This information will be evaluated based on 52.212-2, para. 3.2.2.1.1, Element 4.
155	3/17/2023	Draft RFP & SF1449 & Attachment 16 Project Verification Form	81	4.3.2.1(c) (ii)	If there is no limit on project experience or number of teaming partners does the government understand the administrative lift required to verify each of these projects that may require Attachment 16?	Yes
156	3/17/2023	Draft RFP & SF1449	87	6.1.5	Shall the offeror provide Reps and Certs utilizing the Full Text in the solicitation (starting on pdf pg. 88), downloaded from SAM or both?	Per 52.212-3, "The Offeror shall complete only paragraph (b) of this provision if the Offeror has completed the annual representations and certification electronically in the System for Award Management (SAM) accessed through https://www.sam.gov. If the Offeror has not completed the annual representations and certifications electronically, the Offeror shall complete only paragraphs (c) through (v) of this provision".
157	3/17/2023	Attachment 1 Statement of Work and Appendix A	2	C.3.1 FCI	For the final issuance of the RFP, can the government please provide a definition for the overall scope of each subcategory within each category in FC1 (i.e. Financial Planning, Records, Management, Office Planning, Web Design, Printing Services, etc.)	The items (i.e. Financial Planning, Records, Management, Office Planning, Web Design, Printing Services, etc.) are not subcategories of FC1. These are examples of services that may be rendered under that specific FC.
158	3/17/2023	Attachment 1 Statement of Work and Appendix A	2	C.3.1 FCI	For the final issuance of the RFP, can the government please provide a definition for the overall scope of each subcategory within in category in FC3 (i.e. Site Assessments & Planning, Engineering Process, Improvement, Configuration Management, Requirements Analysis, Concept Development, etc.)	The items (i.e. Site Assessments & Planning, Engineering Process, Improvement, Configuration Management, Requirements Analysis, Concept Development, etc.) are not subcategories of FC3. These are examples of services that may be rendered under that specific FC.
159	3/17/2023	Attachment 8 FC1 Self Scoring Sheet V2	N/A	All tabs	How does the government intend to assess experience across all subcategories if the scoring sheet doesn't assign point values for product service codes and coverage across all subcategories.	The DHS intends to evaluate experience based on 52.212-2 and 52.212-2 Addendum.
160	3/17/2023	General			Unlimited past performances put an undue burden on the companies, and there is no upper limit that we can strive to. We recommend the Government put a ceiling on the number of past performances for each functional area.	Thank you for your recommendation. Please note that in order for an offeror to claim a project, it must comply with all the requirements of the solicitation. This includes but is not limited to meeting the definition of relevant and recent found in the addendum to 52.212-1. This requirement puts restrictions on when the project had to occur in order to be considered.
161	3/17/2023	General			Request the government to put a limit on re-using the same project across multiple teams. For e.g., GSA did that on POLARIS	Thank you for your recommendation. Per 52.212-1 Addendum para. 4.3.1.1(c), for experience to be relevant it cannot be claimed more than once for each Functional Category.
162	3/17/2023	General			We request the government to increase the number of awardees due to the competition	Thank you for your recommendation.
163	3/20/2023	PACTS III Draft RFP	Pg. 64	1.1, Structure and Objectives	Will the task orders from PACTS II that are currently set aside for Service-Disabled Veteran-Owned Small Business (SDVOSB) also be set aside for SDVOSBs on PACTS III?	No. PACTS III is an entirely new contract vehicle than PACTS II. There is no affliation between PACTS III and the contractors currently on PACTS II.
164	3/20/2023	PACTS III Draft RFP	Pg. 64	1.1, Structure and Objectives	Are there any limitations to the number of small businesses that can join the offeror in a "Small business teaming arrangement?"	No, per 52.207-6, a Small Business Teaming Arrangement means "an arrangement where - **Two or more** small business concerns have formed a joint venture; **or** A small business offeror agrees with **one or more other small business concerns** to have them act as its subcontractors under a specified Government contract. A Small Business Teaming Arrangement between the offeror and its small business subcontractor(s) exists through a written agreement between the parties that–Is specifically referred to as a "Small Business Teaming Arrangement"; and Sets forth the different responsibilities, roles, and percentages (or other allocations) of work as it relates to the acquisition". In addition to the offeror complying with 52.207-6, it shall also abide by 52.219-14, Limitation on Subcontracting.
165	3/20/2023	PACTS III Draft RFP	Pg. 64	1.1, Structure and Objectives	Will the Government allow teaming post-award, or will the offeror be limited to partners proposed in the IDIQ proposal?	The offeror will be limited to the partners proposed in the IDIQ proposal. If the offeror is awarded a contract, then that contract is with that offeror and only that offeror (to include all members that were part of the offeror). (Ref. 52.212-1 Addendum, para. 3.1 (k))
166	3/20/2023	PACTS III Draft RFP	Pg. 64	1.1, Structure and Objectives	In order to help DHS small business goals, will the Government place a higher value on team composed of all responsible small businesses rather than small businesses that are relying heavily on large businesses as teaming partners for points towards an award?	The DHS has no intention on providing a higher value on a team arrangement composed of all small businesses as it is required per FAR 52.207-6(a)(1)(ii).
167	3/20/2023	PACTS III Draft RFP	Pg. 64	1.1, Structure and Objectives	Is subcontractor past performance weighted equally to prime past performance in the evaluation criteria?	Draft RFP 52.212-2 Addendum, para. 1.1 states, "Past performance will not be evaluated as part of this source selection".
168	3/20/2023	PACTS III Draft RFP	Pg. 64	1.1, Structure and Objectives	Does the draft RFP allow for small primes with large business subcontractors?	Prime contractors may subcontract to large business subcontractors as long as the prime contractor follows FAR 52.219-14 **at the task order level.**
169	3/20/2023	PACTS III Draft RFP	Pg. 64	1.1, Structure and Objectives	Can a minority member of the JV hold the facility clearance under a JV?	Per 52.212-2 Addendum, para. 4.5.2, "If the offeror is part of a joint venture, then per CFR 121.103(h)(4), the Government will accept facility clearance information from either the joint venture itself or the individual partner(s) to the joint venture that will perform the necessary security work has (have) a facility security clearance". Additionally, if the JV doesn't have its own Facility Clearance, then every member of the JV must have a Facility Clearance – which is consistent with the statute behind the regulation.

170	3/20/2023	PACTS III Draft RFP	Pg. 64	1.1, Structure and Objectives	Can a minority member of the JV hold the approved accounting system under a JV?	Per 52.212-2 Addendum, para. 4.5.1, "If the Offeror is a Joint Venture, Teaming Arrangement or Mentor Protégé the accounting system of the member that will bill the Government for all task orders must meet the definition of adequate".
171	3/20/2023	PACTS III Draft RFP	Pg. 64	1.1, Structure and Objectives	Is there a preference for projects completed as the Prime contractor?	No, there is no preference. 52.212-1 Addendum, para. 4.3.1.1(f), all members may submit projects and none receive preference.
172	3/20/2023	PACTS III Draft RFP	Pg. 64	1.1, Structure and Objectives	Is there a preference for DHS-specific past performance to ensure offerors understand and are prepared for DHS-specific processes such as the DHS suitability process?	52.212-2 Addendum, para. 1.1 states, "Past performance will not be evaluated as part of this source selection".
173	3/20/2023	PACTS III Draft RFP	Pg. 69	1.1 Structure and Objectives	How many awards does the Government anticipate making under each FC and corresponding small business tracks if it anticipates making several awards within each FC and small business track?	The DHS intends on making approximately five awards per track under each FC but reserves the right to have as many awardees it deems appropriate. (Ref. 52.212-2 Addendum para. 1.1 & 2.0; 52.216-27)
174	3/20/2023	PACTS III Draft RFP	Pg. 72	3.0 Volume I - Executive Summary	Would the Government consider allowing for more than five awards under the SDVOSB track due to the historical precedence of SDVOSB task order set-asides under the PACTS II vehicle?	Thank you for your suggestion.
175	3/20/2023	PACTS III Draft RFP	Pg. 72	3.0 Volume I - Executive Summary	Does the statement "Note: FAR 52.207-6 is applicable to this solicitation, therefore, small business teaming arrangements are the only types possible" mean that large businesses cannot participate as subcontractors to small businesses providing a proposal for the PACTS III Solicitation?	Per FAR 7.107-6 and 52.207 (a)(1)(ii), which states a small business teaming arrangement is where a small business offeror agrees with one or more other small business concerns to have them act as its subcontractors.....This is applicable to the actual teaming arrangement itself. It does not preclude a company, regardless of the partnership from subcontracting to large businesses that are not part of the "team" as long as it complies with 52.219-14.
176	3/20/2023	PACTS III Draft RFP	Pg 73	4.2 Self Scoring Sheet	"There is no limitation to the number of qualifying projects an offeror can claim under the Experience subfactor for each Functional Category." Is it the Government's intent to allow offerors to submit what could be hundreds of qualifying projects to capture maximum points?	Offerors can submit as many projects they would like as long as it meets the requirements of the solicitation.
177	3/20/2023	PACTS III Draft RFP	Pg 73	4.2 Self Scoring Sheet	If the number of qualifying projects is unlimited, can additional tabs be added to the scoresheet?	Yes, if the offeror exceeds 50 projects then the DHS can provide additional scoresheets upon request.
178	3/20/2023	PACTS III Draft RFP	Pg. 73	4.0 Volume II - Technical	In order to allow for a more streamlined acquisition process, would the Government consider limiting the number of experiences an offeror can provide to 20 or less?	Thank you for your suggestion.
179	3/20/2023	PACTS III Draft RFP	Pg. 74	4.0 Volume II - Technical	Will the Government consider evaluating the quality of experiences to ensure the best possible performance (E.G. CPARS reports/Past Performance Questionnaires)?	Thank you for your suggestion.
180	3/20/2023	PACTS III Draft RFP	Pg. 74	4.0 Volume II - Technical	Is it acceptable to have 0 projects provided by the Prime contractor in the current RFP as written without any requirement for prime offeror participation in the evaluation criteria/scoring sheet?	Yes
181	3/20/2023	PACTS III Draft RFP	Pg. 74	4.0 Volume II - Technical	Can a project/experience be used more than once within a Functional Category (e.g. can an offeror use a project experience on the SDVOSB track under FC1 and then use the same project/experience as a sub on the 8a track under FC1)?	Per 52.212-1 Addendum para. 4.3.1.1(c), for experience to be relevant it cannot be claimed more than once for each Functional Category.
182	3/20/2023	PACTS III Draft RFP	Pg. 74	4.0 Volume II - Technical	Are there any limitations on teaming on multiple teams in multiple functional categories or socioeconomic categories?	No, there are not any limitations. However, note that per 52.212-1 Addendum para. 4.3.1.1(c), for experience to be relevant it cannot be claimed more than once for each Functional Category. Additionally, be aware of the terms and conditions surrounding Organizational Conflicts of Interests and Cross-Teaming that are outlined in Part III, Terms and Conditions, paragraphs 10.0 and 10.1.
183	3/20/2023	PACTS III Draft RFP	Pg. 74	4.0 Volume II - Technical	How will the contractor be evaluated regarding experience managing multiple teaming partners, staffing awarded task orders, concurrent rapid turn task orders, and managing an IDIQ PMO?	Offerors will be evaluated in accordance with 52.212-2 and 52.212-2 Addendum.
184	3/20/2023	PACTS III Draft RFP	Pg. 74	4.0 Volume II - Technical	Does the Government wish to see 50 experiences provided by each offeror across each Functional Category/Socioeconomic track, and will it allow offerors to provide all 50 projects in the highest point category, valuing teammate experience more highly than the management, technical abilities, and the abilities of the prime offeror to respond to multiple, concurrent task orders?	Per 52.212-1 Addendum para. 4.3.1, "For a project to qualify as Experience it must meet the definitions of relevant and recent"
185	3/20/2023	PACTS III Draft RFP	Pg. 74	4.0 Volume II - Technical	Would the Government consider requiring a minimum number of projects to be provided by the prime offeror and not through a teaming partner, putting more emphasis on the prime offeror's technical and management abilities rather than the teammates?	Thank you for your suggestion.
186	3/20/2023	PACTS III Draft RFP	Pg. 74	4.0 Volume II - Technical	Is there a limit to the number of projects an offeror can provide in the FC2 score sheet template?	Yes, if the offeror exceeds 50 projects then the DHS can provide additional scoresheets upon request.
187	3/20/2023	PACTS III Draft RFP	Pg. 74	4.0 Volume II - Technical	Is the Government requiring offerors to stick to 10 experiences per tab as currently structured?	Yes, per 52.212-1 Addendum para. 2.5.7, "RFP 70SBUR23R00000016, Self-Scoring Sheets, Attachments 8-10, shall be submitted in workable Excel format. The Offeror shall populate only applicable cells of the spreadsheet as outlined in the Self-Scoring Sheet Instructions, Attachment 13. If the Offeror adjusts or manipulates the Self-Scoring sheets in any way other than what is stated in the Self-Scoring Sheet Instructions, Attachment 13, the Offeror's proposal will be deemed grossly deficient and will render the proposal unawardable".
188	3/20/2023	PACTS III Draft RFP	Page 75, Item (c)	4.3.1 Qualifications, 4.3.1.1 Project Relevancy	Does the statement "A project is relevant when is not being claimed more than once for each Functional category" apply to offerors bidding with multiple teams, and can a company provide the same experience to multiple teams in different socioeconomic categories or tracks such as 8(a) and SDVOSB, or once one experience is used, it cannot be used again within a Functional Category?	Yes, a project is relevant when is not being claimed more than once for each Functional category" does apply to offerors bidding with multiple teams. Yes, once one experience is used, it cannot be used again within a Functional Category.
189	3/20/2023	Self-Scoring Sheet(s), Attachment(s) 8-10	N/A	N/A	If an experience has the correct NAICS code but a different PSC code, will the Government prioritize the NAICS code over the PSC code?	No, there is not a priority between the NAICS and PSC; they are both required. Per 52.212-2 Addendum 3.2.2.1.1, Element 4, the PSC code shall be listed under the respective NAICS code in Attachment 11.
190	3/20/2023	Self-Scoring Sheet(s), Attachment(s) 8-11	N/A	N/A	Would the Government consider offering more points for a higher level for security (e.g. 20 points for a secret level facility clearance and 40 points for a top secret clearance), and would the Government consider making this a gate as many PACTS II task orders currently require personnel to be cleared at the secret or top secret level?	Thank you for your suggestion.
191	3/20/2023	General			If PACTS III is solicited with multiple SB tracks (SDVOSB, WOSB, 8(a), etc.), would it be possible for industry to participate in multiple team bids (i.e. PRIME bid as SDVOSB track, subcontractor bid on WOSB track, subcontractor on 8(a) track)	Yes, it would be possible for industry to participate in multiple team bids as long as they meet all the requirements of the solicitation. We recommend you pay close attention to 52.212-1 Addendum, para. 1.1 as it defines "one proposal". Per 52.212-1 Addendum para. 4.3.1.1(c), for experience to be relevant it cannot be claimed more than once for each Functional Category. Additionally, be aware of the terms and conditions surrounding Organizational Conflicts of Interests and Cross-Teaming that are outlined in Part III, Terms and Conditions, paragraphs 10.0 and 10.1.
192	3/20/2023	Attachment 8			Will the Government set the minimum threshold for "Total Score' prior to RFP release? If not, can the Government share a range for contract award scores as this will help industry determine teaming arrangements and result in reduced costs/pricing for the Government.	The DHS will provide the results of the survey that was sent out with the draft RFP to assist companies with developing their strategy. (Ref. 52.212-1 Addendum, para. 1.3)
193	3/20/2023	4.1, Technical General	Pg.72	N/A	Suggest the Government review and change the language in this paragraph because it implies a more traditional Technical response (pages of written technial) of an approach for each PWS task, which conflicts with the Proposal Organization (Table 5, pg 68).	Thank you for your recommendation.
194	3/20/2023	4.3.1.1 (b)(i), Project Relevancy	Pg.74 and 75	N/A	Suggest the Government clarify the first-tier subcontractor language since it is unclear for the Prime Bidder's projects as a first-tier subcontractor and it is unclear for the Prime Bidder's teammates (for both projects where they are either the Prime or first-tier subcontractor).	Thank you for your recommendation.
195	3/20/2023	4.3.1.1 (e), Project Relevancy	Pg.75	N/A	Suggest the Government clarify the first-tier subcontractor language since it is unclear for the Prime Bidder's teammates (for both projects where they are either the Prime or first-tier subcontractor).	Thank you for your recommendation.
196	3/20/2023	4.3.1.1 (f), Project Relevancy	Pg.75	N/A	Suggest the Government review and clarify this language since it is not consistent with how the Government has defined the Bidder's team (Executive Summary) using a 1-page diagram depicting the corporate members of your team (e.g., prime, first-tier subcontractor, member of JV, teaming and/or mentor protege arrangement). In other words as currently written, (4.3.1.1 (f)) is excluding a more traditional teaming arrangement with a Prime Bidder and first-tier subcontractors.	Thank you for your recommendation.
197	3/20/2023	4.3.1.2, Project Recency	Pg.75	N/A	Why has the Government specified project recency as 2 years (730 calendar days)? Suggest the Government use 5 years (1,825 calendar days) since PACTS III Total Period of Performance is 10 years.	Thank you for your recommendation.
198	3/20/2023	FC 1, Self-Scoring Sheet	N/A	Attachment 8	Suggest the Government add Instructions for these sheets and include instructions on how to identify and score projects from the Prime Bidder's teammates.	Thank you for your recommendation. Per 52.212-1 Addendum, para. 2.5.7, RFP 70SBUR23R00000016, Self-Scoring Sheets, Attachments 8-10, shall be submitted in workable Excel format. The Offeror shall populate only applicable cells of the spreadsheet as outlined in the Self-Scoring Sheet Instructions, Attachment 13. Also, see 52.212-1 Addendum, para. 1.1 for the definition of one proposal.
199	3/20/2023	FC 2, Self-Scoring Sheet	N/A	Attachment 9	Suggest the Government add Instructions for these sheets and include instructions on how to identify and score projects from the Prime Bidder's teammates.	Thank you for your recommendation. Per 52.212-1 Addendum, para. 2.5.7, RFP 70SBUR23R00000016, Self-Scoring Sheets, Attachments 8-10, shall be submitted in workable Excel format. The Offeror shall populate only applicable cells of the spreadsheet as outlined in the Self-Scoring Sheet Instructions, Attachment 13. Also, see 52.212-1 Addendum, para. 1.1 for the definition of one proposal.
200	3/20/2023	FC 3, Self-Scoring Sheet	N/A	Attachment 10	Suggest the Government add Instructions for these sheets and include instructions on how to identify and score projects from the Prime Bidder's teammates.	Thank you for your recommendation. Per 52.212-1 Addendum, para. 2.5.7, RFP 70SBUR23R00000016, Self-Scoring Sheets, Attachments 8-10, shall be submitted in workable Excel format. The Offeror shall populate only applicable cells of the spreadsheet as outlined in the Self-Scoring Sheet Instructions, Attachment 13. Also, see 52.212-1 Addendum, para. 1.1 for the definition of one proposal.
201	3/20/2023	Attachment 5- Labor Categories and Qualifications	N/A	N/A	Can the government identify which positions have been identified as SCA	If SCLS is applicable it will be identified at the task order level per Part III, para. 15.0, 15.1 and 15.2
202	3/20/2023	Attachment 4 - Labor Category Pricing Template	N/A	N/A	Should the offeror use Washington DC metro area for Labor Category pricing or is another location desired?	Per 52.212-1 Addendum, para. 5.1, "The fully burdened ceiling rates shall include all direct labor and indirect costs applicable to that labor category (such as fringe benefits, overhead, and G&A), and profit. The Offeror should propose its base rates considering the maximum education and experience requirements for each labor category identified in the Labor Categories and Qualifications, Attachment 5. Additionally, the offeror shall consider the employee working in the **highest cost location**, highest performance at a government or Contractor site and the types of orders that will pose the most risk to it. These rates shall be based on a full-time equivalent employee and are only applicable to work performed within the 50 States and US territories".
203	3/20/2023	Attachment 12 - Proposal Compliance Checklist	Pg 6	Volume II - Technical Ques. 18-20	Ques 18-20 seem to indicate an offeror must have a SECRET or TS level clearance, however, there is no reference of clearance requirements in draft documentation. Can the government clarify the security requirements for submission, if any?	Offerors are not required to have SECRET or TS level clearance. However, if the offeror would like to claim points for either clearance level, then they need to follow the procedures outlined in 52.212-1 Addendum, para. 4.5. The DHS will then evaluate it IAW 52.212-2 and 52.212-2 Addendum.
204	3/20/2023	Attachment 1 - Statement of Work	Pg 3	C.3.2 FC 2	Can the government define the services for #5 (Communications and Interpreting)?	This language will be removed from the final SOW.
205	3/20/2023	Attachment 14 - Qualifying Project Examples	Pg 1	Attachment 14	Suggest the Government provide language or project examples that address the Bidder's teammates and how to account for the Bidder and the entire Team's Qualifying Projects. Also, providing clarity on the use eof the term Offeror. Does it include the Bidder and the Team?	Thank you for your recommendation. 52.212-1 Addendum, para. 1.1 should help you with your question as it defines what is considered a proposal.
206	3/20/2023	Attachment 16 - Project Verification Form	Pg 1	Attachment 16	Suggest the Government clarify what the Bidder is supposed to submit in the proposal if the FPDS report is accurate. Does it matter if the accurate FPDS report is for the Bidder's teammate rather than the Bidder (Offeror)?	Reference 52.212-1 Addendum, para. 4.3.2.1 (b)
207	3/20/2023	Standard Form 1449	3	NAICS: 561110 Office Administrative Services $12.5	If an offeror is considered large in 561110 (FC2) but small in 541611 (FC1) and 541330 (FC3), we are permitted to bid on the two functional categories in which we are still considered a small business. Is this correct?	Correct. The offeror shall follow 52.212-1 Addendum, para. 3.1 (e) and *Note
208	3/20/2023	Part I – Continuation of the SF1449 PWS, Section C.5, Other Direct Costs/Ancillary Support Services and Products	4	This vehicle does not provide any information technology (IT) services. Other Direct Costs (ODCs) and Ancillary Support Services are defined as integral and necessary to complete a total integrated solution…Sub-areas include, but are not limited to, professional services, commercial services/products, equipment (leased or purchased), IT services and/or components, administrative support, data entry, and subject matter expertise.	Will IT services be a part of this procurement?	Per SOW, Section C.5, Other Direct Costs/Ancillary Support Services and Products, IT services shall only be ancillary. Services being rendered under PACTS III shall be predominantly within scope of the three Functional Categories
209	3/20/2023	Reporting Requirements, Appendix A, Post Award Small Business Program Representation	N/A	Representation is required 60 to 120 days prior to the five (5) year anniversary of the OASIS+ SB Master Contract.	If we exceed the size standard at the five-year mark, will we be off-ramped off the contract and unable to compete on small business set-asides?	Per Part III, para. 11.0 (i), the offeror could be off-ramped prior to exercising the options if its re-certification concludes that contractor has outgrown their size status. The first option period will be exercised after the end of the third year.
210	3/20/2023	Reporting Requirements, Appendix A, Post Award Small Business Program Representation	N/A	Representation is required 60 to 120 days prior to the five (5) year anniversary of the OASIS+ SB Master Contract.	Is this meant to say PACTS III (not OASIS+)?	Yes, thank you.
211	3/20/2023	HSAR 3052.209-72, Organizational Conflict of Interest (Jun 2006)	31	(a) Determination. The Government has determined that this effort may result in an actual or potential conflict of interest, or may provide one or more offerors with the potential to attain an unfair competitive advantage.	Are there any currently awarded contracts at this time that will cause an OCI in connection with this effort?	There are no OCIs that we are aware of at this time. However, if one exist in the future on the IDIQ or a Task Order, then this clause should be updated accordingly. Additionally, the contract awardee and/or offeror shall comply with all OCI provisions/clauses and Part III, para. 10.0
212	3/20/2023	HSAR 3052.209-72, Organizational Conflict of Interest (Jun 2006)	31	(a) Determination. The Government has determined that this effort may result in an actual or potential conflict of interest, or may provide one or more offerors with the potential to attain an unfair competitive advantage.	Is an OCI Plan required with proposal submission?	A OCI Plan is not required unless the conditions outlined in Part III, para. 10.0 exist

213	3/20/2023	16.0 Re-Representation	54	The Contractor shall re-represent its size status upon the occurrence of any of the following… Within 60 to 120 days prior to the end of the fifth year of the contract	Does this mean that the Contractor will have at least five years on the contract prior to being off ramped for exceeding the size standard?	No, this was incorrectly stated. Updated language may be provided in the final RFP. Reference response to question 3 above.
214	3/20/2023	52.212-1, 2.5.6	69	Page size shall be 8.5 x 11 inches and the text size shall be no less than 12-point Times New Roman font.	Does the Times New Roman, 12-point font apply to the graphics, tables, charts, and figures?	Per 52.212-1 Addendum, para. 2.5.6, "Page size shall be 8.5 x 11 inches and the text size shall be no less than 12-point Times New Roman font". Tables, figures, graphics and charts cannot deviate from this requirement.
215	3/20/2023	52.212-1, 4.3.2.1 (iii)	77	Copy of Contract PWS or SOW	If a PWS or SOW is considered Controlled Unclassified Information, which requires a password, where would the Government like us to include the password for such documents in our proposal submission?	If something is required to be password protected , please send the password in a separate email.
216	3/20/2023	Draft RFP	Pg. 80	4.3.1.2 Project Recency	Given that project experience makes up the majority of points, two years of performance is overly restrictive for small businesses. We request the government evaluate performance that has occurred within five years since issuance of the solicitation.	Thank you for your recommendation
217	3/20/2023	Attachment 11_Functional Categories_Corresponding_NAICS_PSC	Row 38	N/A	Would the government add NAICS 541990, ALL OTHER PROFESSIONAL, SCIENTIFIC, AND TECHNICAL SERVICES, to FC3 for the purpose of project relevancy?	The Government has selected a primary NAICS code, as reflected in the draft RFP, for each Functional Category that best represents the scope of services for the particular category.
218	3/20/2023	Draft RFP	Pg. 64	Part V, Section 1.1, 2nd Para.	The draft RFP includes the following text: "One proposal constitues, one or a set of self-scoring sheets including claims from one of the following: an individual business, a Joint Venture, a Teaming Arrangement or Mentor Protégé". Does a team consisting of a small business Joint Venture (i.e., offeror) and multiple small business teaming partners (i.e., subcontractors) meet the definition of a Teaming Arrangement?	Per the statement in the draft RFP mentioned in your question, one proposal can only come from one of the following: an individual business, a Joint Venture, a Teaming Arrangement or Mentor Protégé. A Joint Venture (JV) is recognized by the SBA as a stand-alone entity. Therefore, if a JV includes members that are not part of the JV, then it would violate the one proposal rule since the proposal would be submitted from more than one of the types listed above. Additionally, FAR 52.207-6 as it is applicable to this solicitation and defines what a Small Business Teaming Arrangement is.
219	3/20/2023	Draft RFP	Pg. 70	Part V, Section 2.5.7 Table 6 **AND** Part V, Section 3.1, 1st Para.	Table 6 indicates that the naming convention for Volume I Executive Summary should be <UEI>_FCXX_Volume I. Within the first paragraph of Section 3.1, the RFP instructions state that Attachment 18 in Volume I is to be provided in workable excel format. In the same paragraph, the RFP instructions state that the Offeror shall include information required by paragraphs (k) and (l) within Volume I, if applicable. Based on the stated RFP instructions, an Offeror is required to provide Attachment 18 in excel format and additional Executive Summary information (required by paragraphs (k) and (l)) in PDF format. Please provide instruction regarding the required naming convention for the two requested documents: (1) Attachment 18 and (2) Additional Executive Summary Information.	Please include the two requested documents: (1) Attachment 18 and (2) Additional Executive Summary Information under one Volume and name it "<UEI>_FCXX_Volume I"
220	3/20/2023	Draft RFP	Pg. 74	Part V, Section 4.3.1	The draft RFP includes the following text: "For a project to qualify as Experience it must meet the definitions of relevant and recent as stated below". Does the definition of "project" include **ANY** of the following: (1) a single contract (including prime contracts, subcontracts, and commercial contracts), (2) a single task order awarded under a single award or multiple award ID/IQ, BOA, BPA, or similar type master contract, or (3) a single task order awarded under a Federal Supply Schedule?	Correct, per 52.212-1 Addendum, para. 4.3.1, in order for a project to qualify as Experience it must meet the definitions of relevant and recent. These definitions do not put any exclusions on any of the items (1)-(3) that you listed. However, note para. 4.3.1.1, does state that the offeror must of provided the service as a Prime or First-Tier Subcontractor to a public and/or private customer.
221	3/20/2023	Draft RFP	Pg. 107 **AND** Pg. 126	Part V, Section 6.0 FAR 52.212-3 **AND** FAR 52.219-1	If a Teaming Arrangement (consisting of a small business Joint Venture and multiple small business subcontractors) submits a proposal, are all subcontractors required to provide completed copies of both FAR 52.212-3 "Offeror Representations and Certifications - Commercial Products and Commercial Services" and FAR 52.219-1 "Small Business Program Representations"?	Yes, each member of the team must provide completed copies of both FAR 52.212-3 (unless the condition in the first paragraph of 52.212-3 is applicable) and 52.219-1 so the DHS can ensure compliance with FAR 19.301-1 (Ref. 52.212-1 Addendum, para. 3.1 (e)) and FAR clause 52.219-14.
222	3/20/2023	Draft RFP	79	52.212-1, Addendum, Para 4.3.1.1	Can a task order under an IDIQ contract be used as a qualifying project?	Per 52.212-1 Addendum, para. 4.3.1, in order for a project to qualify as Experience it must meet the definitions of relevant and recent. These definitions do not put any exclusions on using a task order under under an IDIQ contract.
223	3/20/2023	Draft RFP	79	52.212-1, Addendum, Para 4.3.1.1	Can a project with a different NAICS code but with relevant scope be used as a qualifying project?	Projects must be similar to the services outlined in the SOW pertaining to the Functional Category the offeror is submitting its offer for (Ref. 52.212-1 Addendum 4.3.1.1(a)). If the Offeror believes the NAICS/PSC code assigned to the contract was not correct then it shall follow the instructions provided in FAR 52-212-1 Addendum, para 4.3.2.1 (a)(ii) and 4.3.2.1 (c). This information will be evaluated based on 52.212-2, para. 3.2.2.1.1, Element 4.
224	3/20/2023	Draft RFP	Pg. 59 (64/138)	Part III - Terms and Conditions; section 21	The RFP states the following: "The minimum contract sales requirement is $250,000 in awarded task order value for each contract" Can the government confirm that if an IDIQ awardee does not earn at least $250,000 in task order awards within the base year they will be off ramped?	Correct. Per Part III, para. 21.0, "If the Contractor does not meet the minimum contract sales requirement by the end of the base year of the Master Contract period of performance, the Government will off ramp the contractor in accordance with Part III, paragraph 11.0." Please note that paragraph should state, the base "period" not base "year". Therefore, this time period would be a total of three years and not one year. Please review the final RFP for clarifying language.
225	3/20/2023	Draft RFP	Pg. 75 (80/138)	4.3.1.1 (f)	According to this section, a project example is relevant when "the project for each Fucntional Category is from the JV, teaming Arrangement or SBA Mentor-Protégé Arrangement itself or a member of the JV, Teaming Arrangment or SBA Mentor-Protégé Arrangement" Are there any restrictions on the number of project examples that may come from a subcontractor within a teaming agreement?	Projects can only come from the JV, teaming Arrangement or SBA Mentor-Protégé Arrangement itself or a member of the JV, Teaming Arrangment or SBA Mentor-Protégé Arrangement. Meaning if a subcontractor is not a **member** of the JV, teaming Arrangement or SBA Mentor-Protégé Arrangement as identified in 52.212-1 Addendum, para. 3.1(k) then those projects will not meet the definition of relevant as defined in this solicitation.
226	3/20/2023	Draft RFP	Pg. 75 (80/138)	4.3.1.1 (f)	According to this section, a project example is relevant when "the project for each Fucntional Category is from the JV, teaming Arrangement or SBA Mentor-Protégé Arrangement itself or a member of the JV, Teaming Arrangment or SBA Mentor-Protégé Arrangement" Can the government confirm that all members of a Teaming Arragnment (or subcontractors) must be small under the propsed functional category NAICS at the time of submission?	Yes, all members of a Teaming Arrangement must be small under the proposed functional category NAICS at the time of initial offer per 52.207-6 and FAR 19.301-1(b). Provision 52.207-6 is applicable to the draft RFP and states, a small business teaming arrangment means an arrangement where, a small business offeror agrees with one or more other small business concerns to have them act as its subcontractors...." Additionally, FAR 19.301-1(b) states, "An offeror is required to represent its size and socioeconomic status in writing to the contracting officer at the time of initial offer".
227	3/20/2023	Attachment+9_FC2_Self_Scoring_Sheet_V2	Excel	Subfactor 1.3 Facility Clearance	In the self-scoring matrix, would the Government consider removing the scoring qualification for holding a Government Facility Clearance? Since the Government Contracting Activity can sponsor vendors for a facility clearance, this category puts small businesses with less resources at a disadvantage for not holding a clearance when they could be sponsored by the Government at a future date.	Thank you for your recommendation. Please note that offerors are not required to have SECRET or TS level clearance. However, if the offeror would like to claim points for either clearance level, then they need to follow the procedures outlined in 52.212-1 Addendum, para. 4.5. The DHS will then evaluate it IAW 52.212-2 and 52.212-2 Addendum.
228	3/20/2023	Attachment+9_FC2_Self_Scoring_Sheet_V2	Excel	Subfactor 1.1 Experience	In the self-scoring matrix, would the Government consider revising the scoring qualifications for relevant projects, as there is currently a significant emphasis on small dollar value projects? The major emphasis on small projects could present risk to the Government, as the effort to operate smaller value projects presents less complexity from a staffing, management, delivery perspective. A CPAR score from a project size of $50k to less than $1M is difficult to compare to a CPAR score from a greater than $5M project, given the inherent complexities from a larger project. In the current scoring, a project between the $50k and $1M range, would receive 84 points, while a project sized between $1M and $5M would receive 36 points, which is less than half the total of 84. To address these concerns the Government could consider changing the point value of the project range, removing several of the project ranges, and/or making the relevant project total value ranges larger than currently listed.	Thank you for your recommendation. Per para. 4.2, the point system is based on historical actuals and the DHS future need. To maintain the integrity of the point system we are ensuring the method is consistent across all subfactors. Therefore, since we are projecting the percentages of orders that correlate to the respective dollar ranges for future orders we must only allow points based on this factual data.
229	3/20/2023	PACTS+III+Draft+RFP+and+SF1449	Page 55, Paragraph 1 Page 80, 4.3.1.1 f	10.1 Cross Teaming Limitations and 4.3.1.1 Project Relevancy	Would the Government please confirm if it is allowable for the offeror to use qualifying projects/past performance from other subsidiary(s) within the same corporate structure?	Per 52.212-1 Addendum, para. 4.3.1.1 (f), Projects can only come from the JV, teaming Arrangement or SBA Mentor-Protégé Arrangement itself or a member of the JV, Teaming Arrangment or SBA Mentor-Protégé Arrangement. Members of the team are those that are identified in 52.212-1 Addendum, para. 3.1(k). **Therefore, if other subsidiaries within the same corporate structure are members of JV, teaming Arrangement or SBA Mentor-Protégé Arrangement meaning the intention is that they will perform work on fuutre PACTS III orders then yes, it would be allowable.**
230	3/20/2023	PACTS+III+Draft+RFP+and+SF1449	Page 111, Paragraph 1	3.3.2.1 Fairness and Reasonableness	Given the on-going inflation and wage price pressure, would the Government consider revising the 3% yearly escalation rate?	The labor rates, to include the escalation rate has taken into account the on-going inflation and wage price pressure. Additionally, Per 52.212-1 Addendum, para. 5.1, "The applied escalation factor will be revisited prior to the exercise of each option period. The established ceiling rates in the awarded contract will only be adjusted upwards to reflect changes in escalation that are greater than the currently applied escalation factor".
231	3/20/2023	Attachment 8-10	74	Draft RFP 4.2	We recommend that a greater number of points be scored for Top Secret vs. Secret clearance as TS cleared companies are not limited to which task orders they respond to.	Thank you for your recommendation.
232	3/20/2023	Attachment 8-10	72-73	Draft RFP 4.2	We recommend that DHS award points for corporate certifications such as ISO 9001; ISO 20000; ISO 27001; and CMMI	Thank you for your recommendation.
233	3/21/2023	Draft RFP	pg. 74	4.2	It makes sense to use the value of historic task orders in determining the points awarded for the size of qualifying projects, but **awarding fewer points for experience with larger sized project can increase the risk to the Government**. If the Government favors experience below $5M, when the Government procures more complex services that may far exceed $5M in size, the Government may not have enough potential contractors with the capability and capacity to deliver. Can the Government consider awarding an equal amount of points for all projects above the median size of historic task orders?	Thank you for your recommendation. Per para. 4.2, the point system is based on historical actuals and the DHS future need. To maintain the integrity of the point system we are ensuring the method is consistent across all subfactors. Therefore, since we are projecting the percentages of orders that correlate to the respective dollar ranges for future orders we must only allow points based on this factual data.
234	3/21/2023	Draft RFP	pg. 64	1.1	If there is no limit on the number of qualifying projects and subcontractors, this will lead to very large teams looking to maximize their points. This will result in teams with many subcontractors with likely similar capabilities. For example, a team with 5 subcontractors will likely be capable to meet the Government's needs as a 15 subcontractor team. Can the Government consider limiting the number of qualification projects (e.g., 6 projects) or subcontractors (e.g., 5 subcontractors)?	Thank you for your recommendation
235	3/21/2023	Draft RFP	pg. 64	1.1	Can the Government confirm that an offeror can submit a proposal as a prime in a socioeconomic track and a subcontractor in a separate socioeconomic track under the same functional category?	It would be possible for industry to participate in multiple team bids as long as they meet all the requirements of the solicitation. We recommend you pay close attention to 52.212-1 Addendum, para. 1.1 as it defines "one proposal". Per 52.212-1 Addendum para. 4.3.1.1(c), for experience to be relevant it cannot be claimed more than once for each Functional Category. Additionally, be aware of the terms and conditions surrounding Organizational Conflicts of Interests and Cross-Teaming that are outlined in Part III, Terms and Conditions, paragraphs 10.0 and 10.1. Lastly, note that if a subcontractor is not a member of the JV, teaming Arrangement or SBA Mentor-Protégé Arrangement as identified in 52.212-1 Addendum, para. 3.1(k) then those projects will not meet the definition of relevant as defined in this solicitation.
236	3/21/2023	Draft RFP	pg. 74	4.2	There is no scoring element that assesses the quality of an offer's experience. By only reviewing the magnitude of experience, the Government will not be able to assess if an offer can successfully meet or exceed their requirements, delivering high quality results on time and under budget. Can the Government consider adding a scoring element providing an increasing number of points for highly rated CPARS or past performance questionnaires on experience projects?	Thank you for your recommendation.
237	3/21/2023	Draft RFP	pg. 92	1.1	With no restriction on the number of qualification projects, responding to PACTS III will be very expensive for a small business. Can the Government consider increasing the number of awardees per functional category and socioeconomic track from five to twenty five, so the potential value of responding is greater than the cost for offers?	Thank you for your recommendation. Per 52.212-1 Addendum, para. 1.3, The DHS will provide its market research results which will include the range of points the DHS is anticipating for the highest technically rated offerors. The offerors are encouraged to populate the self-scoring sheet on their own to assess its possibility to win and determine if it wants to submit a proposal for PACTS III.
238	3/21/2023	Draft RFP	pg. 74	4.2	Since the scoring system uses anticipated requirements of task orders, it would benefit the Government to include additional points for previous experience at DHS. The Government should consider granting an additional 100 points for each experience project at DHS, and an increasing number of points for the breadth of experience at DHS components.	Thank you for your recommendation.
239	3/21/2023	Draft RFP	pg. 92	1.1	There are very few awards planned for each socio-economic category. Competition, therefore, will be fierce. Please consider significantly limiting the number of projects that large company members of small business joint ventures can contribute to be evaluated.	To ensure compliance with CFR 125.8(e) and 13 CFR 124.513(f), the DHS does not intend on limiting the number of projects that members can contribute.
240	3/21/2023	Draft RFP	pg. 92	1.1	The limited number of awards in each socio-economic category means that DHS may be concentrating the opportunity to bid on task orders for many small businesses, and therefore significantly reducing the small business industrial base that serves the Department. This is a potential major unintended consequence of such a small number of awards in each track. Please consider increasing the number of awards in each track.	Thank you for your recommendation.
241	3/21/2023	Draft RFP	pg. 74	4.2	The number of potential simultaneous task orders awarded to PACTS III awardees means that effective management of delivery is important for reducing risk to the Government. Please consider requesting an offeror Project or Program Manager resume as part of a proposal to evaluate management capabilities.	Thank you for your recommendation.
242	3/21/2023	Draft RFP	pg. 74	4.2	To evaluate an offer's capability to deliver as a prime contractor to the Government, please consider awarding additional points for each experience project delivered as a prime contractor.	Thank you for your recommendation.
243	3/21/2023	Draft RFP	pg. 75	4.3	The recency definition of two years is a very narrow threshold. If the Government modifies the RFP to place limits on the number of qualification projects, please consider increasing the definition to five years. This will allow offers to provide a more representative sample of their experience without burdening the Government evaluators with thousands of additional qualification projects.	Thank you for your recommendation.
244	3/21/2023	Draft RFP	Page 80	Section 4.3.1.1 (f)	Draft Solicitation, Section 4.3.1.1 (f) Project Relevancy (page 80), please confirm that an offeror bidding as a Mentor-Protégé JV (MPJV) can utilize projects performed by the MPJV, the Mentor and/or the Protégé?	Per Draft Solicitation, Section 4.3.1.1 (f), projects may be submitted from the JV, Teaming Arrangement or SBA Mentor-Protégé Arrangement **itself** or **a member** of the JV, Teaming Arrangement or SBA Mentor-Protégé Arrangement. This is in line with CFR 125.8(e) and 13 CFR 124.513(f).
245	3/21/2023	Draft RFP	Page 82	Section 4.3.2.2	Draft Solicitation, Section 4.3.2.2 Verification of Project Experience Submission (Non-Federal Contracts and all First-Tier Subcontracts) (page 82), please confirm our understanding that project experience under non-Federal Government contracts submitted by the offeror for this procurement can be commercial contracts.	Per 52.212-1 Addendum, para. 4.3.1.1(e), A project is RELEVANT when it is from the offeror providing the service as a Prime or First-Tier Subcontractor to a public and/or private customer.
246	3/21/2023	Draft RFP	Page 97	Section 1.1	Draft Solicitation, Section 1.1 Source Selection Methodology (page 97) states that "[p]ast performance will not be evaluated as part of this source selection." However, in accordance with FAR Subpart 15.304 (c)(3)(i) Evaluation factors and significant subfactors, states that "[p]ast performance, except as set forth in paragraph (c)(3)(iii) of this section, shall be evaluated in all source selections for negotiated competitive acquisitions expected to exceed the simplified acquisition threshold." •Please explain why past performance will not be evaluated as part of this source selection. •Did the Contracting Officer, in compliance with FAR 15.304(c)(3)(iii), document the reason why past performance is not an appropriate evaluation factor for this acquisition? •Will past performance be evaluated at the task order competition level?	Yes, the CO has complied with all the FAR requirements. It is the decision of the CO for the task orders to determine whether they would like to evaluate past performance.
247	3/21/2023	Draft RFP	Page 97	Section 1.1	Draft Solicitation, Section 1.1 Source Selection Methodology (page 97), please explain the relative order of importance of the Technical and Price Factors, and the Subfactors under the Technical and Price Factors.	This information will be provided in the final RFP.
248	3/21/2023	Draft RFP	Page 97	Section 1.1	Draft Solicitation, Section 1.1 Source Selection Methodology (pages 97) states that "[t]he DHS will only accept and evaluate one (1) proposal from each Offeror for each Functional Category. …If the Offeror elects to be considered for more than one of the socioeconomic tracks, the same one (1) proposal will be evaluated only amongst the other Offerors within the respective socioeconomic tracks." •Please clarify/confirm that an Offeror under multiple socio-economic categories can submit a proposal for more than one track within each Functional Category (e.g., an SDVOSB/WOSB can submit a proposal within Functional Category 1 under the SDVOSB track and the WOSB track. •Please explain how an offeror "elects" to be considered for more than one of the socioeconomic tracks within the same Functional Category.	Per the Draft Solicition, Section 1.1, "If the Offeror elects to be considered for more than one of the socioeconomic tracks, **the same one (1) proposal** will be evaluated only amongst the other Offerors within the respective socioeconomic tracks." Meaning, if an offeror has multiple socio-econominc categories and would like to be consider for more than one track under the same Functional Category, then that Offeror will only submit one proposal for that Functional Category. The offeror shall only provide one proposal per Functional Category regardless of how many tracks it would like the DHS to considered it for. Furthermore, if the offeror would like to "elect" to be considered for more than one of the tracks within the same Functional Category, then it should state which ones by fulfilling the requirement in 52.212-1 Addendum, para. 3.1(e).

249	3/21/2023	Draft RFP	Page 98	Section 1.6	Draft Solicitation, Section 1.6 Exclusion of Grossly Deficient Proposals (page 98), please define and provide examples of "essential requirements of the solicitation".	"Essential requirements of the solicitation" are those items that are "absolutely necessary". This is based on the definition of "essential" in the dictionary.
250	3/21/2023	Draft RFP	Page 99	Section 1.7	Draft Solicitation, Section 1.7 Discussions (page 99), given the Government's stated intent to not conduct discussions, please provide some examples of the types of "minor or clerical errors" for which clarifications may be required.	Please reference FAR 14.407 (FAR 15.306 (b)(3)(i))
251	3/21/2023	Draft RFP	Page 99	Section 1.8	Draft Solicitation, Section 1.8 Correction Potential (page 99), please define "correction potential".	This will be provided in the final RFP.
252	3/21/2023	Draft RFP	Page 107, Page 109, and Page 82	Section 3.2.2.1.2 and Table 3 and Section 4.3.2.2	Draft Solicitation, Section 3.2.2.1.2 Non-Federal DHS Contracts and First-Tier Subcontracts Experience (page 107), states that "[t]he DHA will use the following methods to evaluate PQP's Non-Federal DHA Contracts …". However, Table 3 (page 109) and Draft Solicitation Section 4.3.2.2, Verification of Projects Experience Submission (Non-Federal [Government] Contracts and all First-Tier Subcontracts) (page 82), states that "[t]his verification method should be used when submitting project experience under non-Federal Government Contracts…" (emphasis added). Please resolve this apparent inconsistency.	52.212-1 Addendum, para. 4.3.2.2, refers to documents that the offeror is required to submit so the DHS can verify the Non-Federal Contracts and all First-Tier Subcontract experience it would like to claim. Once the offeror submits this required information, those documents will then be evaluated in accordance with 52.212-2 Addendum, Section 3.2.2.1.2(1)-(6) which states, "The DHS will visually review the document fields noted on the evaluation checklist below". The evaluation checklist stated in 3.2.2.1.2 is Table 3, so one is referring to the other.
253	3/21/2023	Draft RFP	Page 102	Section 3.1	Draft Solicitation, Section 3.1 Initial Evaluation - Acceptability Review, subpar. 4) (page 102), indicates the DHS' review will include a "top level review of the documentation." Please clarify/describe what is meant by "top level review" of the documentation.	A "top level review of the documentation" will be skimming the documentation provided in the proposal to ensure large pieces of information are not missing. A more thorough review to ensure all required documentation was provided will be conducted later in the source selection.
254	3/21/2023	N/A	N/A	N/A	If an offeror is notified of its removal from the competition (e.g., for failing the Acceptability Review), will that offeror be able to receive a pre-award debriefing at that time? If not, will that offeror be required to wait until after award to receive a debriefing?	An offeror will not be notified until the end of the source selection as to whether or not it will receive an award. Ref. 52.212-1 Addendum, para. 2.2 and 52.212-2 Addendum, para. 2.0. Language will be adjusted in the final RFP to ensure clarity is provided on this topic.
255	3/21/2023	Attachment 9	N/A	N/A	Attachment 9, FC2 Self-Scoring Sheet, line 109, states Secret Clearance (If taking credit for Secret, answer No to Less than Secret). Please clarify what is meant by "[i]f taking credit for Secret, answer No to Less than Secret".	The statement "If taking credit for Secret, answer No to Less than Secret" was included by error. This will be corrected in the final RFP.
256	3/21/2023	Attachment 10	N/A	N/A	Attachment 10, FC3, Self-Scoring Sheet, line 109, states Secret Clearance (If taking credit for Secret, answer No to Less than Secret). Please clarify what is meant by "[i]f taking credit for Secret, answer No to Less than Secret".	The statement "If taking credit for Secret, answer No to Less than Secret" was included by error. This will be corrected in the final RFP.
257	3/21/2023	Attachment 14	N/A	N/A	Attachment 14, Qualifying Projects Examples, includes six examples of how each project would be analyzed by the DHS to determine if it would qualify. It is respectfully requested that the DHS also provide an example of an evaluation involving a Federal Government Contract submittal which includes a SOW/PWS.	Thank you for your recommendation.
258	3/21/2023	Draft RFP: section 4.2, paragraph 4	PDF Pg 78		The current instructions for the self-scoring sheets allow offerors to submit an unlimited number of projects for verification for each proposal. Currently, in just a single functional category, one company could submit over 300 contracts without adding any additional tabs to the self-scoring sheet. Additionally, with the current requirements for teaming and scoring, it is likely that offerors will be submitting hundreds, and even thousands of contracts for verification – along with all of the verification documentation to prove that experience, which could be thousands and hundreds of thousands of pages – for every single proposal. We suggest that the government updates the scoring requirements to ease the burden of both proposal preparation and evaluation by limiting the maximum number of contracts for submission, and/or updating the scoring system from an uncapped accumulation method, to a mean/average of the scores submitted for each dollar range.	Thank you for your recommendation.
259	3/21/2023	Draft RFP section e	PDF Pg 80		Offerors may currently submit contracts in which they performed as a prime or subcontractor. If a team is comprised of members who performed as a prime AND a subcontractor on a contract (team member A was the prime and team member B was a subcontractor to team member A on the contract), can those individual portions of that contract both be used as project experience? If so, can the government provide guidance on how offerors are to score these individual portions (would the obligated dollar value be the obligated dollar value for that specific portion of the work performed by each member of the team)?	Per 52.212-1 Addendum para. 4.3.1.1(c), for experience to be relevant it cannot be claimed more than once for each Functional Category.
260	3/21/2023	Draft RFP: Section 4.0	PDF Pg 82		The current self-scoring requirements only take into account the obligated dollar value of a contract and relevance to the PACTS III tasks. We suggest a scoring methodology that accounts for performance by incorporating CPARS scores and/or PPQs. This will ensure that offerors who provide a higher quality standard of performance to their customers, have a better chance of being selected for the contract, thus providing a higher quality pool of offerors to propose on PACTS III task orders.	Thank you for your recommendation.
261	3/21/2023	Draft RFP: section 10.0; section 1.1; section c; section 3.0	PDF Pg 52; Pg 69; Pg 80; Pg 101		The instructions on page 69 encourage offerors whose companies fall under multiple socioeconomic categories to easily submit the same contracts across multiple proposals, while the instructions on page 80 and 101 imply that a single contract can only be used once per functional category and proposal. Since the instructions on page 54 allow a single company to be a part of multiple teams proposing on the PACTS III master contract, we suggest that the government also allow companies that are part of multiple teams to submit their contracts across multiple proposals as long as they are proposing for different socioeconomic categories (1 contract per functional category per socioeconomic category).	Per 52.212-1 Addendum, para. 4.3.1, in order for a project to qualify as Experience it must meet the definitions of relevant and recent. Paragraph 4.3.1.1 (c) further states that a project is relevant when, "It is not being claimed more than once for each Functional Category". In other words, a project can only be claimed once for each Functional Category regardless if an offeror would like to be considered under multiple socioeconomic categories or want to be a part of multiple teams under one Functional Category. Additionally, per 52.212-1 Addendum, para. 1.1, "The DHS will only accept and evaluate one (1) proposal from each Offeror for each Functional Category. One proposal constitutes, one or a set of self-scoring sheets including claims from one of the following: an individual business, a Joint Venture, a Teaming Arrangement or Mentor Protégé. **If the Offeror elects to be considered for more than one of the socioeconomic tracks, the same one (1) proposal will be evaluated only amongst the other Offerors within the respective socioeconomic tracks".** In other words, if an offeror would like to be considered for multiple socioeconomic tracks within the same Functional Category, the offeror only submits one proposal and states which tracks it would like the DHS to consider them under per 52.212-1 Addendum, para. 3.1(e)
262	3/21/2023	Draft RFP: Section 4.1	PDF Pg 77		Offerors are required to submit documentation to verify claims stated in the Self-Scoring Sheet(s). Should offerors include the entire document or only the relevant portion of the document as verification?	Offerors shall include the entire document and highlight/tag/provide an index to the pertinent areas. Ref. 52.212-1 Addendum para. 4.3.2.1(a)(ii) and (c)(iii); para. 4.3.2.2(c)
263	3/21/2023	Draft RFP: Table 6	PDF Pg 75		Offerors are required to include experience verification in a separate file within the Technical Acceptability submission. Will the government be providing a more specific instructions/structure for offerors to follow when submitting this file or are offerors able to structure the verification ourselves?	The draft RFP does not have more specific instructions/structure for offerors to follow when submitting files. We recommend you review the final RFP for any future changes.
264	3/21/2023	Draft RFP: Table 7	PDF Pg 76		Offerors are required to include experience verification in a separate file within the Technical Acceptability submission. Due to the likelihood of extremely large file sizes, and considering this is an email submission, will the government allow offerors to submit this requirement in multiple files?	The DHS is in discussions with its IT Department regarding email size limitations. Please review the final RFP for further instructions.
265	3/21/2023	Draft RFP: Section 4.0	PDF Pg 111		The government states "the overall responsibility determination will be made on an acceptable/ non-acceptable basis. The government cannot award to an Offeror who is not responsible". Can the government please define what it considers to have adequate financial resources to perform the contract? Recommend minimum $1M dollar line of credit.	The DHS intends on using sam.gov and FAPIIS to determine a contractor's responsibility.
266	3/21/2023	Draft RFP: Section 2.5.6	PDF Pg 74		Can the government confirm that substantiation documentation does not need to conform the 12-point TNR font requirements?	Per 52.212-1 Addendum, para. 2.5.6, "Page size shall be 8.5 x 11 inches and the text size shall be no less than 12-point Times New Roman font".
267	3/21/2023	GENERAL	N/A		For the SDVOSB category, recommend the Government require the SDVOSB to have applied to or be SBA certified by time of submission. Self-certified SDVOSBs must apply for SBA certification by January 1, 2024 to continue to compete for set-asides. This reduces the risk to the government when a final award is made in the SDVOSB category.	Effective 1/1/23, to be eligible for award as a VOSB or SDVOSB, the vendor must pursue SBA certification of the VOSB/SDVOSB size status. Companies can continue to self-certify if they had an application pending with the SBA. **Small businesses that do not have an application pending with the SBA on or before 12/31/23** will not be eligible to self-certify for SDVOSB sole source or set asides on and after 1/1/24. Since VOSB/SDVOSB type businesses can self-certify without providing proof of an application pending until after 12/31/23 and we intend on having proposals due prior to 12/31/23, then an offeror is not required to submit any additional information that states it is a VOSB/SDVOSB.
268	3/21/2023	GENERAL	N/A		Due to the limited number of awards for each track, we recommend the government require that offerors submit a Multi-Award IDIQ contract reference with resulting task orders to prove their ability to compete, execute, and manage once awarded a prime contract on the PACTS III IDIQ.	Thank you for your recommendation.
269	3/21/2023	GENERAL	N/A		Can the government clarify what the tie-breaker is going to be for offerors that score that same number of points?	The DHS does not anticipate any ties; therefore, no tie-breakers exist.
270	3/21/2023	GENERAL	N/A		Due to the likelihood that proposing teams will be comprised of companies from multiple socioeconomic categories (to include large businesses), we recommend that the government adds additional scoring criteria to encourage companies which do fall into the socioeconomic category for the track they are submitting for to submit contracts (i.e. a SDVOSB company submitting contracts on the SDVOSB track scores higher than a large business subcontractor to a SDVOSB company submitting on the SDVOSB track).	Thank you for your recommendation.
271	3/21/2023	Part I - Continuation of SF1449	4		The 5th paragraph does not state that incentive contracts are allowed. However in Part III - Terms and Conditions, Paragraph 14.0 Task Order Contract Types lists FAR Subpart 16.4 Incentive Contracts. Which is correct?	Fixed-Price Incentive orders are allowed on PACTS III. This is captured by the statement, "allows for Fixed-Price (FP) **and its various forms" under the 5th paragraph of "Part I- Continuation of SF 1449"**
272	3/21/2023	Part III - Terms and Conditions	59		Is there a limit to the amount that can be purchased on the Government-wide purchase card?	Per FAR 13.301 the Government-wide purchase card may be used to make micro-purchases which currently has a threshold of $10,000 for non-SCLS services and $2,500 for SCLS services.
273	3/21/2023	Part V - Solicitation Provisions, Instructions & Evaluation; Attachment 8	74		The scoring would indicate that a project that is valued at over $50M is valued at 1/37th the value of a project that is under $1M. Is this correct? If so, that would mean a company with ten contacts valued at $900K per contract would receive 37 times the points of a $50M contract.	For Functional Category 1, the offeror will receive 74 points for projects between $50,000.01-$1M and 2 points for projects greater than $50,000,000.01 if they meet the requirements of the solicitation. For more information as how the point system was developed, see 52.212-1 Addendum, para. 4.2
274	3/21/2023	Part V - Solicitation Provisions, Instructions & Evaluation	92		If an offeror has multiple small business designations, do they have to submit a separate proposal for each designation within each FC? As an example, our company is an 8(a) and SDVOSB. Do we need to submit 2 separate proposals, one for 8(a) and a separate proposal for SDVOSB for FC1?	Per the Draft Solicitation, Section 1.1, "If the Offeror elects to be considered for more than one of the socioeconomic tracks, the same one (1) proposal will be evaluated only amongst the other Offerors within the respective socioeconomic tracks." Meaning, if an offeror has multiple socio-econominc categories and would like to be consider for more than one track under the same Functional Category, then that Offeror will only submit one proposal for that Functional Category. The offeror shall only provide one proposal per Functional Category regardless of how many tracks it would like the DHS to considered it for. Furthermore, if the offeror would like to "elect" to be considered for more than one of the tracks within the same Functional Category, then it should state which ones by fulfilling the requirement in 52.212-1 Addendum, para. 3.1(e).
275	3/21/2023	Draft RFP	64	Part 5, para 1.1	Will the Government confirm that bidders must submit a separate and complete proposal for each Functional Category it bids, or just submit a separate Technical Volume for each Functional Category it bids??	Bidders must submit a separate and complete proposal for each Functional Category it bids.
276	3/21/2023	Draft RFP	7-10, 14	Part 2, FAR 52.212-5	Under listing for FAR 52.212-5, FAR clause 52.204-25 is referenced. It is also listed in full on pages 7-10. Will the Government delete the reference by clause on page 14 to eliminate the duplication?	Per the FAR matrix, 52.204-25 may be incorporated by reference. Therefore, the DHS will consider deleting the 52.204-25 that is in full text
277	3/21/2023	Draft RFP	48	Part 3, para 9.1	In para 9.1 Security Clearances, the Government states that bidders must provide employees with the appropriate clearances. Can employees with interim security clearances perform on this contract?	The PACTS III team was unable to locate the statement, bidders must provide employees with the appropriate clearances" in Part III, para. 9.1. This section pertains to Task Order personnel and the security requirements will be at the dicretion of the Ordering Contractng Officer (OCO)
278	3/21/2023	Draft RFP	50	Part 3, para 11.0	Para 11.0, On Ramping/Off Ramping of Contractors Post Contract Award states, " There will be no open season to publicly post and allow for new offerors after the original solicitation closing date. Will the Government remove this sentence and allow for an on-ramping period after the first option period (five years into POP) for all eligible companies? Our rationale is that for a contract with a ten year POP, many bidders who submit a bid for PACTS III will outgrow the size standards in a course of five years, and many outstanding new companies will become qualified to submit a bid. By leaving the guidance as written, the Government will not receive the benefits of best qualified companies because many of the companies that could "fleet up" will be those that are average and not grow out of the size standard.	Thank you for your recommendation. Also, please note that the first option period ends three years into the POP (Ref. 52.212-1 Addendum, para.1.2).
279	3/21/2023	Draft RFP	50	Part 3, para 11.0 (i)	This paragraph states, " Unilateral off-ramping of contractors within functional areas and socio-economic categories will occur based on the following: (i) Re-certification concludes that contractor has outgrown their size standard." Will the Government remove this line from the contract? Rationale is that companies that successfully get an award and then are successful in winning task orders should not be penalized and removed from the contract due to outstanding performance driving growth. Small businesses that get a contract award should remain on the contract and eligible to compete for task orders for the entire period of performance.	The statement in draft RFP Part III, para. 11.0, "Unilateral off-ramping of contractors within functional areas and socio-economic categories will occur based on the following: (i) Re-certification concludes that contractor has outgrown their size standard" is to comply with the requirements outlined in FAR 19.301-2 and 52.219-28. (Also, reference draft RFP Part III, para. 16.0 for information about Re-Representation)
280	3/21/2023	Draft RFP	51	Part 3, para 11.0 (v)	This paragraph states, " Unilateral off-ramping of contractors within functional areas and socio-economic categories will occur based on the following: (v) Contractor has not met the Minimal Contract Sales Requirement IAW the section in Part III Terms and Conditions titled, "Minimum Contract Sales Requirement." Will the Government consider changing the criteria to establishing a requirement for a minimum number of bids submitted? The objective is to have contract holders interested in competition, and you may have a company that submits many competitive proposals, but is not successful in getting an award for all the reasons that source selection drives awards. To Off-ramp a company that has submitted proposals in good faith but has been unsuccessful in obtaining an award seems unjust.	Thank you for your recommendation.
281	3/21/2023	Draft RFP	54	Part 3, para 16.1	Para 16.1 c. states that a small business must recertify its size standard within 60-120 days prior to the end of the fifth year in the contract. Para 16.1 I states that timely representation of size and socioeconomic statement is required prior to the completion of the PACTS II base ordering period (which is 3 years). Recommend para 16.1 i. be changed to state that "Timely representation of size and socioeconomic status is required prior to the completion of the PACTS III first Option Period..." This will make it consistent with para 16.1 c.	Thank you for your recommendation. The statement, "Timely rerepresentation of size and socioeconomic status is required prior to the completion of the PACTS III base ordering period" is an occurance that is unique to this acquisition that triggers rerepresentation, in addition to those listed in 16.0 (a)-(d).
282	3/21/2023	Draft RFP	69	Part 5, para 2.5.5	This paragraph provides guidance for marking the first page of each Volume. Can bidders have a cover page with this information and other identification data (e.g., Volume Title, Bidder Name, etc.) on a Cover Sheet for each of the 4 volumes and not count towards the page count?	Based on the draft RFP, the offeror cannot provide a cover page with the information you are requesting. Please see the final RFP for possible updates to this portion of the RFP.
283	3/21/2023	Draft RFP	74	Part 5, Table 8	Does the valuation of points based on size structure properly align with the intended focus area and risk assessment for the government? At review it appears that the lower the points the government is not intending to assess risk with past performance which is the best practice for the use of past performance. Rather the assessment method is giving favor to more high risk competitors and lowering the value of more experienced team members. This is in opposition to best practices for use of past performance. The rationale is that the larger a task order, the more complex the management and execution requirements are on the private contractor. Companies should be rewarded for performing on more complex task orders, not penalized. The weight on $50,000 to $1M task orders is extremely high for a total value of a contract over the normal three to five year period of performance. A contract of this size over three year POP might have about 4 FTEs on it. This criteria is going to penalize many companies with strong credentials because companies have very few, if any task orders or contracts with a value under $1M over the full period of performance.	Per 52.212-1 Addendum, para. 4.2, "The points system was developed for each functional category by using historical actuals. This data was then used to project the DHS's future need. The total number of anticipated orders for PACTS III was derived from the data and then points were proportioned based upon the number of orders that had the characteristics that the DHS would benefit from."
284	3/21/2023	Draft RFP	75	Part 5, para 4.3.1.2	Para 4.3.1.2 a. Project Recency states, "The performance has occurred within two years (730) calendar days since issuance of this solicitation. Will the Government clarify that this means the end date of the Period of Performance is within this period? Or must all performance be within this period?	The offeror must of completed six (6) consecutive months of performance on the project within two years since the issuance of the solicitation.
285	3/21/2023	Draft RFP	77	Part 5, para 4.3.2.2 (a)	This paragraph discusses verification documents for non-federal contracts and all first tier contracts. In subpara (a), it asks for a signed copy of conformed contract award documents or original contract award documents and associated modifications. First Tier subcontractors will not have access to contract documents. Request this language be updated to refer to conformed subcontracts or subcontracting documents as delineated by the subcontract agreement.	If the offeror is claiming a project that it performed as a First-Tier Subcontractor, the offeror shall provide the signed copy of conformed contract award documents or original contract award documents and associated modifications that was between them and the Prime.
286	3/21/2023	Draft RFP	79	Part 5, para 5.1	Para 5.1 states, " Attachment 4 shall be submitted in Excel, unlocked, formulas included…" Please clarify that the formulas you are discussing are the ones developed by the Government for the option years. If not, please clarify what formulas must be included.	Yes, the formulas that this statement is referring to are those that were developed by the Government for the option years.
287	3/21/2023	Draft RFP	79-80	Part 5, para 5.1	Will the Government accept a submission with one or two of the Functional Categories vice all three categories?	The offeror is not required to submit a proposal for all three Functional Categories. Per 52.212-1 Addendum, para. 2.5.7 and para. 3.1(d), the offeror submits one proposal as defined in para. 1.1 for each of the Functional Category(ies) it would like the DHS to consider them for.

288	3/21/2023	Draft RFP	81	Part 5, para 6.1.2	Para 6.1.2 Part II requires offerors to fill out and submit all required clauses. Request that the Government identify all required clauses for this submission.	Thank you for your recommendation.
289	3/21/2023	Draft RFP	74	Part 5, para 4.3	Bidders are required to submit supporting documentation for contracts cited on Attachments 8-10. How does the Government want us to identify each supporting documentation to link it to the correct line on the Technical Exhibits. One proposed solution is to have a Bold Line before each set of supporting documentation showing the line number, project title, and total obligated value. They would be attached to the corresponding Attachment (8,9 or 10) in the order cited on the Attachment.	Thank you for your recommendation.
290	3/21/2023	Draft RFP	68	Part 5, Table 5	Request the Government delete the page count limits for Volume II, Accounting System Verification. DCAA documentation of accounting system verification most times exceeds five pages. There should be no page limit for this section.	Thank you for your recommendation.
291	3/21/2023	Draft RFP	68	Part 5, Table 5	Does the Government require statements for bidders that there are no Organizational Conflicts of Interest? If so, there in the proposal should this statement be placed?	The offeror shall follow the guidance provided in 52.212-1 Addendum, para. 3.1(l), Part III, paras. 10.0 and 10.1 and any other applicable terms and conditions, provisions or clauses.
292	3/21/2023	Draft RFP	68	Part 5, Table 5	FAR Clause 52.237-10 requires bidders to identify its Uncompensated Overtime Policy. Where in the volume should this policy be submitted? There should be no page count limitation for this document.	This provision will be removed from the IDIQ since it requires proposed hours which are not know until task orders are solicited. Therefore, this provision will not be applicable at the IDIQ level but may apply to task orders. If it does, the Ordering Contracting Officer will include it in the solicitation for its task order.
293	3/21/2023	Draft RFP	107	Part 5, FAR 52.212-3	For Joint Venture bidders, are the Reps and Certs submitted for the Joint Venture only, or for each member of the Joint Venture?	As a Joint Venture (JV), the offeror would only have to submit one Reps and Certs for that established JV under that UEI. The reps and certs must include completed copies of both FAR 52.212-3 (unless the condition in the first paragraph of 52.212-3 is applicable) and 52.219-1 so the DHS can ensure compliance with FAR 19.301-1 (Ref. 52.212-1 Addendum, para. 3.1 (e)).
294	3/21/2023	Attachments 1,5			There are no Labor Categories to support the requirements of the PWS in para C.3.1 FC1 2. Professional Support Services. Will the Government add Labor Categories to perform Web Design, Database Design, Graphic Design and Printing Services?	The Government will review this language and requirement. Any changes will be incorporated in the final RFP.
295	3/21/2023	Attachments 8,9,10,13			Bidders are required to enter Experience Projects based on their Total Obligated Value. There are no instructions on how to compute the Total Evaluated Value. Questions we have include: 1), Do we only compute values up the end of the last base period or option period that has been completed; or compute the value up through a date you will specify in the final solicitation; Do we compute the Total Obligated Dollars since award of the contract; or 4) Do we compute the Total Obligated Dollars for work performed in the two year period cited in Part 5? Request the Government provide very clear guidance on both the periods of performance we will use and how to complete the Total Obligated dollars so me meet the Government's intent for this factor. The guidance in attachment 13 is not clear partially because the date is listed as "XX" and one part mentions the POP must start within two (2) years of "XX" date, but below the example shows a three year POP.	Thank you for your recommendaiton.
296	3/21/2023	Attachments 1,11		Part 1	On page 4 of Part 1, Attachment 11, and on Page 1 of Attachment1, The Government lists the three NAICs codes that will be used for Task Orders issued under the three Functional Categories, and proposal submission requirements will only consider projects that have the corresponding NAICS codes (541611, 561110 and 541330). This is very constraining for bidders, as Administrative, Management, General Management Consulting Services; Office Administrative Services; and Engineering Services can be executed under several other NAICS codes at the discretion of the Government. In order to allow bidders to show their full capabilities in support of each of the Functional Categories, will the Government consider allowing bidders to submit experience projects using the following additional NAICS Codes for each Functional Category: Functional Category 1: 541430, 541519, 541612, 541613,541614, 541618; Functional Category 2: 541219, 561210, 561410, 561431, 561492, 561499; and Functional Category 3: 541490, 541620, 541690	Projects must be similar to the services outlined in the SOW pertaining to the Functional Category the offeror is submitting its offer for (Ref. 52.212-1 Addendum 4.3.1.1(a)). If the Offeror believes the NAICS/PSC code assigned to the contract was not correct then it shall follow the instructions provided in FAR 52-212-1 Addendum, para 4.3.2.1 (a)(ii) and 4.3.2.1 (c). This information will be evaluated based on 52.212-2, para. 3.2.2.1.1, Element 4 or 3.2.2.1.2, Element 4.
297	3/21/2023	Draft RFP	71-72	Part 5, para 3.1 (k)	Para 3.1 (k) requires bidders to provide a one page diagram depicting the corporate members of your team and their roles in the teaming arrangement. The best way to depict the roles of members of a teaming arrangement is to attach copies of Teaming Arrangement documents such as Mentor Protege Agreements, Joint Venture Agreements, Teaming Arrangements, etc. Will the Government allow bidders to attach these documents to the Executive Summary and not count against the page count?	Please only provide the documents being requested through the final RFP.
298	3/21/2023	Draft RFP	pg. 73 (78 in PDF)	Part 4, Section 4.2	Can the contractor claim points if their facilty clearance is non-possessing?	The offeror must submit the documentation required in 52.212-1 to claim points for facility clearance and must be determined "acceptable" based on the criteria set forth in 52.212-2
299	3/21/2023	Draft RFP	Pg 66 (71 in PDF)	Part 4, Section 1.3	What constitutes as being “highly technically rated” in each FC? Is this a point range? For example: offerors whose self-score is between 190-196 (FC 1) will be evaluated first?	See 52.212-2, para. 1.2
300	3/21/2023	General	n/a	n/a - general	Are there a max number of awards for each FC?	Per 52.216-27, "The government estimates five (5) awards in each of the tracks and FCs and may deviate from these numbers".
301	3/21/2023	Draft RFP	106	3.3.2.1 Fairness and Reasonableness	The final bullet point in this section lists one of DHS's burdened rate criteria is "Maximum educational and experience standards outline in Labor Categories and Qualifications, Attachment 5." The educational and experience standards in Attachment 5 are currently only "Minimum Requirements". Can the Government please update Attachment 5 to include the "Maximum Requirements" referenced in this section?	Attachment 5 will remain unchanged; however, language in para. 3.3.2.1 will be updated to reflect "desired" educational and experience standards oppose to "maximum".
302	3/21/2023	Draft RFP	106	3.3.2.1 Fairness and Reasonableness	This section has multiple references a pricing file as Attachment 3. Can the Government please provide the Attachment 3 pricing file?	All attachments associated with the final RFP will be provided with the final RFP
303	3/21/2023	Draft RFP	72	4.2 Self-Scoring Sheet	Will the Government consider adding a requirement for a minimum number of experience projects that must come from the prime contractor?	Thank you for your recommendation.
304	3/21/2023	Draft RFP	72	4.2 Self-Scoring Sheet	Will the Government consider limiting the number of experience projects submitted for points in PACTS III? Allowing 50+ projects makes it very difficult for small business primes to compete.	Thank you for your recommendation.
305	3/21/2023	Draft RFP	72	4.2 Self-Scoring Sheet	Will the Government consider increasing the points given to larger experience projects with a total obligated dollar range of $25M or greater?	Thank you for your recommendation. Per 52.212-1 Addendum, para. 4.2, "The points system was developed for each functional category by using historical actuals. This data was then used to project the DHS’s future need. The total number of anticipated orders for PACTS III was derived from the data and then points were proportioned based upon the number of orders that had the characteristics that the DHS would benefit from."
306	3/21/2023	Draft RFP	64	1.1 Structure and Objectives	The solicitation states, "Under PACTS III, interested small businesses will be able to submit one (1) proposal from each Offeror for each Functional Category. One proposal constitutes, one or a set of self-scoring sheets including claims from one of the following: an individual business, a Joint Venture, a Teaming Arrangement or Mentor Protege. If the Offeror elects to be considered for more than one of the form (4) socioeconomic tracks, the same one (1) proposal will be used and evaluated only amongst the other Offerors within the respective socioeconomic tracks." Can scoring experience projects come from subcontractors to the prime DHS PACTS III offeror?	Per 52.212-2 Addendum, para. 4.3.1.1 (f) for a project to meet the definition of RELEVANT it can only come from the JV, teaming Arrangement or SBA Mentor-Protégé Arrangement **itself or a member** of the JV, Teaming Arrangment or SBA Mentor-Protégé Arrangement. Meaning if a subcontractor is not a member of the JV, teaming Arrangement or SBA Mentor-Protégé Arrangement as identified in 52.212-1 Addendum, para. 3.1(k) then those projects will not meet the definition of relevant as defined in this solicitation.
307	3/21/2023	Draft RFP	64	1.1 Structure and Objectives	If subcontractors are allowed, is there any restriction on using the same experience projects in multiple proposal submissions?	See reponse above. As for restrictions on using the same experience projects in multiple proposal submissions, per 52.212-2 Addendum, para. 3.2.2.1.1 and 3.2.2.1.2, a project must be in-scope of the Functional Category/NAICS in order for the offeror to receive points. Due to the large difference between each Functional Category it would be difficult to state that one project meets the scope of more than one Functional Category. The intent is that once one project is used, it cannot be used again, in any capacity.
308	3/21/2023	Standard Form 1449	Pg. 3	Block 10	Should all three NAICS (541611, 561110, 541330) and applicable size standards be identified in this block? Currently, the block only reflects NAICS 561110 with a size standard of $12.5M. Part I - Continuation of SF 1449 include the NAICS code but does not include the size standards.	Each IDIQ contract can only be assigned one NAICS code and size standard. Therefore, there is only one in Block 10. The SF 1449 that has been included in the solicitation represents a "model contract" and the NAICS code and size standard will be updated based on each IDIQ contract. For example, all offerors that are awarded a contract for FC 1, will have NAICS 541611 and the size standard in Block 10 of the 1449. For more information about the applicable NAICS and size standards, reference 52.212-1 Addendum, Table 1 and Table 7 and provision 52.219-1, Alt II.
309	3/21/2023	Draft RFP	Pg. 81	6.1.1.1 Initial/Minimum Order Price (CLIN 0002) (a) (2)	Attachment 1, Section C.8.3 and Section 6.1.1.1 conflicts with the maximum number of vendor attendees allowed to attend the Post Award Confrence (PAC). Attachment 1, Section C.8.3 provides for a maximum of four (4) persons while Section 6.1.1.1 provides for a maximum of two (2) persons. Please confirm the maximum number of Vendor attendees to allow for proper pricing of CLIN 0002.	This information will be clarified in the final RFP.
310	3/21/2023	Draft RFP	Pg. 45	Part III - Terms and Conditions, 3.0 Government Facilities	Section 3.0 states, "The Contractor is responsible for ensuring that its employees do not disturb papers on desks, open desk drawers or cabinets..." This implies that contractor employees on-site will have to share a desk with other personnel. Will Contractor employees working on-site at the Government Facility have assigned work spaces or use hotel seats (i.e. share a desk)?	This will be determined based on the individual needs of the Ordering Contracting Officer and their acquisition. Since this is an IDIQ for many types of requirements, this language is included to try and capture any and all requirements.
311	3/21/2023	Draft RFP	Pg. 66	Part V- Solicitation Provisions, Instructions & Evaluation, 1.3 Proposal Preparation Instructions	This sections states, "Based on marked research, the DHS anticipates the highest technically rated offerors to propose the number of points identified in the ranges below for each FC and track." Please provide the ranges for each FC and track as Table 4. Market Research Results located on page 67 reflects TBD for each FC and track.	This table will be populated based on the results from the survey that was issued with the draft RFP. Therefore, this table cannot be populated until after the initial draft RFP.
312	3/21/2023	Draft RFP	Pg. 80	Part V- Solicitation Provisions, Instructions & Evaluation, 5.1 Labor Category Price Proposal	Current BLS data shows the CPI Inflation in current market conditions to be 7% from January 2022, which is above the 3% escalation. To allow for adjustments to the escalation factor during contract performance, would the Government please include 52.216-4, Economic Price Adjustment - Labor and Material to the contract?	Thank you for your recommendation.
313	3/21/2023	Draft RFP	Pg. 92	Part V- Solicitation Provisions, Instructions & Evaluation, Addendum to FAR 52.212-2 Evaluation - Commercial Products and Commercial Services (Nov 2021); 1.1 Source Selection Methodology	States, " The DHS intends to make approcimately five (5) awards for each socioeconomic track within each Functional Category as described in 52.216-27 of this solicition." Does DHS plan to make 5 Awards for each socioeconomic track or four (4) award as stated in section 1.1 PACTS III Structure and Objectives located on page 64?	The DHS intends to make approximately five (5) awards for each socioeconomic track within each Functional Category as described in 52.216-27 of this solicition.
314	3/21/2023	Standard Form 1449	Pg. 3	Block 18a. And Block 18b.	Box 18a. or Box 18b. should be checked. Please enter either the payment address in Box 18a. Or check box located at 18b.	Thank you for your recommendation.
315	3/21/2023	Draft RFP	Pg. 64	Part III, Terms and Conditions, Section 19.0 Invoicing Procedures	Section 19.0 Invoicing Procedures appears to be missing the normal invoicing procedures. The procedures listed apply only to the Minimum Guarantee Instructions, CLIN 0002.	There are only invoicing procedures pertaining to the minimum order on the IDIQ since that will be the only order that is directly invoiced against the PACTS III IDIQ. All other invoices will be handled at the individual task order level issued by the ordering contracting officer. The invoicing procedures are unique to each of those TOs; therefore, detailed invoicing instructions will be provided in each TO for that specific TO.
316	3/21/2023	Draft RFP	Pg. 72; Pg. 90; Pg. 92	Part V - Solicitation Provisions, Instructions & Evaluation, 4.2. Self-Scoring Sheet; FAR 52.212-2 Evaluation - Commercial Products and Commercial Services (NOV 2021); and 1.1 Source Selection Methodogy	4.2. Self-Scoring Sheet states, "Only the information contained within the Self-Scoring Sheet(s) will be considered in the evaluation; therefore, the Offeror must include all the information it would like the DHS to consider." FAR 52.212-2 Evaluation does not include 4.2 Self-Scoring Sheet. 1.1 Source Section Methodology also does not include the Self-Scoring Sheet. Please confirm how the Self-Scoring sheet will be scored in the evaluation process.	Per 52.212-2 Addendum, para. 2.0, "The evaluation process will begin by ranking the proposals in order from highest total claimed score". This score is derived from cell B1 of the Self-Scoring sheet (Ref. 52.212-1 Addendum, para.4.2)
317	3/21/2023	Draft RFP	Pg. 75	Part V - Solicitation Provisions, Instructions & Evaluation, 4.3 Experience (Subfactor 1.1) (c)	(c) requires that a project is not being claimed more than once for each Functional Category. Would the Government please define a project under a Multiple Award (MA) IDIQ? Example: For Multiple Award (MA) IDIQs is a project defined as an individual Task Order or Delivery Order or is a project defined as the MA IDIQ and any Task Order(s) or Delivery Order(s) issued under the IDIQ be considered one project?	For Multiple Award (MA) IDIQs, a project is defined as an individual Task Order or Delivery Order since that is where dollars are obligated.
318	3/21/2023	Draft RFP	92	1.1 Source Selection Methodology	In recognition of PACTS being DHS's flagship SDVOSB vehicle for almost 15 years, would the government consider increasing the number of SDVOSB awardees to 15 in each FC? We understand the government's desire to support additional socioeconomic categories on PACTS III, but in doing so, you're hurting the SDVOSB community by reducing the number of awardees from 20+ on PACTS II FC1 to 5 on PACTS III. PACTS I and II were so successful based on the contributions of the SDVOSB community and we would appreciate if the government would factor this into the award structure for PACTS III.	Thank you for your recommendation.
319	3/21/2023	Draft RFP	92	1.1 Source Selection Methodology	We recommend the government consider increasing the number of awardees for each functional category and socioeconomic track to at least 10+. In our experience, most PACTS II RFPs have a less than 50% response rate from vendors, so reducing the awardees from 20+ on PACTS II to 5 in each socioeconomic category on PACTS III is far too low for healthy competition at the task order level, even more so considering the government is not currently requiring vendors to possess a facility clearance at the time of proposal submission. This response rate is consistent with similar vehicles, like OASIS SB, which has hundreds of awardees and typically sees single digit bids on each TO RFP. There were only 7 winners on PACTS I FC 1 and the government increased that to 20+ on PACTS II FC 1 to address this issue and ensure adequate task order competition.	Thank you for your recommendation.
320	3/21/2023	Draft RFP	47	8.2 Sensitive Information	This section states the base PACTS III IDIQ contracts do not have a minimum requirement for security clearances, but an existing facility clearance may be required for task order awards. Would the government reconsider and require awardees to possess a minimum Secret clearance? With so few awardees in each socioeconomic category (only 5), it's plausible that some may not have a facility clearance and will not be able to bid on certain task orders, resulting in minimal competition. We believe it is in the government's best interest to require all awardees to possess at least a Secret facility clearance at the time of proposal submission to ensure adequate competition at the task order level.	Thank you for your recommendation.
321	3/21/2023	Draft RFP	59	21.0 Minimum Contract Sales Requirement	This section states contractors will be off-ramped if they do not have $250,000 in awarded task order value by the end of the three-year base period. Will the government consider removing this requirement? PACTS III includes 12 different set-aside options (4 socioeconomic tracks across 3 functional categories), so awards will be far more dispersed than they were under PACTS I and II. It's plausible that certain set-aside groups may not be used as heavily as others and there won't be equal opportunity for all contractors to win $250,000 within the first three years. We believe this clause will unfairly penalize the contractors on less used tracks/FCs, which is outside of their control.	Thank you for your recommendation.
322	3/21/2023	Draft RFP	59	21.0 Minimum Contract Sales Requirement	If the government does not remove this clause, please consider changing the requirement from "the Government **will** off ramp the contractor" to "the Government **may** off ramp the contractor" and allow contractors to submit justification for why they should not be off ramped. If a contractor can demonstrate that they are actively bidding on TORFPs and submitting high quality proposals, but have not won $250,000 due to a limited number of opportunities on their set-aside track/FC, we believe they should be allowed to remain on the contract. Unfortunately, on competitive vehicles like PACTS and OASIS where vendors are pre-vetted, active and high-quality participation doesn't always translate to contracts wins, but that doesn't mean a vendor deserves to be automatically off-ramped. Plus, the original pool of 5 anticipated vendors is so small to begin with that automatic off-ramping does not seem warranted or beneficial to the Components.	Thank you for your recommendation.

323	3/21/2023	Draft RFP	64	1.1 Structure and Objectives	This section states "interested small businesses will be able to submit one (1) proposal from each Offeror…" Can one company submit a proposal as a Prime Offeror and also be a subcontractor on another proposal within the same track?	Yes, if that subcontractor is a member of the other offeror's team. Per 52.212-1 Addendum, para. 4.3.1.1 (f), Projects can only come from the JV, teaming Arrangement or SBA Mentor-Protégé Arrangement itself or a member of the JV, Teaming Arrangment or SBA Mentor-Protégé Arrangement. Meaning if a subcontractor is not a member of the JV, teaming Arrangement or SBA Mentor-Protégé Arrangement as identified in 52.212-1 Addendum, para. 3.1(k) then those projects will not meet the definition of relevant as defined in this solicitation. Note that per 52.212-1 Addendum para. 4.3.1.1(c), for experience to be relevant it cannot be claimed more than once for each Functional Category. Additionally, be aware of the terms and conditions surrounding Organizational Conflicts of Interests and Cross-Teaming that are outlined in Part III, Terms and Conditions, paragraphs 10.0 and 10.1.
324	3/21/2023	Draft RFP	68	2.5 Organization/Number of Copies/Page Limits	Table 5 states there is a 5-page limit for Executive Summary and that it should follow Attachment 18, which is an Excel spreadsheet. Are offerors required to submit our Executive Summary in Excel or can we export the table in Attachment 18 to Word/PDF and provide other executive summary content within the 5-page limit?	Per 52.212-1 Addendum, para. 3.1, "A compliant proposal shall include a completed Volume I Cover Sheet, Attachment 18 in Volume I **in workable excel format**".
325	3/21/2023	Draft RFP	68	2.5 Organization/Number of Copies/Page Limits	Would the government consider removing the page limit for the Accounting System Verification Documentation? The documentation includes standard reports from DCAA, DCMA, CPAs, etc. and therefore the page limit is outside of our control.	Thank you for your recommendation.
326	3/21/2023	Draft RFP	70	3.0 Volume I - Executive Summary	Item (i) requires the name, title, and signature of the person authorized to sign our proposal. However, the corresponding row 16 in Attachment 18 does not allow us to insert an electronic signature. Please confirm offerors can export Attachment 18 to PDF to sign electronically. If not, please update the spreadsheet to allow for a signature.	Thank you for your recommendation. Per 52.212-1 Addendum, para. 3.1, "A compliant proposal shall include a completed Volume I Cover Sheet, Attachment 18 in Volume I **in workable excel format**".
327	3/21/2023	Draft RFP	70	3.0 Volume I - Executive Summary	Item (m) includes special requirements for 8(a) offerors to verify their status. Please update the solicitation to require the same level of verification for SDVOSBs and SBA Mentor-Protégé Program (MPP) JVs. For example, SDVOSBs should have to provide a copy of their SAM.gov profile and their SBA Veteran Small Business Certification (VetCert) record to confirm SDVOSB status. Similarly, MPP JVs should have to provide a copy of their approval from SBA to confirm their size and socioeconomic status.	Thank you for your recommendation.
328	3/21/2023	Draft RFP	72	4.2 Self-Scoring Sheet	The 3rd paragraph states there is no limitation to the number of qualifying projects an offeror can claim. We strongly recommend DHS reconsider and set a maximum number of projects, such as 20. By not setting an upper limit, the government is putting a premium on the quantity of teammates/projects vs. the quality of teammates/projects. The scorecard essentially becomes an exercise in building the largest team and heavily favors Mentor-Protege JVs that have a large business mentor. It also places a huge burden on the government to review the excessive amount of paperwork/contract awards/supporting documentation to verify the points for an unlimited number of projects. If the government is concerned about ties, there are other options to break ties, such as the number of projects from the prime vs. subs, number of projects in a certain value range, etc., that provide a more meaningful assessment of team strength than the sheer volume of projects.	Thank you for your recommendation.
329	3/21/2023	Draft RFP	72	4.2 Self-Scoring Sheet	In the spirit of set-aside contracts, would the government consider requiring more than half of the qualifying projects to come from the prime and/or similarly-situated entities (e.g., subcontractor SDVOSBs on the SDVOSB track)? This was a requirement on PACTS II. Without this requirement on PACTS III, the SDVOSB, HubZone, WOSB, and 8(a) tracks can be overtaken by small business subcontractors without regard to socioeconomic category.	The DHS does not understand this question. Please rephrase and submit.
330	3/21/2023	Draft RFP	72	4.2 Self-Scoring Sheet	Would the government consider weighting projects performed within DHS and/or awarding bonus points for DHS projects to recognize the importance of understanding the DHS work environment, systems, components, etc.? With so few awardees anticipated in each track, it's feasible that a majority of them may not bring DHS experience and we believe that would be a detriment to the Components.	Thank you for your recommendation.
331	3/21/2023	Draft RFP	74	4.2 Self-Scoring Sheet	Table 8 shows an equal number of points for having a Secret clearance and a Top Secret clearance. Since offerors only receive points for their highest clearance level, would the government consider giving more weight to having a Top Secret clearance? It's harder to obtain and maintain a Top Secret clearance and that should be reflected in the point scale.	Thank you for your recommendation.
332	3/21/2023	Draft RFP	74	4.2 Self-Scoring Sheet	We recommend the government set a minimum number of projects that must be submitted by the Prime and/or JV Lead/Protégé, such as 5, as well as a maximum number of projects that can be submitted by the JV Mentor, such as 3. As the draft RFP is written now, the large business Mentor of a JV could fill out the entire scorecard with no representation from the small business Prime/Protege and that defeats the purpose of a small business set-aside contract.	Thank you for the recommendation.
333	3/21/2023	Draft RFP	74	4.2 Self-Scoring Sheet	We recommend the government consider adding a few additional scoring elements to evaluate the quality of the prime contractor and ensure they are equipped to manage a contract of this size. For example, additional points could be offered to companies that demonstrate experience managing IDIQ contracts, managing multiple subcontractors on a previous contract, or possessing ISO 9001 Quality Management certification. The government could also evaluate the quality of each offeror's Key Program Manager resume.	Thank you for your recommendation.
334	3/21/2023	Draft RFP	74	4.3.1.1 Project Relevancy	Can the government please clarify how the total project value is calculated? Item (b) states it is based on the total amount of funds that have been obligated for the project and Attachment 8 Self-Scoring Sheet says to include Options. Should funding for unexercised option years be used in calculating total project value or only exercised options?	Total obligated funds includes exercised options only.
335	3/21/2023	Draft RFP	75	4.3.1.1 Project Relevancy	Item (c) states projects cannot be claimed more than once for each functional category. Please confirm our understanding that if Company A submits a proposal as a prime offeror under FC 1 SDVOSB Track and also as a subcontractor under the remaining three tracks on FC 1, Company A's projects can only be used in one FC 1 socioeconomic category proposal. If our understanding is correct, how will the government confirm that projects are not being reused considering the government is only evaluating the highest technically rated offerors? For example, if Company Z is rated highest, the government won't know if they reused their projects in another proposal unless the government compares their submission to every other proposal. Is this the government's intention?	Once a project is used, it cannot be used again for any reason. The DHS will intends on implementing procedures to ensure projects are not used more than once.
336	3/21/2023	Draft RFP	75	4.3.1.1 Project Relevancy	Will the government consider increasing the "recency" window for relevant projects to the industry standard three or five years? Attachment 13 states the start date of projects must have been within the last two years and item (d) on page 75 of the draft RFP states that six consecutive months must have been completed by the date proposals are due. Requiring the start date to be within the last two years eliminates projects that may cover the full two-year window, but were awarded more than two years ago. We recommend the government use the traditional calculation for recency which states projects must have been completed or ongoing within three or five years of the RFP release date.	Thank you for your recommendation. We recognize that there is a disconnect between the RFP and Attachment 13. Per 52.212-1 Addendum, para 4.3.1.1 (d), "The offeror has provided at least six (6) consecutive months of performance **by the date proposals are due**". This does not require that the projects **have been completed** by the date proposals are due. Also, 4.3.1.2 (a) states, "The performance has occurred within two years (730 calendar days) since issuance of this solicitation". This does not require that the project **"started"** within two years since issuance of the solicitation.
337	3/21/2023	Draft RFP	75	4.3.1.1 Project Relevancy	Item (d) on page 75 of the draft RFP states that six consecutive months must have been completed **"by the date proposals are due"**. We recommend changing to this to "as of the RFP release date" to ensure a fixed date in time that is not impacted by potential proposal extensions. Any project eligibility criteria that is based a proposal due date leaves offerors in limbo as their projects eligibility may be in flux based on the shifting proposal due date.	Thank you for your recommendation.
338	3/21/2023	Draft RFP	75	4.3.1.2 Project Recency	Please clarify the recency window. Item (a) states performance must have occurred within two years of the solicitation issuance. However, this conflicts with Attachment 13 which states the PoP start date must have been within two years.	See question above.
339	3/21/2023	Attachment 4	N/A	N/A	The pricing template has a column for base year rates, plus 10 options years for a total of 11 years. Please confirm offerors should only be pricing 10 years total.	Correct, the offerors should only be pricing 10 year total.
340	3/21/2023	Attachment 4	N/A	N/A	Since the period of performance is a three year base period, plus two, three-year option periods, and a one-year option period, we recommend the government update row 5 in the header to Year 1 (Base), Year 2 (Base), Year 3 (Base), Year 4 (Option), and so forth for clarity's sake.	Thank you for your recommendation.
341	3/21/2023	Draft RFP	99	3.2.2.1.1 Federal Government Contract Experience	Element 4: Within Scope of PACTS III requires projects to have an applicable NAICS Code ***and*** PSC Code. Would the government consider accepting projects that have a relevant NAICS Code ***or*** PSC Code?	Projects must be similar to the services outlined in the SOW pertaining to the Functional Category the offeror is submitting its offer for (Ref. 52.212-1 Addendum 4.3.1.1(a)). If the Offeror believes the NAICS/PSC code assigned to the contract was not correct then it shall follow the instructions provided in FAR 52-212-1 Addendum, para 4.3.2.1 (a)(ii) and 4.3.2.1 (c). This information will be evaluated based on 52.212-2, para. 3.2.2.1.1, Element 4.
342	3/21/2023	Attachment 11 Functional Categories Corresponding NAICS PSC	N/A	N/A	Would the government consider adding R799 Other Management Support Services as a corresponding PSC code under NAICS 541330? PSC R799 directly aligns to Attachment 1 Scope of Work, Section C.3.3 FC3, Bullet 1. Program Management Support.	Thank you for your recommendation.
343	3/21/2023	Attachment 16 Project Verification Form	N/A	N/A	Please confirm our understanding that offerors only need to complete and submit Attachment 16 if the combination of FPDS reports, contract award document, and SOW are not sufficient to verify all scoring elements.	The contract award document is required for all projects. For Federal projects - Attachment 16 is only required for Federal projects if there is missing or incorrect information stated on the FPDS report. The SOW/PWS is only required if Attachment 16 is provided. For non-Federal or First-Tier project, Attachment 16 and the SOW is required for all projects.
344	3/21/2023	Attachment 16 Project Verification Form	2	N/A	Element 4 has a field for offerors to list the principal NAICS code, but there is no field for PSC code. How/where should offerors designate the PSC code if it cannot be verified in FPDS reports or contract documentation?	Follow the guidance provided in 52.212-1 Addendum, para. 4.3.2.1(c) and 4.3.2.2 and 52.212-2 Addendum, para. 3.2.2.1.1(c)(ii), 3.2.2.1.2(4)(b)(ii)
345	3/21/2023	Attachment 8 FC1 Self-Scoring Sheet	N/A	N/A	The draft solicitation states that offerors will only receive credit for their highest level clearance (i.e., Secret ***or*** Top Secret clearance, but not both). However, the scorecard itself does not appear to make that distinction. For clarity's sake, we recommend adding language in the scorecard instructing offerors to select "No" for Secret clearance if they are claiming points for Top Secret.	Thank you for your recommendation.
346	3/21/2023	Attachment 8 FC1 Self-Scoring Sheet	N/A	N/A	We recommend adding a column to the self-scoring sheet to list the contract number for each project to facilitate mapping to our supporting documentation.	Thank you for your recommendation.
347	3/21/2023	Draft RFP	67	1.3 Proposal Preparation Instructions	Regarding Table 4 Market Research Results, we greatly appreciate the government's plan to conduct market research and share the results to help offerors make bid/no bid decisions. However, we would request that the government consider not releasing the results if there are any significant changes to the RFP based on industry feedback or reissuing the survey based on any changes. Even a slight change to the scoring criteria for the recency window, eligible PSC codes, RFP release date timing, or how total contract value is calculated, for example, may have a huge impact on an offeror's points. So while the market research results are incredibly valuable to offerors, if the survey is not based on the final evaluation criteria, RFP release date, and recency window, the results may inadvertently mislead offerors.	Thank you for your recommendation.
348	3/21/2023	Draft RFP	67	1.3 Proposal Preparation Instructions	When you share the Table 4 Market Research Results, can you provide the total number of responses and explain what the range is based on (i.e., the high and low scores, the 25-75 percentile, a certain number of standard deviations from the average, etc.). This will help offerors understand the numbers and put them in context.	Thank you for your recommendation.
349	3/21/2023	Attachment 14: Qualifying Project Examples	Page No. 4		Per Attachment 14, example #4, government conflated issuance of solicitation (page 4) of 10/10/2023 and due date (reflected in page 1) of 10/10/2023. **Can you please clarify on whether example #4 would still not qualify to receive the full points based on this clarified data?**	Thank you for bringing this error to our attention. Since the issuance and due date of proposals cannot be the same day we are not able to answer your question. We will fix this error going forward which should help answer your question.
350	3/21/2023	Attachment 14: Qualifying Project Examples	Page No. 6		Refencing Attachment 14, Example No. 6: This example highlights "The offeror can only use its projects on one or the other." Is this example of Sole Proprietorship and Teaming Arrangement implying an offeror "can submit or participate" in multiple bids (Prime and/or Subcontractor within the socio-economic set-asides) but cannot "reuse-recycle" the same relevant and eligible projects?	Yes, it would be possible for industry to participate in multiple team bids as long as they meet all the requirements of the solicitation. We recommend you pay close attention to 52.212-1 Addendum, para. 1.1 as it defines "one proposal". Per 52.212-1 Addendum para. 4.3.1.1(c), for experience to be relevant it cannot be claimed more than once for each Functional Category. Additionally, projects can only come from the JV, Teaming Arrangement or SBA Mentor-Protégé Arrangement itself or a member of the JV, Teaming Arrangment or SBA Mentor-Protégé Arrangement. Meaning if a subcontractor is not a member of the JV, Teaming Arrangement or SBA Mentor-Protégé Arrangement as identified in 52.212-1 Addendum, para. 3.1(k) then those projects will not meet the definition of relevant as defined in this solicitation.
351	3/21/2023	Draft RFP	Page No. 92	Section 1.0, ***Subsection 1.1 Source Selection Methodology***	Based on the statement "If the Offeror elects to be considered for more than one of the socioeconomic tracks, the same one (1) proposal will be evaluated only amongst the other Offerors within the respective socioeconomic tracks," May a JV mentor company of a WOSB protege company (JV) participate in a Prime WOSB bid with a unique UEI (JV's UEI) and that same mentor company with a different UEI bid via a teaming arrangement as a subcontractor to a SDVOSB, HubZone, or 8(a) Prime offeror? If yes, can two bid submissions from two different socio-economic tracks contain the same relevant and eligible projects submitted from two different offerors with two (2) unique UEI's?	Per 52.212-1 Addendum para. 4.3.1.1(c), for experience to be relevant it cannot be claimed more than once for each Functional Category.
352	3/21/2023	Draft RFP	Page No. 74-75	Section 4.3.1, ***Subsection 4.3.1.1 Project Relevancy***	In support of the parameters presented in the Draft RFP about proposal deadline is critical to bid viability for small businesses as we select our eligible and relevant projects. The relevant projects can shift with an amendment that "bumps" the proposal deadline by two (2) to three (3) weeks. The DRFP example date in Attachment 14 of ***10 Oct 2023*** defines the 730 days and six (6) month parameters. **Recommend establishing a firm date** for project relevancy is essential for the small business nature of the offerors. Shifting this date with amendments can negatively impact your available offerors who have invested resources between the draft and final RFP period.	Thank you for your recommendation.
353	3/21/2023	Draft RFP	pg. 15	52.212-5, Contract Terms and Conditions, (b), (19)	Please confirm that Offerors can establish teaming arrangements with all business sizes and subcontractors of varying socioeconomic status. For example, an SDVOSB Prime can partner with a HubZone, EDWOSB, 8(a) or large business subcontractor?	Based on FAR 7.107-6, FAR Provision 52.207-6 is applicable to the draft RFP and states that a Small Business Teaming Arrangement means an arrangement where two or more small business concerns have formed a joint venture; or a small business offeror agrees with one or more other small business concerns to have them act as its subcontractor.
354	3/21/2023	Draft RFP	pg. 64	52.212-1, Addendum, Para 1.1	Paragraph two of this section states, "Unders PACTS III, interested small businesses will be able to submit one (1) proposal from each Offerors for each Functional Category. One proposal constitutes, one or a set of self scoring sheets including claims from one of the following: an individual business, a Joint Venture, a Teaming Arrangement of Mentor Protege." Please confirm and clarify that Offerors can leverage Qualifying Projects of subcontractors under our teaming arrangement, and subcontractors are to provide the same type of documentation per instructions in Section 4.3.2 Verification.	Per 52.212-1 Addendum, para. 4.3.1.1 (f), Projects can only come from the JV, teaming Arrangement or SBA Mentor-Protégé Arrangement itself or a member of the JV, Teaming Arrangment or SBA Mentor-Protégé Arrangement. Meaning if a subcontractor is not a member of the JV, teaming Arrangement or SBA Mentor-Protégé Arrangement as identified in 52.212-1 Addendum, para. 3.1(k) then those projects will not meet the definition of relevant as defined in this solicitation. A subcontractor is not a member of the teaming arrangement unless there is a written agreement between all parties and a team is formed. Yes, a teaming arrangement, JV, to include all its members will be recognized as the "offeror"; therefore, the offeror is required to provide all the documentation required by the solicitation to verify each project it claims.
355	3/21/2023	Draft RFP	pg.70	52.212-1, Addendum, Para 2.5.7, Table 6 Proposal Naming Conventions	We respectfully recommned UEI_FCXX_Volume II to include the Glossary of Abbreviations and Acronyms and Self Scoring Sheets to be named under individual files using nomenclature(s) UEI_FCXX_Volume II_Self Scoring Sheets_FC#	Thank you for your recommendation.
356	3/21/2023	Attachment 14, Qualifying Project Examples, Example 4	pg. 75	5.2.212-1, Addendum, Para 4.3.1.1 Project Relevancy (d) 52.212-1, Addendum, Para 4.3.1.2 Project Recency (a)	Section 4.3.1.1 (d) states that relevancy is identified, in terms of period of performance, ". . . offeror has provided at least six (6) consecutive months of performance by the data proposals are due." Section 4.3.1.2 (a) states that qualifying projects must indicate "The performance has occurred within two years (730 calendar days) since issuance of this solicitation." Attachment 14 uses examples considering October 10, 2023 as the proposal due date. In example 4, the QP does not qualify as a recent past performance stating that a portion of the PoP that is within the two years of the "final solicitation due date" does not meet the required minimum performance of six consecutive months by the time the performance is due. Will the the government please clarify if recency period of performance determinations will be made from the time the solicitation is issued, or based on the proposal due date of the solicitation.	Per draft RFP, 52.212-1 Addendum, para. 4.3.1.2, a project is recent when "the performance has occurred within two years (730 calendar days) since issuance of this solicitation. We recognize that the issuance date and proposal due date in the Atch. 14 examples were the sam (10/10/2023) and we intend on correcting this error going forward to avoid any confusion.
357	3/21/2023	Attachment 11	N/A	N/A	We respectfully request the Government to consider adding PSC Codes R431 - Support- Professional: Human Resources, R710 - Support- Management: Financial and R703 - Support-Management: Accounting as qualifying PSCs under NAICS 541611.	Thank you for your recommendation.
358	3/21/2023	Attachment 11	N/A	N/A	We respectfully request the Government to consider adding PSC Codes R699 - Other Business Administrative Support Services as a qualifying PSC under NAICS 561110	Thank you for your recommendation.
359	3/21/2023	Attachment 11	N/A	N/A	We respectfully request the Government to consider adding PSC Code R699 - Other Business Administrative Support Services as a qualifying PSC under NAICS 541330.	Thank you for your recommendation.

360	3/21/2023	General	N/A	N/A	Are Offerors allowed to use multiple call orders issued under agency-specific multiple award blanket purchase agreements (BPAs) as individual task orders/qualifying projects?	Per 52.212-1 Addendum, para. 4.3.1, in order for a project to qualify as Experience it must meet the definitions of relevant and recent. These definitions do not put any exclusions on allowing call orders from BPAs. However, note para. 4.3.1.1, does state that the offeror must of provided the service as a Prime or First-Tier Subcontractor to a public and/or private customer.
361	3/21/2023	Draft RFP	64	1.1 Structure and Objectives	Are the NAICS codes within the Functional Areas determined from the main NAICS codes that the company associates with, or are they for specific contracts?	The NAICS codes for each Functional Category need to be associated with both the offeror (Ref. 52.212-1 Addendum, para. 3.1 (e), "Note")) and the specific projects it is claiming (Ref. 52.212-1 Addendum, para. 4.3.2 and Ref. 52.212-2 Addendum, para. 3.2.2)
362	3/21/2023	Draft RFP	N/A	N/A	Would the government provide Attachment 8 as an Excel document? This is presumed to be the Self Scoring for FC1?	Attachment 8 was provided as an excel document in the sam.gov posting.
363	3/21/2023	Draft RFP	N/A	N/A	Would the government consider NAICS 541990? That is where a lot of small businesses function. As it stands now, the 541611, 561110, and 541330 are the only options.	Thank you for your recommendation.
364	3/21/2023	Draft RFP	67	Part V: Solicitation Provisions, Instructions & Evaluation; 1.3: Proposal Preparation Instructions Table 4.	Please provide the table completed with the TBDs filled in for the number of estimated points to obtain an award, with the assumptions behind the numbers. Our assessment is that neither the government nor offerors are able to estimate these numbers creating a untenable offeror situation. Given the uncapped number of partners allowed, and uncapped number of experience references with extreme emphasis on the numerous available small references, it creates an open-ended, uncapped (partner and) scoring environment. Offerors must determine whether bidding expenses to create a huge partner team would result in a reasonable chance of award. This unconstrained solicitation makes that impossible resulting in a no-bid conclusion.	This table will be populated based on the results from the survey that was issued with the draft RFP. Therefore, this table cannot be populated until after the initial draft RFP.
365	3/21/2023	Draft RFP	70	Volume I- Executive Summary-3	This section is named "Executive Summary" and includes instructions to include a Completed Volume I - Cover Sheet Attachment 18 in Volume I in workable Excel format. It further asks for inclusion of the information required by (k) and (l). Is that K and L supposed to be submitted in the Excel workbook, or should offerors create a separate document? If so, what is the naming convention for that document?	Yes, the offeror shall create separate documents for (k) and (l). Please use the naming convention for Volume I as outlined in 52.212-1 Addendum, Table 6.
366	3/21/2023	Draft RFP	70	Volume I- Executive Summary-3	Is the Cover Sheet Attachment 18 considered the Executive Summary or may offerors include an Executive Summary in an additional narrative document?	No, offerors may not include an Executive Summary in an additional narrative document for 52.212-1 Addendum, para. 3.1, para. (a)-(j). Please reference 52.212-1 Addendum, para. 3.1 which states, "A compliant proposal shall include a completed Volume I Cover Sheet, Attachment 18 in Volume I in workable excel format. A completed Volume I Cover Sheet shall include documenting all the information being request in paragraphs (a) – (j) below in the appropriate space designated on the Volume I Cover Sheet, Attachment 18".
367	3/21/2023	Draft RFP	71	Executive Summary Content-3.1	The executive summary requirements appear to be the only place that teaming arrangement constraints are discussed. Please confirm that ANY number of subcontractors, JV partners, CTA partners, and/or combinations (i.e. subs to any of the other partnership structures) are allowed.	There are no restrictions on the number of members a team can have. In order to be a member there must be a written agreement between all parties completed in accordance with the FAR regulations.
368	3/21/2023	Self-Scoring Sheet	73	4.2	The RFP states "There is no limitation to the number of qualifying projects an offeror can claim under the Experience subfactor". Please reconsider. This creates a situation where the scoring is "uncapped" and forces offerors to create teams of ridiculous size who have to arbitrarily target a number of references they think will win an award. Combine this with only 5 awards per FC/socio category and this creates an untenable situation for offerors, forcing a no-bid conclusion.	Thank you for your recommendation.
369	3/21/2023	Self-Scoring Sheet	73	4.2	The RFP states "The DHS projects it will issues approximate 196 order over the entire ten-year period of performance...". What DHS components are assumed to issue these task orders? Only USCIS?	All DHS Components are assumed to issue these task orders.
370	3/21/2023	Draft RFP	75	Project Recency 4.3.1.2	The 2 year requirement for recency plus 6 months of performance within that 2 year window, creates an overly-tight performance constraint. Please consider expanding the performance timeframe to at least 3 years.	Thank you for your recommendation.
371	3/21/2023	Draft RFP	75-76	Verification of Project Experience Submission (Federal) - 4.3.2.1	Please confirm that Task Orders and BPA calls (as opposed to the master BPA or master IDIQ/Schedule) qualify as valid performance references individually. Further confirm that we may claim a separate experience reference for EVERY task order or BPA call on the SAME master contract.	Per 52.212-1 Addendum, para. 4.3.1, in order for a project to qualify as Experience it must meet the definitions of relevant and recent. These definitions do not put any exclusions on allowing call orders from BPAs. However, note para. 4.3.1.1, does state that the offeror must of provided the service as a Prime or First-Tier Subcontractor to a public and/or private customer.
372	3/21/2023	Draft RFP	92	Evaluation M	The government states it intends to make 5 awards in each socio economic category within each FC. Further, on page 73, the government states they anticipate 196 task orders over the entire 10 year period. With the potential for only 19/20 task orders per year that are then broken down further into the 4 categories, offerors may only have a few TORs to respond to a year which makes the 3 year 250k limit for off ramping unrealistic.	Thank you for your recommendation.
373	3/21/2023	Draft RFP	92	Addendum to FAR 52.212-2 Evaluation; 1.1 Source Selection Methodology	The RFP states "DHS intends to award approximately five (5) awards for each socioeconomic track". Please consider expanding the number of awards to at least 10 per FC/socio.	Thank you for your recommendation.
374	3/21/2023	General	N/A	Alternative Competition approach that is biddable	Based on the unconstrained nature of the scoring sheet making it an untenable offeror bidding situation, we would suggest an alternative approach to this competition. Our main assumption behind this new approach is the government was trying to create a pool of awarded contractors that WILL bid on the smaller task orders, probably based on previous experience that awardees would no-bid too many of the smaller TOs. Just because an offeror has many small task order references does NOT mean they will bid on PACTS III TOs, however. There are many reasons to no-bid a task order. We believe the government should just be direct about this specific objective and make it a contractual requirement. For example, the RFP could require the bidder MUST accept a requirement to bid at least 50% (or other REASONABLE %) of the task orders released under the contract (to a maximum requirement of X, again a REASONABLE number, per month). Any failure to comply with the required performance over an Y-month period shall result in IMMEDIATE off-boarding of the contract FOR CAUSE and a negative CPARS. The combination of both being offboarded (wasting all previous investments to obtain the award) along with FOR CAUSE/negative CPARS, should create enough motivation in the contractor community to make sure that only companies that are willing to put the resources into responding to the TOs will actually respond. With that component "fixed", we would suggest the government modify the scorecard with a more common and workable scorecard method requiring a reasonable 5-10 number of performance references emphasizing breadth/depth. Please consider this approach or something similar.	Thank you for your recommendation.
375	3/21/2023	Attachment 1: Statement of Work	1	Section C	Please consider using a NAICS for FC 2 with a larger size standard, such as 561499: All Other Business Support Services, to attract a larger pool of businesses capable of responding to more task orders than 561110 size businesses, who potentially don't have the capabilities or financial resources to respond.	The Government has selected a primary NAICS code, as reflected in the draft RFP, for each Functional Category that best represents the scope of services for the particular category.
376	3/21/2023	n/a	n/a	n/a	Please confirm whether this contract will be usable within USCIS only, or available and marketed DHS wide.	PACTS III will be a department-wide acquisition contract for all DHS components to use.
377	3/21/2023	Draft RFP	Pg. 78	4.2 Self-Scoring Sheet	We recommend the Government consider defining a finite set of Qualifying Projects in order to simplify the evaulation process and reduce the evaluation time. With an unlimited number of Qualifying Projects, the Government will be burdened with reviewing an overwhelming large volume of contract documentation packages.	Thank you for your recommendation.
378	3/21/2023	Draft RFP	Pg. 78	4.2 Self-Scoring Sheet	We recommend the Government place a cap on the number of Qualifying Projects for experience so that the Government awards to the highest qualified offerors vs. awarding to offerors who submit the largest number of Qualifying Projects. The cap on the number of Qualifying Projects will help ensure that evaluation is fair between all submissions.	Thank you for your recommendation.
379	3/21/2023	Draft RFP	Pg. 75	4.3.1 Qualifications	Given a Prime/First Tier Sub Teaming arrangement is the subcontractor allowed to contribute their own projects for scoring purposes in the experience sub-factor?	Per draft RFP 52.212-1 Addendum, a project meets the definition of relevant if it is from **a member of a JV, Teaming Arrangement or SBA Mentor-Protégé Arrangement.**
380	3/21/2023	Draft RFP; 4.4 Self-Scoring sheet; 4.3.2.1 Verification of Project Experience Submission (Federal Government Contracts), (a) Signed copy of Conformed Contract Award Document or Original Contract Award Document and associated modifications…	Pg. 72, 75		Are mutiple, individual, and varied Qualifying Projects orginating from individual task orders as a result of a multiple award or single award IDIQ contract allowed for scoring?	Multiple, separate orders, issued from the same multiple award IDIQ are acceptable as long as it meets the requirements of the solicitation. However, one single task order may only represent one project and can only be used once.
381	3/21/2023	Draft RFP	pg 46	6.0 Contractor Representative(s)	Solicitation states: The contractors shall identify and individual(s) who shall have the authority to make contract and technical and administrative decisions respectively regarding this contract" **Question**: Will this contract representative be Key?	The PACTS III team is unsure what your question is asking. Please rephrase the question.
382	3/21/2023	10 FC3 Self Scoring Sheet	Row 11		All the points generated in the following Projects section are only being added to the Row 10 cell in the Values section. **Question:** Shouldn't they be added to the respective rows in the Values section?	The points for each of the projects the offeror would like to claim will auto-populate if the offeror selects "Yes" from column "C". Row 11-16, Column "D" then auto-populates by aggregating all the scores from the each of the projects for the respective dollar ranges. Please review the instructions for the self-scoring sheets provided in Attachment 13 for further guidance.
383	3/21/2023	Draft RFP	page 73	4.2 Self-Scoring Sheet	Solicitation states: The total amount of points an offeror receives is shown in cell B1 of the first, main sheet of the applicable Self-Scoring Sheet(s). This total automatically aggregates the points from all of the subfactors, to include any projects the offeror claims beyond ten (10). **Question:** Please advise how the aggregate points factor into the Evaluation	The aggregate points in cell B1 will be used to rank the proposals from highest total claimed score to lowest total claimed score. (Ref. 52.212-2 Addendum, para. 2.0)
384	3/21/2023	Draft RFP	page 58	18.3 Fair Opportunity	Solicitation states: Pursuant to FAR 13.202 and 16.505(b)(1)(i), the TO CO May make and award, at or under the micro-purchase threshold, without seeking competitive quotations. **Question:** What is the micro-purchase threshold amount?	Per FAR Part 2.101, Micro-purchase threshold means $10,000, except it means, for acquisitions of services subject to 41 U.S.C. chapter 67, Service Contract Labor Standards, $2,500.
385	3/21/2023	Draft RFP	page 59	2.10 Minimum Contract Sales Requirements	Solicitation state: PACTS III contractors are expected to meet the minimum contract sales requirement prior to the end of the base year of the Master Contract period of performance. The minimum contract sales requirement is $250,000 in awarded task order value for each contract. if the Contractor does not meet the minimum contract sales requirement by the end of the base year of the Master Contract period of performance, the Government will off ramp the contractor in accordance with Part II, paragraph 11.0 **Question 1:** Would you consider lowering the minimum contract value sales amount to $100,000? Not knowing how many Task Orders will be released in the base year it would be unfair assuming a contractor will be awarded a contract. **Questions 2**: Question: Would you consider extending the 12 months to 24 months before off ramping the contractor?	Thank you for your recommendation in question 1. As for question 2, that paragraph should state, the base "period" not base "year". Therefore, this time period would be a total of three years and not one year. Please review the final RFP for clarifying language.
386	3/21/2023	Draft RFP	page 69	2.5.7 Proposal Submission	Solicitation states: This is an electronic submission. **Question:** What is the file size limitation for submission?	We do not have one at this time. Please review the final RFP for any additional information pertaining to this topic.
387	3/21/2023			General	**Question**: Can Project Experience be used more than once across other Functional Categories?	Per 52.212-1 Addendum para. 4.3.1.1(c), for experience to be relevant it cannot be claimed more than once for each Functional Category.
388	3/21/2023	Draft RFP	page 78	4.5 Facility Clearance (Subfactor 1.3)	**Receiving the same points for having Secret or Top Secret seems to be unfair. Consider:** Would you consider allowing more points, possibly double, for Top-Secret Clearance vs a Secret Clearance	Thank you for your recommendation.
389	3/21/2023	Draft RFP	page 81	6.1.1.1 Initial / Minimum Order Price (CLIN 0002 - (a)	Solicitation states: "The offeror shall document its proposed price for the Post Award Conference (PAC) in CLIN 0002 of the SF 1449 and submit it under Volume IV of its proposal. The proposed price will serve as the contract minimum order IAW FAR 52.216-19 Order Limitation. The "minimum order amount" will be obligated via orders issued after announcement of successful Offerors and shall be no less than $1.00 and no more than $TBD.00 **Question:** Please provide the $TBD.00 amount	Please review the final RFP for any additional information pertaining to this topic.
390	3/21/2023	Draft RFP	page 91	1.1 Source Selection Methodology	Solicitation States 3rd sentence: For PACTS III, the best value basis for awards will be determined by the **liighest** Technically Rated Offerors with a Fair and Reasonable Price (HTRO-FRP). **Question:** Should be Highest Technical Rated not Iiighest Technical Rated correct?	Correct. This has been updated to reflect "Highest Technically Rated Offerors with a Fair and Reasonable Price (HTRO-FRP)."
391	3/21/2023	Draft RFP	page 92	1.1 Source Selection Methodology	Solicitation states: The DHS intends to make approximately five (5) awards for each socioeconomic track within each Functional Categoly as described in 52.216-27 of this solicitation. To be considered as a HTRO-FRP Offeror, the proposal must score amongst the highest rated offers received for the track within the Functional Category. The DHS reserves the right to have as many awardees for each track within each Functional Categoly as it deems appropriate. **Recommendation:** With point consideration ranging from project values of >$10,000<$50K up to >$50,000,000.01, we recommend DHS consider at least two categories of awards within each socioeconomic track: 1. Very small business awards ranging with project values LESS THAN $5M; and 2. Small business awards for project values greater than $5,000,000.01. **Recommendation:** In addition, five (5) awards for each socioeconomic track is insufficient to provide DHS effective competition within each track. We recommend at least 15 awards within each track for each Functional Category, this will allow more competition and increase reasonableness of pricing.	Thank you for your recommendation.
392	3/21/2023	Attachment 12, Volume II, #7	page 4		Attachment requests Original Contract Award Document and associated modifications. **Question:** Are all modifications necessary or only the most recent modification?	Yes, all modifications are necessary. If the offeror includes the Conformed Contract Award Document then all of the modifications will be already be included.
393	3/21/2023	Attachment 12, Volume II, #16	page 69		#16 looks like it is requesting information covered by #15. **Clarification:** What is the difference between #15 and#16?	#15 is asking if you are claiming points for having an adequate accounting system and #16 is asking that if you are, does your accounting system meet the definition of "adequate".
394	3/21/2023	Attachment 14: Qualifying Project Examples	Page No. 4		Per Attachment 14, example #4, government conflated issuance of solicitation (page 4) of 10/10/2023 and due date (reflected in page 1) of 10/10/2023. **Can you please clarify on whether example #4 would still not qualify to receive the full points based on this clarified data?**	Thank you for bringing this error to our attention. Since the issuance and due date of proposals cannot be the same day we are not able to answer your question. We will fix this error going forward which should help answer your question.
395	3/21/2023	Attachment 14: Qualifying Project Examples	Page No. 6		Refencing Attachment 14, Example No. 6: This example highlights "The offeror can only use its projects on one or the other." Is this example of Sole Proprietorship and Teaming Arrangement implying an offeror "can submit or participate" in multiple bids (Prime and/or Subcontractor within the socio-economic set-asides) but cannot "reuse-recycle" the same relevant and eligible projects?	Yes, it would be possible for industry to participate in multiple team bids as long as they meet all the requirements of the solicitation. We recommend you pay close attention to 52.212-1 Addendum, para. 1.1 as it defines "one proposal". Per 52.212-1 Addendum para. 4.3.1.1(c), for experience to be relevant it cannot be claimed more than once for each Functional Category. Additionally, projects can only come from the JV, Teaming Arrangement or SBA Mentor-Protégé Arrangement itself or a member of the JV, Teaming Arrangment or SBA Mentor-Protégé Arrangement. Meaning if a subcontractor is not a member of the JV, Teaming Arrangement or SBA Mentor-Protégé Arrangement as identified in 52.212-1 Addendum, para. 3.1(k) then those projects will not meet the definition of relevant as defined in this solicitation.
396	3/21/2023	Draft RFP	Page No. 92	Section 1.0, ***Subsection 1.1 Source Selection Methodology***	Based on the statement "If the Offeror elects to be considered for more than one of the socioeconomic tracks, the same one (1) proposal will be evaluated only amongst the other Offerors within the respective socioeconomic tracks," May a JV mentor company of a WOSB protege company (JV) participate in a Prime WOSB bid with a unique UEI (JV's UEI) and that same mentor company with a different UEI bid via a teaming arrangement as a subcontractor to a SDVOSB, HubZone, or 8(a) Prime offeror? If yes, can two bid submissions from two different socio-economic tracks contain the same relevant and eligible projects submitted from two different offerors with two (2) unique UEI's?	Per 52.212-1 Addendum para. 4.3.1.1(c), for experience to be relevant it cannot be claimed more than once for each Functional Category.
397	3/21/2023	Draft RFP	Page No. 74-75	Section 4.3.1, ***Subsection 4.3.1.1 Project Relevancy***	In support of the parameters presented in the Draft RFP about proposal deadline is critical to bid viability for small businesses as we select our eligible and relevant projects. The relevant projects can shift with an amendment that "bumps" the proposal deadline by two (2) to three (3) weeks. The DRFP example date in Attachment 14 of ***10 Oct 2023*** defines the 730 days and six (6) month parameters. **Recommend establishing a firm date** for project relevancy is essential for the small business nature of the offerors. Shifting this date with amendments can negatively impact your available offerors who have invested resources between the draft and final RFP period.	Thank you for your recommendation.

398	3/21/2023	Draft RFP	Pg 73	Solicitation Section 4.2,Self Scoring Sheet	Since there are no limitations to the number of experiences that may be submitted in a proposal, there is no finite score that can be attained and would allow large teams to form to get higher points. Would you consider changing the self-scoring sheet to impose some limitations to the number of experiences similar to CBP's ESB?	Thank you for your recommendation.
399	3/21/2023	Attachment 8, FC 1 Self-Scoring Sheet and Sol. Section 4.3.1.2	Pg 75	Solicitation Section 4.2,Self Scoring Sheet	The Self-Scoring Sheet states the offeror may submit experiences "completed" within the last 2 years. Section 4.3.1.2(a) states experiences can be submitted that are "performed" within the last 2 years. Would you clarify the discrepancy?	Per the draft RFP, for a project to meet the definition of RECENT performance has occurred within two years since issuance of this solicitation.
400	3/21/2023	Draft RFP	N/A		After IDIQ award, can a prime contractor bring a new subcontractor onto their team that was not identified in their proposal?	We are not requiring that a prime contractor identifies all its subcontractors in its proposal; only the members of its teaming arrangement. Subcontractors are not members of a Teaming Arrangement unless a written agreement has been established using the guidelines in the FAR. Therefore, a prime contractor can subcontract to whoever they choose just as long as they abide by 52.219-14.
401	3/21/2023	Draft RFP	Pg 75 and Pg 76	Solicitation Section 4.3.1.1 Project Relevancy (d)	Section 4.3.1.1 states "The offeror has provided at least six (6) consecutive months of performance by the date proposals are due" and Section 4.3.1.2 states "The performance has occurred within two years (730 calendar days) since issuance of this solicitation." This is extremely limiting especially for small businesses and more so during the timeframe covered due to the pandemic-related considerations. The 6-month performance requirement as stated does not preclude that the performance be within the 2-year past performance window, only that 6 months be completed prior to the date proposals are due. Would the Government consider project examples with any portion of the example project PoP falling within the 2-year Project Relevancy timeframe from proposal due date?	Thank you for your recommendation.
402	3/21/2023	Draft RFP	63	Part III, Section 18.3	Will you consider allowing a company to prime on separate socio-economic tracks under each functional area?	Section 18.3 refers to the fair opportunity process for competing the orders under PACTS III which does not occur unless an offeror is awarded a contract on PACTS. There are no restrictions in the draft RFP that would prohibit a contractor from proposing under multiple socioeconomic tracks. Per the draft solicitation, Section 1.1, "If the Offeror elects to be considered for more than one of the socioeconomic tracks, the same one (1) proposal will be evaluated only amongst the other Offerors within the respective socioeconomic tracks." Meaning, if an offeror has multiple socio-econominc categories and would like to be consider for more than one track under the same Functional Category, then that Offeror will only submit one proposal for that Functional Category. The offeror shall only provide one proposal per Functional Category regardless of how many tracks it would like the DHS to considered it for. Furthermore, if the offeror would like to "elect" to be considered for more than one of the tracks within the same Functional Category, then it should state which ones by fulfilling the requirement in 52.212-1 Addendum, para. 3.1(e).
403	3/21/2023	Draft RFP	63	Part III, Section 18.3	Is there a limit on the number of partners we utlize within each functional area?	No, there is not a limit on the number of partners an offeror utilizes within each functional category. However, there are restrictions on what projects can be used. Please review the solicitation for further guidance.
404	3/21/2023	Draft RFP	64	Part III, Section 21	Considering the addition of three new tracks and siloed nature of the IDIQ Master Contract, would the government consider extending the minumum sales requirements to two years?	Part III, Section 21.0, should state, the base "period" not base "year". Therefore, this time period would be a total of three years and not one year. Please review the final RFP for clarifying language.
405	3/21/2023	Draft RFP	4, 74	Part I - Continuation of SF 1449 and 4.3.1 Qualifications	We did not see Attachment 1, Statement of Work on the draft solicitation, only attachements 4, 7, 9, 10, and 14-18 are provided. Can the Government please provide a draft Statement of Work?	Attachment 1, Statement of Work can be obtained from https://sam.gov/opp/9a0317e9135a4dc6b15bc0a067aff0c5/view
406	3/21/2023	Draft RFP	75	4.3.1 Qualifications	Would the Government consider extending the Recency from two years to five years?	Thank you for your recommendation.
407	3/21/2023	Draft RFP	75	4.3.1 Qualifications	Can the Government please provide an as of date for the two year Recency.	Per 52.212-1 Addendum, para. 4.3.1, "the performance has occurred within two years (730 calendar days) since issuance of this solicitation.
408	3/21/2023	Draft RFP	74-75	Self Scoring Sheet FC & paragraph 4.3.1	Can the Government please confirm that on the self-scoring when it refers to the offeror this includes the prime offeror's subcontractor teammates and projects from teammates can be included in the self-scoring?	Per 52.212-1 Addendum, para. (f), The offeror is a Joint Venture (JV), Teaming Arrangement or SBA Mentor-Protégé Arrangement, and the project for each Functional Category is from the JV, Teaming Arrangement or SBA Mentor-Protégé Arrangement itself or a member of the JV, Teaming Arrangement or SBA Mentor-Protégé Arrangement.
409	3/21/2023	Draft RFP	N/A	Self Scoring Sheet FC & paragraph 4.3.1	We did not see the self-scoring for FC 1, only FC 2 & 3 are provided. Will the Government be sending out a FC 1 self-scoring sheet?	Attachment 8, FC1 Self-Scoring Sheet can be obtained from https://sam.gov/opp/9a0317e9135a4dc6b15bc0a067aff0c5/view
410	3/21/2023	Draft RFP	50	Section 10.1, Cross Teaming Limitations	Can the Government plesae clarify whether a subcontractor can participate with different prime contractors for the PACTS III IDIQ opportunity, or is the subcontractor limited to teaming with only one prime?	Yes, it would be possible for industry to participate in multiple team bids as long as they meet all the requirements of the solicitation. We recommend you pay close attention to 52.212-1 Addendum, para. 1.1 as it defines "one proposal". Per 52.212-1 Addendum para. 4.3.1.1(e), for experience to be relevant it cannot be claimed more than once for each Functional Category. Additionally, be aware of the terms and conditions surrounding Organizational Conflicts of Interests and Cross-Teaming that are outlined in Part III, Terms and Conditions, paragraphs 10.0 and 10.1.
411	3/21/2023	Draft RFP	4	Part I - Continuation of SF 1449	Can the Government pleae clarify whether offerors have to submit proposals for all three Functional Categories or can they bid on only one or two?	The offeror is not required to submit a proposal for all three Functional Categories. Per 52.212-1 Addendum, para. 2.5.7 and para. 3.1(d), the offeror submits one proposal as defined in para. 1.1 for each of the Functional Category(ies) it would like the DHS to consider them for.
412	3/21/2023	Draft RFP	4	Part I - Continuation of SF 1449	If an offorer meets all four of the socioeconomic groups, can that offeror compete for task orders in each of the four categories?	The PACTS III awardees may only compete for orders under the tracks it has received a PACTS III contract for. The process for competing orders is outlined in Part III, para. 18.3.
413	3/21/2023	Draft RFP	50	11.0 On Ramping/Off Ramping of Contractors Post Contract Award	How often will awarded contractors have to recertify to ensure the contractor has not outgrown their size status?	Please see Part III, para. 16.0 for more information.
414	3/21/2023	Draft RFP	69	2.5.6, Page Size and Format	Text size shall be no less than 12 point Times New Roman, does this also include graphcs/charts or can these be a smaller font?	Per 52.212-1 Addendum, para. 2.5.6, "Page size shall be 8.5 x 11 inches and the text size shall be no less than 12-point Times New Roman font". Tables, figures, graphics cannot deviate from this requirement.
415	3/21/2023	Draft RFP	73-74	4.2, Self Scoring Sheet	The points specified in this section do not match the points on the Self Scoring Sheets. For example, the Self Scoring Sheet has 14 points for experiences totally $10K for less than $50K, but the table on page 74 shows zero points. Likewise, the other points for each experience value doesn't match between the Self Scoring Sheets and the table on page 74.	Each Functional Category has its own Self-Scoring sheet and unique point system. Attachment 9, FC2 Self Scoring Sheet references 14 points for projects totaling $10K or more but less than $50K. This information matches the point value under Functional Category 2 in Table 8 in the draft RFP.
416	3/21/2023	Draft RFP	75-78	4.3.2, Verification	Can the Government please clarify how experience as a first tier subcontractor is verified and can this work be used on the Self Scoring Sheet?	Please see 52.212-1 Addendum, para 4.3.2.2 and 52.212-2 Addendum, para.3.2.2.1.2 for more information on how experience as a first tier subcontractor is verified. Per 52.212-1 Addendum 4.3.1.1(e), this work can be used on the Self Scoring sheet as long as the other criteria in the solicitation is met.
417	3/21/2023	Draft RFP	Page 74	Section 4.3 Experience (Subfactor 1.1)	Will IDIQs and BPAs be considered for experience scoring? If so, how should a contractor score these types of contracts as IDIQ and BPA contract values fluctuate based on customer needs?	Since work is not completed on a BPA or IDIQ until the call/orders are issued, only the call/orders awarded off the BPA or IDIQ will be acceptable.
418	3/21/2023	Draft RFP	Page 75	Section 4.3.1.1 (c)	Can you government confirm that the language "(c) It is not being claimed more than once for each Functional Category" means that a project can be used in the proposals for Functional Category 1 and Fuctional Category 2 as long as it is not used twice within a specific Functional Category?	Per 52.212-2 Addendum, para. 3.2.2.1.1 and 3.2.2.1.2, a project must be in-scope of the Functional Category/NAICS in order for the offeror to receive points. Due to the large difference between each Functional Category it would be difficult to state that one project meets the scope of more than one Functional Category. The intent is that once one project is used, it cannot be used again, in any capacity.
419	3/21/2023	Draft RFP			Will the government accept CTAs as defined by FAR 9.601? i.e. Non JV Version	Yes, all teaming arrangement must meet the requirements of FAR 9.6
420	3/21/2023	Draft RFP	74-75	4.3.1.1	Will Task Orders issued out under a single award IDIQ account for separate (individual) projects or will the Single Award IDIQ count as one project when filling out the Self-Scoring Sheet?	Since work is not completed on a IDIQ until the orders are issued, only the orders awarded off the IDIQ will be acceptable.
421	3/21/2023	Draft RFP	Pg. 92	1.0 Basis for Contract Award, 1.1 Source Selection Methodology, Para. 8	The draft RFP states, "One proposal constitutes, one or a set of self-scoring sheets including claims from one of the following: an individual business, a Joint Venture, a Teaming Arrangement or Mentor Protégé." Please confirm that an Offeror may submit a proposal as an individual business and also submit a separate proposal as a member of a Joint Venture.	Yes. Please note 52.212-1 Addendum para. 4.3.1.1(c) which states, for experience to be relevant is cannot be claimed more than once for each Functional Category.
422	3/21/2023	Draft RFP	Pg 75	4.2.1.2 Project Recency	In-line with similar large GWACs/contracts from other government agencies, will the government increase the duration on the recency of the past performance references from the current to 5 years or at a minimum 3 years?	Thank you for your recommendation.
423	3/21/2023	Draft RFP	Pg 75	4.3.2.1 Verification of Project Experience Submission (Federal Government Contracts)	For past subcontracted work performed with a SB Prime, will the government accept the Prime Contractor's subcontracting documentmentation as evidence?	Please note that IAW 52.212-1 Addendum, para. 4.3.1.1(e), for subcontract work to meet the definition of "relevant" it must have been performed as a First-Tier only. Please see 52.212-1 Addendum, para. 4.3.2.2, for information as to what documentation is required if the offeror is using First-Tier subcontractor experience.
424	3/21/2023	Draft RFP	Pg 92	1.0 Basis for Contract Award	If an offer is bidding under two separate functional areas under the same socioeconomic track, will two separate proposals are required for independent submission and scoring?	Yes, submit one proposal for each FC it wants the DHS to consider them under.
425	3/21/2023	Draft RFP	Pg 98	3.2.2 Subfactor 1.1: Experience, 3.2.2.1 Measure of Merit	When providing services as a first tier subcontractor as will the governemetn validate and score supporting documentation from both the teaming and subcontracted documents?	See response to question 423 above.
426	3/21/2023	Draft RFP	Pg 99	3.2.2 Subfactor 1.1: Experience, 3.2.2.1.1 Federal Government Contract Experience Element 3	On a sub-contract, will the total contract value be calculated as the work share on the total obligated amount?	Per 52.212-1 Addendum, para. 4.3.1.1(b)(i) all values shall be based on obligated funds. If the value is different between what is stated on the prime contract versus the actual amount paid (obligated) to the first-tier subcontractor, the offeror shall state the amount actually paid (obligated) to the offeror as a first-tier subcontractor.
427	3/21/2023	Draft RFP	Pg. 73	4.2 Self Scoring Sheet	Based on the language in this Section, there appears to be no limit on the number of references an offeror can include for scoring. This approach may prevent the Government from directly comparing each prime contractor's individual capability and breadth of experience, as offerors may include several subcontractors within their Teaming Arrangement to maximize their scoring. This approach incurs significant risk to the Government of prime contractor performance quality and potential for undue reliance on subcontractors. Recommend that the Government restrict offerors to a finite number of subcontractors within a Teaming Arrangement in order to and/or limit the number of references each offeror may provide in each Functional Category Dollar Range proportionate with the scoring strategy detailed in 4.2 Table 8.	Thank you for your recommendation.
428	3/21/2023	Draft RFP	Pg. 74	4.2 Self Scoring Sheet	For all Functional Categories, the number of points awarded for references in the between $50,000.01 and $1M significantly exceeds the number of points awarded for references between $1,000,000.01 and $5M and $5,000,000.01 and $50M. Given that larger task orders generally require as much, if not more, technical and management expertise as smaller-sized task orders, we recommend the Government consider increasing the point value of larger task orders, as these provide as much or more evidence of successful past performance experience and ability to deliver on PACTS III requirements as the smaller task orders.	Thank you for your recommendation.
429	3/21/2023	Draft RFP	Pg. 74	4.2 Self Scoring Sheet	Section 4.3.1.1 (d) requires that references have at least 6 months of performance prior to proposal submission. At average labor category rates over the course of six months, $50,000 roughly equates to one, part-time (~50% or less) resource over the course of 6 months. We recommend the Government remove the $10k - $50k dollar range, as it provides limited value to assessing the maturity of offerors to successfully deliver on PACTS III requirements.	Thank you for your recommendation.
430	3/21/2023	Draft RFP	Pg. 76	4.3.2.1 Verification of Project Experience Submission (Federal Government Contracts), Section (a.i)	In the case where 4.3.2.1(c) does not apply, but information in the documentation listed in 4.3.2.1 (a) contains missing, incorrect, or outdated information, can the Government confirm that the Project Verification form listed in 4.3.2.1 (c) (ii) can be submitted as evidence to verify contract elements?	The PACTS III team is unsure what your question is asking. Please rephrase the question and provide an example if possible.
431	3/21/2023	DRFP and Draft SF 1449	72	3.0 (k)	FAR 52.207-6 (a) (1) (ii) defines a "Small Business Teaming Arrangement". For PACTS III Offerors submitting bids for Functional Category 1, must first tier subcontractors in the "Small Business Teaming Arrangement" meet the small business size standard of FC1, NAICS 541611, $24.5M?	Per FAR 52.207-6 all members of a small business teaming arrangement must be small.
432	3/21/2023	DRFP and SF1449	SF1449 Block 10	SF1449	Will PACTS III Offerors submitting bids in Functional Category 1 (NAICS 541611) be required to meet the small size business standard for NAICS 561110, $12.5M as listed in block 10 of the SF1449?	Offerors are required to meet the size standard associated with the NAICS code for each Functional Category(FC). The NAICS code, $12.5M as listed in block 10 is there and not all the other NAICS codes associated with the other FCs since we can only put one NAICS in that block.
433	3/21/2023	DRFP and Draft SF 1449	72, Self Scoring Sheet	4.2	Will DHS re-look the acquisiton strategy which appears to currently reward offerors able to assemble the largest teams? The draft solicitation states that "there is no limitation to the number of qualifying projects an offeror can claim under the experience subfactor for each Functional Category." PACTS III awards, therefore, will go to the offerors who are able to commit the business development resources necessary to assemble the largest teams of first tier small business subcontractors able to present the most projects meeting the self scoring worksheet criteria. These large teams are invariably unwieldy at IDIQ level, with multiple subcontractors competing for a limited number of FTEs on any given task order opportunity. We also suggest weighting of projects reflecting DHS past performance/experience. With no points benefit to DHS incumbent projects, DHS will invariably receive bids from awardees with no appreciation for, or experience in supporting, the unique complexities of the DHS enterprise mission set. Finally, we suggest the PACTS II procurement as a proven model for this procurement. Recent experience in large procurements utilizing a self scoring methodology (CIO SP4, POLARIS SDVOSB Pool) demonstrate that this points based acquisition strategy invariably results in extensive protests, delays, amendments, and failed acquisitions.	Thank you for your recommendation.
434	3/21/2023	Draft RFP	Pg. 75	4.3.1.1 Project Relevancy, Para. (f)	Does the government expect there to be a limit or required number of past performances that must come from the prime?	The draft RFP does not limit or require number of past performances that must come from the prime.
435	3/21/2023	Draft RFP	Pg. 92	1.1 Source Selection Methodology	Given there are ~20 current awardees in Functional Area 1 and the government anticipates awarding 5 SDVOSB contracts, How does the government intend to provide fair and adequate opportunity for new entrants?	The PACTS III solicitation does not restrict new entrants from providing an offer; therefore, they are being afforded the same opportunities as contractors that are not new entrants.
436	3/21/2023	Attachment+1_Statement+of+Work+and+Appendix+A, Para. C.3.3	Pg. 3		Will there be an opportunity to build out a more robust set of engineering services in the SOW and LCATS to support a deeper portolio of engineering support?	The Government's requirement for engineering services, within scope of PACTS III, is reflected in the current draft SOW. It is subject to change prior to the posting of the final RFP.
437	3/21/2023	Draft RFP	101/138	Draft RFP: 3.0 Evaluation	Will the government please clarify if offerors may use duplicate projects IF submitting under different socioeconomic tracks?	No, offerors may not use projects more than once for each functional category. (Ref. 52.212-1 Addendum, para. 4.3.1.1 (c))
438	3/21/2023	Draft RFP	103-106/138	Draft RFP: 3.2.2.1.1 Federal Government Contracts Experience	When proving experience, must offerors present all documents listed or a combination to prove all claimed aspects of the experience? The element text states "OR" while Table 2 states "AND," leading to confusion on the documents necessary to prove each experience claimed.	The Conformed Contract Award Document or Original Contract Award Document and associated modifications is required for all projects. Depending on the situation for each project the offeror will provide the FPDS or Project Verification Form. If the Project Verification Form is used, then the offeror is required to provide the SOW/PWS. (Ref. 52.212-1 Addendum, para. 4.3.2 for more detail as to what documentation is required).
439	3/21/2023	Draft RFP	103-106/139	Draft RFP: 3.2.2.1.1 Federal Government Contracts Experience	Should offerors highlight or tag the documents submitted for experience?	Offerors shall include the entire document and highlight/tag/provide an index to the pertinent areas. Ref. 52.212-1 Addendum para. 4.3.2.1(a)(ii) and (c)(iii); para. 4.3.2.2(c)

440	3/21/2023	Draft RFP	Pg. 78	4.2 Self-Scoring Sheet, Paragraph 3	We recommend the Government place a cap on the number of Qualifying Projects for experience. Without a project limit it seems that the Government is favoring any Offeror that can form the largest team or provide the largest number of projects, whether that be a Prime with several Subcontractors; a Mentor - Protege Joint Venture with a very large business as a Mentor that has a large volume of projects to leverage; or a Joint Venture made up of several JV members where each company can bring contracts to the proposal. By placing a reasonable limit on the number of projects submitted the Government can do an apples to apples evaluation between offerors.	Thank you for your recommendation.
441	3/21/2023	Draft RFP	Pg. 65	1.1 Structure and Objectives, Table 1 - 3	Will the Government please provide further clarification on the size standard requirements for Qualifying Project leveraged Subcontractors, JV Members, and Mentor - Protégé JV Members as it relates to each Functional Category.	All offeror's (to include team members), with the exception of the SBA Mentor Protégé must be a small business based on the size standard associated with the NAICS for each Functional Category.
442	3/21/2023	Draft RFP	Pg. 4 and Pg. 58	Part I - Continuation of SF1449, Paragraph 4 and 18.2 Set-Asides Based on Socio-Economic Group	The shift from a sole SDVOSB set-aside for PACTS II to having four, separate and distinct tracks (SDVOSB, WOSB, HUBZone, and 8(a)) for PACTS III is a substantial change. In situations in which market research demonstrate multiple tracks can perform the task order, how will DHS determine which track (not Functional Category) to compete task orders under for PACTS III?	Per Part III, Para. 18.2, "The OCO will conduct market research in accordance with FAR Part 10 for each requirement to determine which track is best suited to meet the Component's needs".
443	3/21/2023	Draft RFP	Pg. 20	Part II - Contract Clauses FAR52.212-5 Contract Terms and Conditions Required to Implement Statutes or Executive Orders	FAR 52.219-16 Liquidated Damages – Subcontracting Plan is checked. Since the proposed acquisition strategy for PACTS III is all small business tracks, there should not be a Small Business Subcontracting Plan requirement. Please confirm.	Yes, you are correct. Thank you for bringing that error to our attention.
444	3/21/2023	Draft RFP	Pg. 59	Part III - Terms and Conditions, 21.0 Minimum Contract Sales Requirements	This section states that the "minimum contract sales requirement is $250,000 in awarded task order value for each contract." It goes on to state that if a Contractor does NOT meet this requirement by the end of the base year of the Master Contract period of performance that the Government will off-ramp them. Please confirm that the base year refers to the 3-year base contract period.	Correct. That paragraph should state, the base "period" not base "year". Therefore, this time period would be a total of three years and not one year. Please review the final RFP for clarifying language.
445	3/21/2023	Draft RFP	Pg. 67	Part V - Solicitation Provisions, Instructions & Evaluation, 2.1.1 Questions	The instructions require offeror's to include the "pdf. Page number of the solicitation." The solicitation also provides a TOC for many of the different sections. Would the government please ensure that the actual page numbers match the pdf page numbers and that the TOC's are accurate?	Thank you for your recommendation
446	3/21/2023	Draft RFP	Pg. 69	Part V - Solicitation Provisions, 2.5.3 Indexing and 2.5.4 Glossary of Abbreviations	These sections state that each volume should include an index and glossary. Does this apply to Vol I (Exec Summary) and Vol III (Labor Category Pricing), which are each Excel files? Especially for Vol III, which is currently limited to 1 page.	Yes, it does apply to Volume I but should not apply to Volume III since it is one page. Please see the final RFP for clarity.
447	3/21/2023	Draft RFP	Pg. 69	Part V - Solicitation Provisions, 2.5.3 Indexing and 2.5.4 Glossary of Abbreviations	If the 1-page limitation applies to Vol III, Labor Cat Pricing, does the government mean "1 tab" since it is an Excel file?	Yes
448	3/21/2023	Draft RFP	Pg. 70	Part V - Solicitation Provisions, Instructions & Evaluation, 2.5.7 Proposal Submission	The instructions require offeror's to "submit with textual search and copy functions enabled." Would the government please provide solicitation documents with textual search and copy functions enabled?	Thank you for your recommendation. The solicitation document can be searched and copied if you converting them to a word document.
449	3/21/2023	Draft RFP	Pg. 73	Part V - Solicitation Provisions, Instructions & Evaluation, 4.2 Self Scoring Sheet	The solicitation states, "The points system was developed for each functional category by using historical actuals. This data was then used to project the DHS's future needs." The ceiling value listed for PACTS III is $5.6B, which is significantly higher than the $1.5B ceiling for PACTS II. The delta in ceiling value seems to indicate that the utilization of the PACTS III vehicle could increase greatly from PACTS II. If PACTS III is more utilized Department-wide than PACTS II, the data and point system presented may be counterproductive. Is DHS anticipating a similar type of for services and sizes for PACTS III task orders tied to the historical data cited or is an increase in services, number of task orders and size of task orders anticipated? Please explain.	Yes, the DHS is anticipating similar type of work as it has had for these three functional categories in the past. Please note that PACTS II was originally a five year vehicle and did not include Functional Category 3.
450	3/21/2023	Draft RFP	Pg. 74	Part V - Solicitation Provisions, Instructions & Evaluation, 4.3 Experience (Subfactor 1.1)	The current draft solicitation does not appear to have many restrictions beyond the small business offeror being able to qualify for their track (e.g. socioeconomic category, size, prime/sub, JV, etc.). Is it the intention of the DHS to allow large businesses first-tier subcontractors to contribute to the 'unlimited' experience project scorecard?	If a large business is part of a SBA Mentor Protege it will be considered. However, only small businesses may be part of a teaming arrangement.
451	3/21/2023	Draft RFP	Pg. 80	Part V - Solicitation Provisions, Instructions & Evaluation, 5.1 Labor Category Price Proposal	Section 5.1 states that "the offeror shall consider the employee working in the highest cost location…" In order to ensure fair competition and maintain the geographical coverage needed for this contract, would DHS consider mandating a location for all offerors to use?	Thank you for your recommendation.
452	3/21/2023	Draft RFP	Pg. 80	Part V - Solicitation Provisions, Instructions & Evaluation, 5.1 Labor Category Price Proposal	The 2nd to last paragraph of Section 5.1 states that "the offeror is encouraged to provide discounts with its original proposal." The pricing sheet, however, does not provide an area for us to provide discount's. Please clarify.	If the offeror would like to provide discounts, please reflect that in the base rate.
453	3/21/2023	Draft RFP	Pg. 81	Part V - Solicitation Provisions, Instructions & Evaluation, 6.1.1.1(a)(2)	With regards to the Post Award Conference (PAC), this sections states that "The number of vendor attendees shall be limited to a maximum of two (2) persons" where Attachment 1 SOW, C.8.3 (page 5) says "The number of Contractor attendees shall be limited to a maximum of four persons…" Assuming that the vendor = Contractor, please clarify whether the number of vendor attendees is 2 or 4.	Clarity will be provided in the final RFP.
454	3/21/2023	Draft RFP	Pg. 90	FAR 52.212-2 Evaluation - Commercial Products and Commercial Services (NOV 2021)	The very last line of section (a) states that the "Technical and past performance, when combined, are not applicable." Does "past performance" equate to experience? Please clarify	Clarity will be provided in the final RFP.
455	3/21/2023	Draft RFP	Pg. 90	FAR 52.212-2 Evaluation - Commercial Products and Commercial Services (NOV 2021)	The very last line of section (a) states that the "Technical and past performance, when combined, are not applicable." Does this sentence mean that the technical portion of an offeror's proposal is not applicable in the evaluation process? Please clarify	Clarity will be provided in the final RFP.
456	3/21/2023	N/A	N/A	N/A	What is the minimum # of points needed to successfully bid?	There is not a minimum number of points needed to successfully bid.
457	3/21/2023	N/A	N/A	N/A	Does this include design by professional engineers?	The Government is unclear on this question. Please review the Statement of Work, Section C.3.3, FC3-Engineering Services- NAICS Code 541330.
458	3/21/2023	N/A	N/A	N/A	For ongoing projects, can we include all option years or just those within the last 2 years?	Per 52.212-1 Addendum, para. (b) states "that for a project to be relevant the total amount of funds that have obligated for the project being claimed falls within the range". Only options that have been exercised will have funds obligated; therefore, options that have not been exercised should not be accounted for when determining which projects the offeror would like to submit.
459	3/21/2023	Draft RFP	Pg. 71	4.3.1	Can an offeror use a task order issued under a IDIQ or BPA as a qualifying project?	Yes
460	3/21/2023	Draft RFP	Pg. 74	4.2	Table 8 depicts the scoring allocation for the self scoring spreadsheet.While we understand the points are based on the task orders released under PACTS II, the current allocation is going to favor companies that do not have necessarily have experience managing larger contracts which may cause issues in the execution of future task orders. Would the Government consider adjusting the point allocation to give credence to experience managing larger task orders and contracts?	Thank you for your recommendation.
461	3/21/2023	Attachment 1 SOW	Pg. 2	SOW C.3.1 FC1	The SOW indicates the "vendor is soley responsible for program management". Can the government clarify how this requirement "solely responsible" differs from other requirements where this qualifier is not included?	This language will be clarified in the final SOW. The requirement outlined in C.3.1.3 - Program Management requires the contractor to provide program management support to Government personnel as outlined by specific task order requirements. This type of program management is separate and distinct from the requirement at C.1.3. which requires the contractor to provide overarching contract and task order management at the IDIQ level.
462	3/21/2023	Attachment 1 SOW and RFP	Pg. 5 and Pg. 53	SOW C.7 Security Requirements and RFP 9.1 Security Clearances	Can the government confirm if Secret or Top Secret certifications are required for any positions at the IDIQ level/proposal submission?	Offerors are not required to have SECRET or TS level clearance at the IDIQ level.
463	3/21/2023	Draft RFP	64	RFP Part V, 1.1	The RFP states: ***Under PACTS III, interested small businesses will be able to submit one (1) proposal from each Offeror for each Functional Category*** **Question:** Is it permissible for a company to be a prime offeror under one Functional Category/ Socio economic group and another proposal as a subcontractor for a separate prime offeror in the same functional category and socio-econimic group?	Yes, but only if the subcontractor is an actual member of a teaming arrangement.
464	3/21/2023	RFP and Attachment 1	RFP: Page Attach 1: no page number	RFP: Intro and Attach 1, C.3.1	The RFP states: ***This vehicle does not provide any information technology (IT) service*** s Attachment 1 in its requirements description for FC1 states: ***Professional Support Services:*** ***a. Web Design, including web based graphics*** ***a. Database Design, Development and Construction*** In Attachment 5, Labor Categories, none of the labor categories provided for FC1 have any description that indicates that they can be used to proved the sit services described in Attachment 1. The costs for technical personnel to provide these services are significantly higher than for other professions, and without separate labor categories, rates will be distorted. Furthermore, database design and development, without the scope to create or modify the applications that use the database does not provide a functional system that could be used by users. **Request:** Please resolve this conflicting language. Either all ow IT services in the IDIQ, adding the necessary labor categories to perform this work or remove scope from FC1 that only partially provides the capability for these activities.	The Government will review this language and requirement. Any changes will be incorporated in the final RFP.
465	3/21/2023	RFP			**Questions**: Are there any restrictions with respect to the type of subcontractors a prime can have on their team? For example: Can a prime who is an SDVOSB have a large company or a company with a different socio-economic category on their team? Is there any limits on the nuimbers of subcontractors the Prime can have on their team? is here any restrictions on the number or type of project that one or more subcontractors can provide for the proposal? Must a company be a team member in order to proivde a project for a prime offeror? Are there any different rules regarding team compositon if the team forms as a CTA or Joint Venture?	Per 52.207-6, all members of a team arrangement must be small businesses. A large business may be a part of a Mentor Protégé or Joint Venture if the SBA has approved it and given authority to that entity to propose as a small JV. There is no limit to the number of members on a team. Please see the the solicitation, specifically 52.212-1 Addendum as to what types of projects may be submitted. Only members of a teaming arrangement, JV, MP or an individual company can submit projects. To form a CTA the offeror shall following FAR 9.6. To form a Joint Venture following the guidelines put in place by the SBA.
466	3/21/2023	Attachment 1	no page number	C.3.1	it is noted that FC1 does not provide scope for logistics services. PACTS II included logistics services which were utilized in many task orders. **Question**: Is it the Government's intention to exclude logistics Task Orders from this contract? If so, why?	It is not the Government's intention to exclude logistics support services from PACTS III.
467	3/21/2023	RFP Part V	Page 66	1.3	On page 66, the RFP states: ***Based on market research, the DHS anticipates the highest technically rated offerors to propose the number of points identified in the ranges below for each FC and track.*** On page 73 of the RFP states: ***There is no limitation to the number of qualifying projects an offeror can claim under the Experience subfactor for each Functional Category.*** **Question:** **With no limitation on the number of projects that an offer can claim, how does the Government intend to estimate the number of points needed to obtain a contract?** Particularly in the case of mentor protege offerors who can utilize a vast number of projects from their mentor, the largest number of points will be determined only by the offerors who submit the most projects. **Does the Government intend to base contract awards on the number of points earned by an unlimited number of projects submitted by an offeror?** **In order to provide an equitable and fair selection process, it is requested that the Government amend the RFP to:** **1. limit to no more than 2 projects be provided by the mentor in a mentor protege relationship.** **2. Limit the total number of projects that any offeror can submit to no more than 10 projects.**	Thank you for your recommendation. Proposals will be evaluated in accordance with 52.212-2 and its addendum.
468	3/21/2023	RFP Part V	Page 67	1.3, Table 4	Table 4 on page 67 is designed to show the range of points Anticipated based on Market Research Question: **Can the Government please describe the methodology which will be used to establish the information?** Note: Currently, the number of projects that can be submitted by an offeror is unlimited, hence the number of points that can be gained is also unlimited.	This table will be populated in the final RFP with information derived from the survey that was sent out with the draft RFP.

469	3/21/2023	RFP Part V	Page 73	L, 4.3	The RFP states: *DHS will only review and verify the accuracy of this documentation for those offerors it deems as the highest technically rated offerors* **Question:** With an unlimited number of projects and hence an unlimited numb er of points, and a point system that ranks small projects much higher than large contracts, what is the Government's rationale for determining the "highest Technically rated offerors? "	See RFP Section 1.2 for the definition of Highest Technically Rated with Fair and Reasonable Price. The government will rank offerors in order from highest to lowest based on the number of points claimed and verified on the Self Scoring Sheet.
470	3/21/2023	RFP Part V	Page 73	L, 4.3 and Table 8	The RFP states: *The points system was developed for each functional categoly by using historical actuals. This data was then used to project the DHS's future need. The total number of anticipated orders for PACTS III was derived from the data and then points were proportioned based upon the number of orders that had the characteristics that the DHS would benefit from* **Question:** What is the relationship between the value distribution of PACTS II task order and a points system who's purpose is to select the most qualified and most capable offerors for contract selection? **Comment:** Attributing points to projects with the lowest valued projects rated with a higher number of points is not a fair or reasonable method for determining "best technically qualified" bidders. There is no logical linkage between the value distribution of PACTS II task orders and the capabilities of PACTIS III offerors. if any thing, the relationship is the reverse (offerors with many smaller contracts are LESS technically qualified than offerors with larger, more complex projects. **Request;** In order to provide a fair and equitable method of evaluating the technical capabilities of offerors it is respectfully requested that the Government revaluate the point system to award more points for larger, more complex projects which actually reflects the abilities of companies with a higher technical capability.	Thank you for your suggestion. The point system is intended to meet the size demand for the majority of orders expected to be made under PACTS III, as projected by historical data.
471	3/21/2023	RFP Part V	Page 74	L, 4.3 and Table 9	Table 8 provides a value distribution of PACTS II task order for FC3, which was not included in PACTS II. **Question;** How did the Government determine the value distribution of PACTS II task orders, since no task orders of this type existed in PACTSII ?	Because FC3 did not exist under PACTS II, the government gathered historical data on the spend that occured for the applicable NAICS by DHS components outside of PACTS II.
472	3/21/2023	RFP Part V	Page 74 and 75	L.4.3.1.1 and 4.3..1.2	In Section L.4.3.1.1 the RFP states: *The offeror has provided at least six (6) consecutive months of perfo1mance by the date proposals are due;* In Section L.4.3.1.2 the RFP states: *(a) The perfo1mance has occurred within two years (730 centidays) since issuance of this solicitation.* Hypothetically if the RFP was issued in Oct 2023 and proposals due Dec 2023, the window in which the project must either end, be ongoing or start is 1 year, 9 months. Furthermore, the dates for both RFP issue and proposal due are not easily predicted for an IDIQ of this type. This short window and the unpredictability of both RFP issue and Proposal due dates makes it difficult to accurately identify projects which will be usable for the proposal. Additionally, two years is an unusually short recency requirement for past performance projects. **Request**: It is respectfully requested that the recency requirement in Section L.4.3.1.2 be increased to the more customary three years from the date of issuance of the RFP.	Thank you for your suggestion.
473	3/21/2023	Attachment 16			Currently, Attachment 16, the Project Verification Form is provided as a scanned PDF,, which cannot be accurately converted to a Word document so it can be edited. Request: It is requested that the Government proved this document in Word form so it can be used.	Attachment documents that are required to be filled in will be provided in Word format with the final RFP.
474	3/21/2023	Draft RFP	page 80	RFP Part 5 Section 5.1.1	The RFP states: *These rates are based on an annual escalation factor of 3.0% beginning with the first option period.* At this time as of the end of February, the Consumer Price Index is 6%. **Question ;** What methodology did the Government use to select a price escalation of 3% for this solicitation?	Additional information as to how the DHS developed the escalation rate will be provided in the final RFP.
475	3/21/2023	Draft RFP	Page 81	RFP Section 6.1.2	The RFP States: *The offeror shall complete all fill-in info1mation required by clauses pertinent to this acquisition and submit it under Volume IV of its proposal.* **Request:** To ensure proposal compliance, it is requested that the Government specify the clauses that must be provided in this section.	Thank you for your suggestion.
476	3/21/2023	Draft RFP	Page 82	RFP Section 6.1.3	The RFP states: *The offeror shall provide any info1mation required by the Tens and Conditions of this solicitation and submit it under Volume IV of its proposal.* **Request:** To ensure proposal compliance, it is requested that the Government specify the clauses that must be provided in this section.	Thank you for your suggestion.
477	3/21/2023	Draft RFP	Page 82	RFP Section 6.1.5	The RFP states: *The offeror shall provide all intonation that is required by the provisions of this solicitation, as applicable under Volume IV of its proposal. Those provisions include,* ***but are not limited to*** *:* **Request:** In order to ensure proposal compliance, it is requested that the words "but are not limited to" be removed from this section, and that the Government specify exactly what information must be provided in this section.	Thank you for your suggestion.
478	3/21/2023	Draft RFP	Page 50	RFP Part III Section 11.0	The RFP States: *Only offerors who have identified their offers to be valid throughout the entirety of the PACTS III period of perfo1mance will be eligible for on ramping. There will be no open season to publicly post and allow for new offerors after the original solicitation closing date.* It appears that the Government intends to use proposals that were the basis for initial contractor selection for on-ramping purposes throughout the entire 10 year period of performance. There are several challenges to this approach which will significantly reduce the usability of this IDIQ in the later years of the Period of Performance: 1.. Many companies will have ceased to exist or to have graduated out of their small business status after 3 years. 2. Projects used as a basis for the proposal will be past the period of acceptance and may not accurately represent the companies current capability. **Request:** it is respectfully requested that the Government reconsider this on-ramp approach.	The on ramping approach is intentionally designed to maintain the integrity of the PACTS III vehicle. The government does not intend to keep companies that have outgrown their small business size standard at the time of option exercise, either. Additionally, the on ramping approach is designed to mirror the evaluation from the time of initial award.
479	3/21/2023	Draft RFP	Table 6 page 70	RFP Section L>.2.5	The RFP's file naming convention or Volume II, Experience Verification is: *<UEI> FCXX Volume II Experience* This file naming convention does not provide a standard way for offerors to label the files they submit for each project. With an unlimited number of projects allowed, the number of feels for each offeror will be large. For example, an offeror with 20 projects and an average of 3 PDF files per project, will generate 60 files for that offeror. if each offeror creates their own naming convention, the result will be very difficult for reviewers to manage. Additionally, the size and number of files will exceed the size capability for email systems to effectively transmit. **Recommend that the Government:** 1. Establish a naming convention that will accommodate the files submitted by each project to organize the files by offeror, project, and file content. 2. Consider establish a portal similar to the Symphony portal used by GSA for POLARIS and OASIS to accommodate the large number of files and file sizes which will be sub mitted by each offeror.	Thank you for your recommendation. We have researched the size limitations of emails and do not foresee any issues at this time with transmitting large files.
480	3/21/2023	Part IV - SOW	no page number	C.3.2	Functional Category 2 (Office Administrative Services) is an improper consolidation of dissimilar industries with a NAICS code (561110) which does not represent any one industry that best describes the principal purpose of the Functional Category [refer to FAR 19.102(b)(1)]. For example, general office administrative services are very dissimilar from Court Reporting and Language Interpreting; A company that provides general office services does not typically also perform Court Reporting or Language Interpreting because these are specialized industries, each with its own NAICS code and requiring certain professional certifications. The description of establishments for NAICS code 56110 in the Census Bureau NAICS Code Directory does not include Court Reporting or Language Interpretation. In this case, the consolidation of dissimilar industries under a single NAICS code in Functional Category 2 will force an offeror to subcontract for services that it would otherwise perform. A Functional Category can contain multiple NAICS codes corresponding to the dissimilar industries provided that a Task Order RFP has a single NAICS code in accordance with FAR 19.102(b)(1). Question- Given that PACTS-3 will be a solicitation for Commercial Services, can the Contracting Officer assign the following appropriate NAICS codes to the dissimilar industries in Functional Category 2 to reflect actual commercial practices- 56110-Office Administrative Services; 561492-Court Reporting; 541930-Translation and Interpretation Services ?	The Government has selected a primary NAICS code, as reflected in the draft RFP, for each Functional Category that best represents the scope of services for the particular category.
481	3/21/2023	PACTS III Draft RFP and SF1149	All	All	Will the Government release a version of the PACTS III Draft RFP and SF1449 with optical character recognition (OCR)? The version dated March 3, 2023 is not searchable.	Thank you for your suggestion.
482	3/21/2023	Attachment 8_ FC1_Self_Scoring_Sheet_V2 Attachment 9_ FC2_Self_Scoring_Sheet_V2 Attachment 10_FC3_Self_Scoring_Sheet_V2.xlsx	Row 8 in the Self-Scoring worksheets Row 6 in the Experience worksheets	Self-Scoring worksheets Experience worksheets	Row 8 in the Self-Scoring worksheets and Row 6 in the Experience worksheets read: "What is the total amount of projects the Offeror has completed within the last two (2) years within the individual ranges provided below?" Please clarify if this requirement should read: "What is the total amount of projects the Offeror has ***ongoing or*** completed within two years (2) years within the individual ranges provided below?"	Thank you for your suggestion.
483	3/21/2023	PACTS III Draft RFP and SF1149	Page 75	4.3.1.1 Project Relevancy and 4.3.1.2 Project Recency	Item (d) in Subsection 4.3.1.1 reads "The offeror has provided at least six (6) consecutive months of performance by the date proposals are due" Item (a) in Subsection 4.3.1.2 reads "(a) The performance has occurred within two years (730 calendar days) since issuance of this solicitation. Please clarify the relevancy/recency timeframe for projects submitted under the Experience subfactor	The offeror must of completed six (6) consecutive months of performance on the project within two years since the issuance of the solicitation.
484	3/21/2023	Attachment 4_Contractor Labor Category Pricing	General	General	Will Attachment 4 in the final RFP contain a tab for offerors to include their pricing build up (to include Overhead, G&A, Fringe, Fee)?	No, pricing build up will be not included since this acquisition is 100% commercial.
485	3/21/2023	PACTS III Draft RFP and SF1149	Page 75	4.3.2 Verification	Please confirm CPARS will not be utilized to verify project experience.	In the draft RFP CPARS will not be utlized to verify project experience. However, please review future versions of the RFP for any changes.
486	3/21/2023	PACTS III Draft RFP and SF1149	Page 77	4.3.2.1 Verification of Project Experience Submission (Federal Government Contracts) and 4.3.2.2 Verification of Project Experience Submission (Non-Fedferal Contracts and all First-Tier Subcontracts)	If Offerors are unable to obtain signatures from the Government or Prime Contractor representatives for a project, Offerors will not earn any evaluation credits for the project. This may unfairly penalize highly qualified Offerors and limit competition under PACTS III.	In accordance with Part V Section 4.3.2.1, the offeror is only required to submit a Project Verification form signed by the cognizant CO official when an FPDS-NG is not available for the project. Additionally, If the cognizant Contracting Officer's signature is unattainable, the Government will accept the signature of the Contracting Officer's Representative (COR) or other Government Employee with cognizance over the submitted project. If signatures are not provided by the appropriate parties as indicated throughout this addendum, evaluation credit shall not be earned.
487	3/21/2023	PACTS III Draft RFP and SF1149	Page 77	4.3.2.1 Verification of Project Experience Submission (Federal Government Contracts)	If a contract's SOW or PWS is classified, what information should an Offeror provide for project verification purposes?	In accordance with Part V Section 2.5.2, no classified information is required or permitted in the offeror's response to this solicitation. For Federal projects, a SOW or PWS is only required to be submitted if the conditions of 4.3.2.1(c) are met. Please review future versions of the RFP for any updates on this subject.
488	3/21/2023	PACTS III Draft RFP and SF1149	Page 106	3.3.2.1 Fairness and Reasonableness	Section 3.3.2.1 references an Attachment 3; we are unable to locate this attachment. Will the Government release Attachment 3 prior to release of the final RFP?	Attachment 3 was not intended to be released with the Draft RFP and is intended to be released with the final RFP.
489	3/21/2023	PACTS III Draft RFP and SF1149	Page 106	4.0 Responsibility, Item (a)	Will the government require Offerors provide evidence of adequate financial resources (e.g., Letter of Credit from Offeror's bank) with the Offeror's proposal?	The DHS intends on determining Contractor responsibility solely through FAPIIS and SAM.gov at this time. If an offeror would like to claim points for having an adequate accounting system (not related to contractor responsibility) it shall follow the guidance provided in the solicitation, specifically the addendums to 52.212-1 and 52.212-2.
490	3/21/2023	Draft RFP	Page 74	Section 4.3.1.1 (d), the RFP	The RFP requires "at least six (6) consecutive months of performance". We have relevant project experiences that are completed but less than six months in performance. Request amending the instructions to something similar to "at least six (6) consecutive months of performance or a completed project, if less than six (6) consecutive months". This will allow for contracts that have shorter periods of performance and still would be relevant to DHS requirements.	The definitions of Recent and Relevent experience are based off the expected future requirements of PACTS III and as a result the government will not be amending this requirement.

491	3/21/2023	Draft RFP	Page 72	4.2 Self Scoring	Can all teammates past performance be included in the prime contractors self scoring spreadsheet?	For a project to meet the definition of relevant, the offeror is providing a proposal as a Joint Venture (JV), Teaming Arrangement or SBA Mentor-Protégé Arrangement, and the project for each Functional Category is from the JV, Teaming Arrangement or SBA Mentor-Protégé Arrangement **itself or a member** of the JV, Teaming Arrangement or SBA Mentor-Protégé arrangement.
492	3/21/2023	Draft RFP	Page 65	Functional Categories and Teaming	Functional Categories and Teaming - Can a company that is tracked as an SDVOSB also be on a team in another track, i.e. WOSB?	Yes, if that subcontractor is a member of the other offeror's team. Per the Draft Solicitation, Section 1.1, "If the Offeror elects to be considered for more than one of the socioeconomic tracks, the same one (1) proposal will be evaluated only amongst the other Offerors within the respective socioeconomic tracks." Meaning, if an offeror has multiple socio-econominc categories and would like to be consider for more than one track under the same Functional Category, then that Offeror will only submit one proposal for that Functional Category. The offeror shall only provide one proposal per Functional Category regardless of how many tracks it would like the DHS to considered it for. Furthermore, if the offeror would like to "elect" to be considered for more than one of the tracks within the same Functional Category, then it should state which ones by fulfilling the requirement in 52.212-1 Addendum, para. 3.1(e). Also pay attention to 52.212-1 Addendum, paras. 4.3.1.1, 3.1(k) and also be aware of the terms and conditions surrounding Organizational Conflicts of Interests and Cross-Teaming that are outlined in Part III, Terms and Conditions, paragraphs 10.0 and 10.1.
493	3/21/2023	Draft RFP	Page 72	4.2 Self Scoring	If a company is a prime in one track and if they can be sub on another track can they use the same self scoring past performance on both tracks?	No. The offeror cannot claim credit for the same project twice within the same functional category.
494	3/21/2023	Draft RFP	N/A	N/A	Will there be a minimum of 5 awardees per track and will there be four tracks in each Functional Category?	The government has identified the four tracks within each Functional Category as outlined in the RFP. As stated in the RFP, the government intends to make in award to approximately five awards for each track. This is not a minimum and as stated in the RFP the DHS reserves the right to have as many awardees for each track within each Functional Category as it deems appropriate.
495	3/21/2023	Draft RFP	Page 74	4.3.1.1 (d)	Will the customer accept TO's completed that were less than 6 months if the TO's were completed as awarded by the customer? Multiple short term TO's successfully completed demonstrates the contracts ability to respond to and complete short term emerging requirements by a customer, therefor the contract should not be penalized for success.	The definitions of Recent and Relevent experience are based off the expected future requirements of PACTS III and as a result the government will not be amending this requirement.
496	3/21/2023	Draft RFP	Pg. 97		If submitting as a teaming arrangement, when conducting the evaluation of past experience will the evaluation consider all teaming member's past experience or only those who fall into one of the four SB categories?	Per 52.212-1 Addendum, para. 4.3.1.1 (f), the DHS will evaluate all projects submitted by, "a Joint Venture (JV), Teaming Arrangement or SBA Mentor-Protégé Arrangement, and the project for each Functional Category is from the JV, Teaming Arrangement or SBA Mentor-Protégé Arrangement **itself or a member** of the JV, Teaming Arrangement or SBA Mentor-Protégé Arrangement". Therefore, if a project is from a member, regardless of its socioeconomic status, and meets the definitions of relevant and recent the offeror may claim it and it will require verification by the DHS.
497	3/21/2023	4.2 Self-Scoring Sheet PACTS+III+Draft+RFP+and+SF1449.pdf, but additionally impacting: Attachment+8_FC1_Self_Scoring_Sheet_V2.xlsx Attachment+9_FC2_Self_Scoring_Sheet_V2.xlsx Attachment+10_FC3_Self_Scoring_Sheet_V2.xlsx Attachment+16_Project+Verification+Form.pdf	pg. 73 (Pg 78/138 of the PACTS+III+Draft+RFP+and+SF1449.pdf)	PART V - SOLICITATION PROVISIONS, INSTRUCTIONS & EVALUATION 4.0 Volume II - Technical 4.2. Self-Scoring Sheet, Paragraph 4	The current Evaluation and Self Scoring Sheet states, "*There is no limitation to the number of qualifying projects an offeror can claim under the Experience subfactor for each Functional Category. For each project that qualifies by meeting the criteria identified in paragraph 4.3 .1 of this solicitation, the offeror will receive the set number of points that corresponds to each of the projects it is claiming.*" There is no CONSIDERATION in SCORING based on contractor performance on an awarded contract? Winning a contract should not be sufficient to be awarded points, the contractor should also be required to postiviely perform on the awarded reference contract. **Would the government please consider contractor performance or minimum performance to determine if experience points are awarded?** For example, adding a requirement for evaluation ratings for past performance/experience submissions. This could be evaluated and scored based on the CPARS or the Project Verification form which are submitted as project verification. The government would then be able to score an experience as POSITIVE or NEGATIVE. A POSITIVE score means receiving a SATISFACTORY or GREATER rating for the majority of CPARS rating elements on a Project and a NEGATIVE score means not receiving a SATISFACTORY or GREATER rating for the majority of CPARS rating elements on a Project. ONLY POSITIVE performance score would be awarded the points in the self scoring sheet.	Thank you for your recommendation.
498	3/21/2023	Draft RFP	Pg. 71	Section 3.0 Table 7	Offeror has sized out of NAICS 561110 (FC2). Are small business offerors permitted to bid on individual functional categories or are offerors required to bid all three functional categories?	Offerors are not required to submit a proposal for all three functional categories. However, please be aware that in accordance with the RFP, an offeror is required to represent in good faith that it meets the small business size standard corresponding to the North American Industry Classification System (NAICS) code for each FC. Offerors that are sized out of that size standard will not be evaluated.
499	3/21/2023	Attachment 8 FC1 Self Scoring Sheet	N/A	Tab 2, Line 6 Instructions	The instruction states: "What is the total amount of projects the Offeror has completed within the last two (2) years within the individual ranges provided below? " Does the Government mean total number of projects and does the Government only wish to see 2 years of completed period of performance?	The revised RFP provides clarification on the instructions.
500	3/21/2023	Attachment 8 FC1 Self Scoring Sheet	N?A	Tab 2, Line 6 Instructions	The instruction states: "What is the total amount of projects the Offeror has completed within the last two (2) years within the individual ranges provided below? " Does the Government only wish to see the most recent 2 years of completed period of performance?	The revised RFP provides clarification on the instructions.
501	3/21/2023	Draft RFP	80	4.3.1.2, Project Recency	Recency is defined as having occurred withion two years (730 calendar days) since issuance of this solicitation. This recency requirement is outside the norm for IDIQs of this size and scope. Would the Government increase the recency timeframe to 5 years?	The government intends to maintain a recency definition of 2 years.
502	3/21/2023	Draft RFP	73	4.2, Attachmst 8-10	The RFP states,"There is no limitation to the number of qualifying projects an offeror can claim under the Experience subfactor for each Functional Category" This broad requirement makes it impossible for industry to gauge what it needs for a winning score. Would the Government consider limiting total project examples substantially or provide a base score so that Industry may have an understanding of what is required for a winning proposal?	The government intends to share findings from the survey responses provided by industry for potential offerors to guage how their scores will compare to the anticipated competition.
503	3/21/2023	Draft RFP		3.2.4 Subfactor 1.3:Facility Clearance	Most small businesses do not require an FCL to provide their servcices to the Federal Government. Additionally most services procured under PACTS II did not require an FCL In fact according to Table 8 on page 74 of the RFP only 10% did. Additionally, there was not a mandatory facility clearance requirement for PACTS II. The Draft RFP for PACTS III appears to weigh this criteria quite heavily by assigning it as one of three subfactors in the Factor I evaluation criteria. This will preclude hundreds of small business from competition.Will the Government consider removing the FCL requirement as a subfactor or at the very least provide a trade-off significantly reducing it's importance in the evaluation criteria?	The evaluation criteria has been developed to address the government's need of PACTS III having requirements that will require either a Secret or Top Secret facility clearance.
504	3/21/2023	Draft RFP		3.2.4 Subfactor 1.3:Facility Clearance	Most small businesses do not require an FCL to provide their servcices to the Federal Government. Additionally most services procured under PACTS II did not require an FCL In fact according to Table 8 on page 74 of the RFP only 10% did. Additionally, there was not a mandatory facility clearance requirement for PACTS II. The Draft RFP for PACTS III appears to weigh this criteria quite heavily by assigning it as one of three subfactors in the Factor I evaluation criteria. This will preclude hundreds of small business from competition.Will the Government provide a trade-off significantly reducing it's importance in the evaluation criteria?	This appears to be a duplicate question. Please see the response to Question 503 above.
505	3/21/2023	Draft RFP	92	1.1 Source Selection Mehodology	The RFP state, "The DHS intends to make approximately five (5) awards for each socioeconomic track within each Functional Category". We understand that the Government feels that it has reached SDVOSB goals and has decided to include multiple socio-economic tracks to PACTS III. However reducing total number of SDVOSB awards from 37 to 10. We believe that this will drastically reduce the SDVOSB footprint in DHS. In the interest of maintaing SDVOSB goals and honoring the nature of the original contract, would the Government consider increasing the number of SDVOSB awards relative to the other socio-economic tracks?	In accordance with RFP, the government may award more than 5 awards within each socioeconomic category, as deemed appropriate.
506	3/21/2023	Draft RFP	Pg. 76-77	Draft RFP, Part V, Volume I - Executive Summary, Section 3.1(k)	According to the Draft RFP, FAR 52.207-6 is applicable to this solicitation. <u>Question:</u> As confirmation, will the Government allow small business Prime contractors to have other than small business Subcontractors on their team and still be eligible for award under 8(a), SDVOSB, WOSB, and/or HUBZone competition, or would this render the Prime ineligible for award under these categories?	In accordance with FAR 52.207-6, teaming arrangements must be made up of small business concerns.
507	3/21/2023	Draft RFP	Pg. 76-77	Draft RFP, Part V, Volume I - Executive Summary, Section 3.1(k)	According to the Draft RFP, FAR 52.207-6 is applicable to this solicitation. <u>Question:</u> To receive award in the SDVOSB competition pool (as an example), must all team members (Prime and all Subcontractors) be SDVOSB's, or does the SDVOSB requirement apply to just the Prime?	The SDVOSB requirement applies to the prime.
508	3/21/2023	Draft RFP	Pg. 80	Draft RFP, Part V, Volume II - Technical, Section 4.3.1.2 Project Recency	According to the Draft RFP, project recency is currently listed at two years (730 calendar days) from issuance of this final solicitation. <u>Question:</u> Will the Government modify this recency requirement to 3 years (1,095 days)? For context, the Government typical experience recency standard is either 3 years or 5 years, and this will allow for use of a wider range of recent/relevant experience.	The government intends to maintain a recency definition of 2 years.
509	3/21/2023	Continuation of SF1449, Part I;	Continuation of SF1449, page #4 (lower right hand corner)	Continuation of SF1449, page #4 (lower right hand corner)	Now that DHS has expanded the small business coverage of PACTS-III to include 4 socio-economic groups, will the government add a Small Business contract category to accompany the 4 current socio-economic groups?	PACTS III will only include the 4 socioeconomic tracks stated in the RFP.
510	3/21/2023	Scorint Worksheet, Attachment 9	Scoring Worksheet, Attachment 9	Scoring Worksheet, Attachment 9	* The current scoring worksheet has places for 250 or 300 contracts completed by the offeror AND the total business for all of these contracts - if an offeror is maximizing its score would represent over $5B in projects. We recommend lowering the number of contracts to something representing a small business... NOT 300 projects and $5B. Will the government resize the submission requirements to 10 or 20 contracts instead of the 250-300 currently called for?	In accordance with the RFP, there is no limit to the number of qualifying projects that can be submitted for experience. The self-scoring spreadsheets are designed to provide enough spaces for offerors to submit project experience. Offerors are not required to utilize the entire spreadsheet.
511	3/21/2023	Att. 14 and Draft RFP	Attachment 14 - Qualifying Project Examples AND 4.3.1.1 Project Relevancy on page 74	Attachment 14 - Qualifying Project Examples AND 4.3.1.1 Project Relevancy on page 74	Currently, qualifying projects have to be completed within the last two years and have 6-months inside the past two years. Will the government modify this requirement by extending the relevant period to 4-years?	The government intends to maintain a recency definition of 2 years.
512	3/21/2023	PACTS-III Draft RFP and SF1449, Basis for Contract Award and Evaluation Process - Pages 91 through 96.	Pages 91-96	Pages 91-96	At this point, the highest scores will receive a contract - assuming a compliant submission is made. Question: has the government considered, or would the government consider, a fixed target for an award? As an example, FC3 right now has a maximum score of almost 40,000 points. Q: WOuld the government consider setting a plateau for small businesses to reach for a contract? For FC3, 30,000 for example? * A second recommendation for consideration is to take the FirstSource approach and make PACTS-III a 2-phase response. Phase 1 would be a GO/No-GO submission... and Phase 2 would contain the project experience and scoring worksheed with all of its required documentation. Bth idease make sense to industry and we believe great sense for the government.	Thank you for your suggestion. Please note there is not a maximum score any of the Functional Categories. If the offeror has more projects than what the Self-Scoring sheet allows for, a Self-Scoring sheet with additional cells can be provided. The government intends to continue using the evaluation approach of Highest Technically Rated Offerors with a Fair and Reasonable Price to select the awardees.
513	3/21/2023	Attachment 9, Scoring Worksheet	Attachment 9, Scoring Worksheet (Project Size Categories)	Attachment 9, Scoring Worksheet (Project Size Categories)	Regarding the project value categories, as depicted on the scoring worksheets, we question the use of the $10,000-$50,000 bracket. These tasks are so small they would generally NOT require the creation of a CPAR and in some cases would be acquired by a Crdit Card? These smaller tasks would be very hard to track and complete for submission on the self-scoring worksheet and appropriate documentation. Would the government consider removing that $$$ value category? The result would be that each FC would be seeking the same number of projects.	Thank you for your recommendation.
514	3/21/2023	Draft RFP	Paragraph 4.3.1.1 Project Relevancy, sub-paragraph f on page 75.	Paragraph 4.3.1.1 Project Relevancy, sub-paragraph f on page 75. Definition of "the Offeror" and qualifying projects from a JV member or a first tier sub-contractor.	13 CFR 125.2(g) states, "When an offer of a small business prime contractor includes a proposed team of small business subcontractors and specifically identifies the first-tier subcontractor(s) in the proposal, the head of the agency must consider the capabilities, past performance, and experience of each first tier subcontractor that is part of the team as the capabilities, past performance, and experience of the small business prime contractor if the capabilities, past performance, and experience of the small business prime does not independently demonstrate capabilities and past performance necessary for award." Would the Government please confirm that qualified offerors (e.g., Certified SDVOSB firms) leading a proposed team of small business contractors will be allowed to submit for scoring purposes the capabilities (e.g., certifications) and past performance of first-tier subcontractors without penalty in conformance with the requirements of this FAR clause?	Per 52.212-1 Addendum, para. 4.3.1.1 (f), Projects can only come from the JV, teaming Arrangement or SBA Mentor-Protégé Arrangement itself or a member of the JV, Teaming Arrangment or SBA Mentor-Protégé Arrangement. Meaning if a subcontractor is not a member of the JV, teaming Arrangement or SBA Mentor-Protégé Arrangement as identified in 52.212-1 Addendum, para. 3.1(k) then those projects will not meet the definition of relevant as defined in this solicitation. A subcontractor can be a member of a Teaming Arrangement as long it is part of the written agreement as required by 52.207-6 which is prescribed in FAR 7.107-6
515	3/21/2023	Draft RFQ, General Proposal Requirements	Page 73	Page 73	Draft states there is no limitation to the number of qualifying projects an offeror can claim. However, in the Scoring Worksheet there is room for 250 or 300 max depending on the FC. Would the government please clarify this statement?	In accordance with the RFP, there is no limit to the number of qualifying projects that can be submitted for experience. The self-scoring spreadsheets were designed to provide enough spaces for project submission. If an offeror has more qualifying projects than can be claimed in the self-scoring spreadsheet, please notify the government so we can add more rows.
516	3/21/2023	Attachment 14, Qualifying Project Examples	Example #4	Example #4	The example #4 implies that 6-months of the POP had to be within the 2-year period, going back from RFP release. It is our understanding that the project had to be anytime within the 2-years and the POP had to be at least 6-months in total. Would the government please clarify?	For the project to be verified, the offeror must have completed at least 6 months of performance within the last two (2) years.

517	3/21/2023	Draft RFP	Pg. 69	2.5.6 Page Size and Format	Can the font size for tables and graphics be less than 12 point?	Per 52.212-1 Addendum, para. 2.5.6, "Page size shall be 8.5 x 11 inches and the text size shall be no less than 12-point Times New Roman font". Tables, figures, graphics cannot deviate from this requirement.
518	3/21/2023	Draft RFP	Pg. 48	9.1 Security Clearances	Typically, DHS contractors have to undergo a DHS suitability evaluation. Is this true for the performers on this contract?	Suitability evaluations will be determined at the task order level and would not be applicable at the IDIQ contract level.
519	3/21/2023	Draft RFP	Pg. 48	9.1 Security Clearances	If DHS suitability is required, does the contractor have to factor this into price? Schedule?	See response to question #518 above.
520	3/21/2023	Draft RFP	Pg. 48	9.1 Security Clearances	For staff that do not yet have DHS suitability, is there an allowed time permissible before onboarding to a specific LCAT?	The suitability determination process, if applicable, will be detailed within solicitations at the task order level.
521	3/21/2023	Draft RFP	Pg. 48	9.1 Security Clearances	For staff who have a DOE Q clearance, how does this translate into the required S/TS clearance requirement? Our understanding is that a DOE Q is comparable to a TS. Please clarify.	Clarity will be provided in the final RFP.
522	3/21/2023	Draft RFP	Pg. 53/Pg. 64	5.1 Labor Category Pricing	Will the established LCATS have defined parameters for high cost of living areas that are identified? Is there guidance to these parameters?	As stated in the draft RFP, "The fully burdened ceiling rates shall include all direct labor and indirect costs applicable to that labor category (such as fringe benefits, overhead, and G&A), and profit. The Offeror should propose its base rates considering the maximum education and experience requirements for each labor category identified in the Labor Categories and Qualifications, Attachment 5. Additionally, the offeror shall consider the employee working in the highest cost location, highest performance at a government or Contractor site and the types of orders that will pose the most risk to it."
523	3/21/2023	Draft RFP	Pg. 79	18.2 Set Asides Based on Socio-Economic Group	Do all members of a PACTS team need to have the same socio-economic designation or just the prime? That is can a large business subcontract to a small business to demonstrate compliance with qualifying projects?	In accordance with FAR 52.207-6, large business subcontractors can not be used in the small business teaming arrangement.
524	3/21/2023	Draft RFP	Pg. 79	18.2 Set Asides Based on Socio-Economic Group	If a small business is awarded a PACTS contract, can they utilize large businesses to respond to task orders?	Yes, just as long as they comply with clause 52.219-14 **at the task order level.**
525	3/21/2023	Draft RFP	pg. 72 - 79	4.0 Volume II - Technical	Are teaming partners (subcontractors) allowed to contribute project experience to demonstrate the ability to execute projects of multiple sizes/complexities?	Yes, team members may submit projects as long as it meets the requirements of the solicitation. (Ref.e draft RFP 52.212-1 addendum para. 4.3.1.1 (f)). Additionally, please note that a qualifying project can not be claimed more than once within the same Functional Category.
526	3/21/2023	Attachment 8 (FC1)	N/A	Subfactor 1.1(c)	The draft self-score worksheet allows an unlimited number of projects to be submitted by an offeror and its teammates. We believe this scoring structure will drive large, diluted teams to gain maximum score. Would the government consider placing a limit on the possible scored projects submitted? A limit would result in a better PACTS III marketplace of smaller teams with more targeted skills for DHS.	Thank you for your recommendation, however the government does not intend to limit the number of projects that can be submitted by an offeror.
527	3/21/2023	Attachment 11 (FC1)	N/A	FC1 541611	Under Functional Category 1, can offerors use a NAICS Code other than 541611 for a qualifying project?	Projects must be similar to the services outlined in the SOW pertaining to the Functional Category the offeror is submitting its offer for (Ref. 52.212-1 Addendum 4.3.1.1(a)). If the Offeror believes the NAICS/PSC code assigned to the contract was not correct then it shall follow the instructions provided in FAR 52-212-1 Addendum, para 4.3.2.1 (a)(ii) and 4.3.2.1 (c). This information will be evaluated based on 52.212-2, para. 3.2.2.1.1, Element 4.
528	3/21/2023	Draft RFP	Pg. 54	16.1 (d) (i)	Is the Offeror required to re-represent upon the IDIQ award? Is the Offeror required to re-represent upon each task order submission?	Per FAR 19.301-1 (b), "An offeror is required to represent its size and socioeconomic status in writing to the contracting officer at the time of initial offer". However, the government anticipates requiring re-representation prior to each option exercise under the IDIQ. Per FAR 52.219-28(c), the ordering contracting officer may explicitly require the contractor to re-represent for an order.
529	3/21/2023	Draft RFP	Pg. 50	11, Para. 3(i)	If an awardee outgrows its small business size standard due to organic growth successfully won on the PACTS III vehicle, would the contract holder be allowed to complete all option periods on its existing task order awards before being off-ramped at the next option period?	Please see Draft RFP Part III, para. 11.0. Specifically it states "If an off-ramp contract holder is actively performing under any task order, the contractor will be required to continue to perform under the terms of the task order through either its completion or termination at the task order level". Therefore, if the options on that specific task order are not exercised, then that TO would end and the offeror would be off-ramped.
530	3/21/2023	Draft RFP	Pg. 51	11, Para. 3(i)	Given the period of performance (base + options) covers 10 years, will the government consider an on-ramp procedure that allows new or updated submissions at the 5-year milestone (e.g., after the 3 year base and first 2 year option period)?	Thank you for your recommendation.
531	3/21/2023	Draft RFP	Pg. 64	1.1, Para. 3	Can a small business participate on multiple offers (at the IDIQ level) within a Functional Category as long as it does not use a project more than once and is not within the same set-aside category? For example, Company X (an SDVOSB) submits a prime bid in the SDVOSB FC1 Pool and uses separate and unique projects as a first tier subcontractor in FC1 for each of the remaining 3 set-aside categories (e.g., WOSB, 8(a), and Hubzone)?	Yes, a small business may participate on mulitple offers. Note that the same project experience cannot be claimed more than once within a Functional Category. Also, be aware of the Organizational Conflict of Interest language within the draft RFP.
532	3/21/2023	Draft RFP	Pg. 64	1.1, Para. 3	Will the government confirm if a team's structure require each member of the team to be a member of the prime offeror's socio-economic set aside category? For example, Company X is a SDVOSB. Company X is only permitted to have teaming arrangements with other SDVOSBs. Teaming Arrangements with other Small Businesses (e.g., SBs, 8(a)s, WOSB, and Hubzone) are **NOT** permitted for an Offeror proposing in the SDVOSB socioeconomic track.	Using the example of the SDVOSB socioeconomic track, the prime is required to be an SDVOSB, however the teaming arrangement can be made of other small business concerns and does not have to all be SDVOSB companies.
533	3/21/2023	Draft RFP	Pg. 71 - 72	3.1 (k)	Will the government confirm that teaming arrangements (e.g., prime/first-tier subcontractor, CTAs, and SBA-approved Mentor Protégé JVs where the managing member is a large businesses) that include a large business are **NOT** allowable?	Per FAR 52.207-6, all members of a small business teaming arrangement must be small. Please see SBA guidance on Joint Venture and Mentor Protégé arrangements as it is the governing body for these.
534	3/21/2023	Draft RFP	Pg. 73	4.2, Para. 3	In order to limit organizational conflicts of interest and establish team structures that are manageable, will the government limit the number of projects an Offeror can submit?	The government does not intend to limit the number of projects that can be submitted by an offeror.
535	3/21/2023	Draft RFP	Pg. 73	4.2, Para. 3	No limit to the number of qualifying projects an Offeror can claim will only benefit SBA approved mentor-protégé joint ventures where the "mentor" is a large business (that can perform up to 60% of the labor). I do not believe this is the government's intent for the PACTS III vehicle. Will the government consider limiting the number projects submitted by an other than small business (i.e., large business) that is a "Mentor" in a SBA approved Mentor Protégé JV?	The government does not intend to limit the number of projects that can be submitted by an offeror, including SBA approved mentor-protege joint ventures.
536	3/21/2023	Draft RFP	Pg. 75	4.3.1.1 (f)	Would the government consider requiring that no less than 50% of qualifying projects come from the Prime offeror?	Thank you for your recommendation, however at this time the government does not intend to require this.
537	3/21/2023	Draft RFP	Pg. 75	4.3.1.1 (c)	Will the government please confirm that a relevant project (signed by a CO with cognizance over the submitted project) can be submitted more than once only if the project's relevancy includes scope that demosntrate relevance in other Functional Categories? For example, Company X has a relevant project that is verified (signed by a CO with cognizance over the submitted project) across each of the three Functional Categories.	Correct. The experience can be claimed in each Functional Category, just not more than once within one category.
538	3/21/2023	Draft RFP	Pg. 72	4.2	The current proposed point system does not factor an Offeror's project performance. Will the Government consider adding CPARS rating levels as a factor (i.e., Exceptional CPARS ratings have higher point value than Satisfactory CPARS ratings)?	Thank you for your recommendation.
539	3/21/2023	Draft RFP	Pg. 72	4.2	To ensure high quality performance, will the Government consider adding a relevant "Corporate Certification" subfactor (e.g., ISO 9001 and/or CMMI Level 3 Services) that speaks to the company's process maturity and ability to deliver quality performance?	Thank you for your recommendation.
540	3/21/2023	Draft RFP	Pg. 72	4.2	Given the importance of Government Contractor's adhering to information security standards that protect sensitive information and enable them to properly respond to sensitive information incidents, will the government please consider adding a corporate certification factor that assigns points to offerors with a certified ISO 27000 system?	Thank you for your recommendation.
541	3/21/2023	Draft RFP	Pg. 78	4.4, Para. 2	To ensure accurate reporting, will the Government assign additional points to Offerors with a DCAA-audited Pre-Award Accounting System?	Thank you for your recommendation, however at this time the government intends to leave the adequate accounting system language as is.
542	3/21/2023	Draft RFP	Pg. 75	52.252-1, Para. 4.3.1.2	Since it is likely the solicitation issuance date cannot be exactly forecasted at this time, it is difficult for potential offerors to know which references will meet the criteria for recency. Potential offerors will be using current data as of the RFI survey due date (March 21, 2023) to complete the RFI survey. Would DHS consider setting a fixed date equal to two years prior to the RFI survey due date (March 21, 2021) as the cutoff date for recency?	Thank you for your recommendation.
543	3/21/2023	Draft RFP	Pg. 94	52.212-2, Para. 1.8	Will DHS have any controls in place to ensure discretional evaluation of "correction potential" is applied equally to all offerors?	The government will evaluate all offerors fairly and in accordance with the evaluation criteria set forth in the RFP.
544	3/21/2023	Draft RFP	Pg.79-83	4.0 Volume II- Technical, Para. 4.3 Experience (Subfactor 1.1)	Many 8(a) businesses have had success obtaining awarded contracts outside of the 8(a) program – i.e. SB, WOSB, SDVOSB, HubZone. Please confirm 8(a) Offerors using such contracts in Section 4.3 Experience is permissible so long as the Offeror meets the NAICS code size standard for the Functional Category.	Confirmed. The NAICS and PSC codes need to be one of those associated with the applicable Functional Category in order for the experience to be validated and accepted.
545	3/21/2023	Draft RFP	Pg.79-83	4.0 Volume II- Technical, Para. 4.3 Experience (Subfactor 1.1)	To ensure Offerors are not overly reliant on subcontractors for subsequent contract performance, please confirm that only contracts performed by the offering entitity - either as a Prime or a First-Tier Subcontractor shall be used in Section 4.3 Experience.	Per 52.212-1 Addendum, para. 4.3.1.1(e), A project is RELEVANT when it is from the offeror providing the service as a Prime or First-Tier Subcontractor to a public and/or private customer. Additionally, 52.212-1 Addendum, para. 4.3.1.1(f) states," the offeror is providing a proposal as a Joint Venture (JV), Teaming Arrangement or SBA Mentor-Protégé Arrangement, and the project for each Functional Category is from the JV, Teaming Arrangement or SBA Mentor-Protégé Arrangement **itself or a member** of the JV, Teaming Arrangement or SBA Mentor-Protégé Arrangement". Therefore, if the subcontractor is a member, all of its experience can be claimed as long as it meets the definition of recent and relevant.
546	3/21/2023	Draft RFP	Pg.79-83	4.0 Volume II- Technical, Para. 4.3 Experience (Subfactor 1.1) and Para. 4.3.1.1(e)	OMB-certified Best-In-Class vehicles (OASIS, Alliant 2, Polaris, OASIS+) have long held that Alaska Native Corporations (ANC), Native Hawaiian Organizations (NHO), and Tribally Owned entities may utilize affiliate past performance, so long as a demonstrated meaningful relationship is substantiated. Please confirm that 8(a) Offerors are permitted to use projects/past performance [as Prime or First-Tier Subcontractors per Section 4.3.1.1 (e)] of all affiliates as part of Section 4.3 Experience (Subfactor 1.1).	8(a) Offerors are permitted to use projects associated with their teaming partners as part of Section 4.3 Experience (Subfactor 1.1).
547	3/21/2023	Draft RFP	N/A	N/A	To ensure Offerors utilizing affiliate past performance deliver DHS a contractual benefit in program execution, please consider requiring submission of a meaningful relationship commitment letter (between the affiliate and Offeror). Such letters will substantiate commitment in accordance with GAO rulings that stipulate, "An agency properly may attribute the experience or past performance of a parent or affiliated company to an offeror where the firm's proposal demonstrates that the resources of the parent or affiliate will affect the performance of the offeror."	Thank you for your recommendation.
548	3/21/2023	Draft RFP	75	4.3.1.1 (e)	Is "Offeror" defined as a Prime and its teammates/subcontractors or just the Prime?	Per 52.212-1 Addendum, para. 1.1, Offeror is defined as an individual business without subcontractors and all members of a JV, Teaming Arrangement or Mentor Protégé.
549	3/21/2023	Draft RFP / Attachment 10	72	4.2	Is there a requirement for the Prime Offeror to submit a certain number of projects or can all/any projects come from the team as a whole?	The draft RFP does not require a certain number of projects from the Prime Offeror.
550	3/21/2023	Attachments 8,9, and 10	98	3.2.2 Subfactor 1.1. Experience-	If a small business offeror persues a JV with a large business/ mentor protege firm, can we use the large business's recent and relevant projects in the self-scoring sheets? If yes, will the large business's projects count the same number of points?	Yes
551	3/21/2023	PACTS III Draft RFP and SF 1449 Attachment 8 _FC1_Self_Scoring_Sheet_V2.xlsx Attachment 9 _FC2_Self_Scoring_Sheet_V2.xlsx Attachment 10_FC3_Self_Scoring_Sheet_V2.xlsx	Page 75 Excel - Tab 1 - 5	4.2 Self Scoring Sheet, Pargraph 4 Attachment 8-10, Self Scoring Sheet	The current Self Scoring Worksheet for the draft solicitation states, "There is no limitation for the number of qualifying projects an offeror can claim under the Experience subfactor for each Functional Category." If vendors are provided with an unlimited number of qualifying projects, there is a potential that any offerors (with teaming partners) could propose over 500 past projects based on the government's criteria. We recommend limiting past experiences to a maximum of 10 projects across the "Total Experience Score."	Thank you for your recommendation.
552	3/21/2023	PACTS III Draft RFP and SF 1449	Page 74	4.3.1.1. Project Relevancy;Paragraph (b), (i)	Would the government please consider using the total contract value award rather than the total amount of funds obligated for each project being used as claimed experience?	Thank you for your recommendation.
553	3/21/2023	PACTS III Draft RFP and SF 1449 Attachment 1_Statement of Work and Appendix A	Page 96 Page 2-3	Section 3.0 - Evaluation - Paragraph 1 Section C.3.Functional Category	Will the government allow offerors to use a project experience across more than one functional category, given a project's scope may cover multiple functional category areas? If so, will the goverrnment allow offerors to identify awarded work/tasks in the SOW/PWS as it is applicable to each functional categories?	No, per draft RFP 52.212-1 Addendum, a project cannot be claimed more than once per functional category.
554	3/21/2023	Attachment 8_FC1_Self_Scoring_Sheet_V2.xlsx	N/A	Total Experience Score	Can the government please provide an updated FC1 self-scoring worksheet that populates the score for project experiences?	Thank you for your recommendation.
555	3/21/2023	Attachment 8 _FC1_Self_Scoring_Sheet_V2.xlsx Attachment 9 _FC2_Self_Scoring_Sheet_V2.xlsx Attachment 10_FC3_Self_Scoring_Sheet_V2.xlsx PACTS III Draft RFP and SF 1449	Excel - Tab 1 - 5 Page 78	Excel - Self-Scoring Sheet; Experience, continued 11 - 50 4.2 Self-Scoring Sheet	For each Functional Category Self Scoring Sheet, would the government to consider adding a row to Tab 1, Self-Scoring Sheet that provides a total for all project experiences across all tabs (e.g. Self Scoring, Experience, continued)? Currently there is room for significant errors in manually adding up the total score depending on the number of experiences provided "to any projects the offeror claims beyond ten (10)."	Thank you for your recommendation.
556	3/21/2023	PACTS III Draft RFP and SF 1449	Page 64	1.0 PACTS III Structure and Objectives 1.1 Structure and Objectives	Can the government please clarify the definition of Teaming Arrangement as used in this Solicitation is as defined in FAR 9.601(2), a Prime/Sub relationship?	As defined in FAR 9.601(1), a contractor team arrangement means an agreement in which two or more companies form a partnership or joint venture to act as a potential prime contractor. Additionally, FAR Provision 52.207-6 is applicable to this solicitation;therefore, all members of the teaming arrangement must be small businesses.
557	3/21/2023	PACTS III Draft RFP and SF 1449	Page 69	2.5.6 Page Size and Format Paragraph 1	Will the government consider text size for graphics, charts, and tables be in 10-point font?	Per 52.212-1 Addendum, para. 2.5.6, "Page size shall be 8.5 x 11 inches and the text size shall be no less than 12-point Times New Roman font". Tables, figures, graphics cannot deviate from this requirement.
558	3/21/2023	PACTS III Draft RFP and SF 1449	Page 72	3.1 Content Bullet (l)	The government has only allocated five pages for Volume 1 - Executive Summary. If an OCI is found, will the government allow for the inclusion of an appendix (outside of page count) in order to allow offerors to respond to the question sufficiently?	Thank you for your recommendation. Please see future versions of the RFP for any updates to this area.
559	3/21/2023	Attachment 18 Volume I Cover Sheet	Row 6	Point of Contact (POC)	Can the government please clarify the offeror's POC (row 6) may be the same individual as the person authorized to sign the proposal (rows 16 and 17)?	Yes, the offeror's POC may be the same individual as the person authorized to sign the proposal.
560	3/21/2023	Draft RFP	69	1.1 Structure and Objectives, Para 2	The RFP states *"One proposal constitutes, one or a set of self-scoring sheets including claims from one of the following: an individual business, a Joint Venture, a Teaming Anangement or Mentor Protege"* . For a Teaming arrangement, is the prime limited to teaming with only similarly situated entities i.e if bidding the SDVOSB do all teaming partners have to be SDVOSB?	Using the example of the SDVOSB socioeconomic track, the prime is required to be an SDVOSB, however the teaming arrangement can be made of other small business concerns and does not have to all be SDVOSB companies.
561	3/21/2023	Draft RFP	69	1.1 Structure and Objectives, Para 2	The RFP states *"One proposal constitutes, one or a set of self-scoring sheets including claims from one of the following: an individual business, a Joint Venture, a Teaming Anangement or Mentor Protege"* . For a Teaming arrangement, if bidding the SDVOSB track, can vendors team with large business?	No, all members of arrangements other than Mentor Protégé must be small in order to be in compliance with FAR 52.207-6.
562	3/21/2023	Draft RFP	69	1.1 Structure and Objectives, Para 2	The RFP states *"One proposal constitutes, one or a set of self-scoring sheets including claims from one of the following: an individual business, a Joint Venture, a Teaming Anangement or Mentor Protege"* . For a Teaming arrangement, if bidding the SDVOSB track, can vendors team with small businesses with no socio-economic status/category?	Per 52.212-1 Addendum, para. 3.1(k), "FAR 52.207-6 is applicable to this solicitation; therefore, small business teaming arrangements are the only types acceptable."
563	3/21/2023	Draft RFP	92	1.0 Basis for contract award / 1.1 Source Selection Methodology; Para 3	The RFP states *"The DHS intends to award multiple, IDIQ contracts in support of PACTS III requirements to those responsible SDVOSB, WOSB, HUBZone and 8(a) small business Offerers whose proposals are most advantageous and represent the highest technically rated offerer with fair and reasonable price to the DHS, based on the following evaluation factors etc.* However, on the same page it states, " The DHS intends to make approximately five (5) awards for each socioeconomic track within each Functional Category as described in 52.216-27 of this solicitation. Can you please clarify if there will be only 5 awards per track/per functional category? For example, if bidding the SDVOSB track, there will be a total of 15 awards, 5 for FC#1, 5 for FC#2, and 5 for FC#3?	Yes, you interpretation is correct. However, note that the five (5) awards are an estimate and the DHS reserves the right to deviate from this if it deems necessary.
564	3/21/2023	Draft RFP		RFP Table 1, 2, 3, Pg 65	Under which Functional Category (FC) would task orders for cybersecurity services be issued? Cybersecurity Services as noted here is meant to be preperation of RMF documentation, Vulnerability Analysis of IT Systems, Threat Analysis, continuous monitoring, Penetration Testing and other non-IT related security measures.	Per SOW, Section C.5, Other Direct Costs/Ancillary Support Services and Products, IT services shall only be ancillary. Services being rendered under PACTS III shall be predominantly within scope of the three Functional Categories

565	3/21/2023	Draft RFP		Cont of SF1449 pg 4, 6th Para states " FP/LM/T&M orders will be allowed using separate CLINS"	Will there be a COST Plus CLIN at either the Contract or TO level?	No, there will not be a cost plus CLIN at the contract or TO level. See Part III, para. 14.0, for all the task orders types allowable on PACTS III.
566	3/21/2023	Draft RFP		1.3 pg 67, Table 4	When does the government expect to populate Table 4 in order for the contractor to evaluate it's likelihood of a technically acceptable proposal based on its self scoring?	This table will be populated based on the results from the survey that was issued with the draft RFP. Therefore, this table cannot be populated until after the initial draft RFP.
567	3/21/2023	Draft RFP		1.1 para 2 allows for Teaming Arrangements	When completing the Self Scoring Sheets should qualifying projects from a teaming arrangement be noted on the primes self scoring sheets or should they complete a separate sheet and if separate how do they indicate the team the scoring should be applied to?	If proposing as a Teaming Arrangement, then the Teaming Arrangment is the "Offeror". All members of that Teaming Arrangement should put their projects in the same Self-Scoring sheet as the Teaming Arrangement itself is viewed as one "offeror"
568	3/21/2023	Draft RFP		4.3.2.2 pg 77	The projects being submitted were part of an IDIQ Contract and issued to the Prime by the Government as Technical Instructions (TIs), whereupon the prime flowed all or a portion of the TI down to the First Tier sub via a subcontract Mod assigning hours and Dollars. The Mods provide Previous Funding and Total Funding for that option years PoP. Would the final De-ob Mod for this contract meet the 4.3.2.2 requirement along with monthly invoices to validate the hours and dollars within the validity period?	If the offeror is claiming a project that it performed as a First-Tier Subcontractor, the offeror shall provide the signed copy of conformed contract award documents or original contract award documents and associated modifications that was between them and the prime. This documentation shall include all funds obligated to complete the project.
569	3/21/2023	Draft RFP		4.3.2.2 pg 77(a)	Does the Conformed Contract Award Document refer to the Prime Contract or the First Tier Subcontract in the case of First Tier Subcontractors?	If the offeror performed work on the project as the prime then it should be the contract between the prime and customer. If it was performed as a First-Tier subcontractor then, the contract between the First-Tier subcontractor and the prime.
570	3/21/2023	Draft RFP		5.1 pg 79	There appears to be no place to include subcontractor rates. Does the government expect that all subcontractor rates in a teaming arrangement will fall within the base rates proposed by the prime?	The rates being proposed shall come from the offeror. The offeror is the individual company (without subcontractors) or the JV, Mentor-Protégé or Teaming Arrangement itself.
571	3/21/2023	Draft RFP		5.1 pg 79, 2nd to last para	How does the government expect to see discounted rates, i.e., a discounted base rate or a narrative entry giving a discount percentage.	The Offeror shall include any discounts at the IDIQ level in the base rate stated in RFP Atch. 4 which will then flow through all subsequent years. Additionally, the offeror may provide discounts in its proposal in response to the task order solicitations.
572	3/21/2023	Draft RFP	64	Section 1.0	Section 1.0 Page 64 Draft RFP states The Department of Homeland Security (DHS) anticipates making several awards within each FC and small business socioeconomic track to ensure beneficial competition occurs at the task order level while maximizing the effectiveness and efficiency of PACTS III. Suggest give estimated range in each socioeconomic category so bidders can know what their chances are of winning so not to waste precious bid and proposal dollars for losing proposition. Right now, under PACTS 2, you have 21 awardees in functional area 1 and 18 under functional area 2. Will you most likely consider the same for each socioeconomic category or will the total across each area include the same number of awardees but just split among SDVOSB, 8A, WOSB and HUBZone?	Please reference FAR clause 52.216-27 in the solicitation.
573	3/21/2023	Draft RFP	66	Section 1.3	Section 1.3 states based on market research, the DHS anticipates the highest technically rated offerors to propose the number of points identified in the ranges below for each FC and track. The offerors are also encouraged to populate the self scoring sheet on their own to assess their win probability and determine if it wants to submit a proposal for PACTS III. Additionally, the RFP states in the evaluation factors that "The DHS intends to make approximately five (5) awards for each socioeconomic track within each Functional Category as described in 52.216-27 of this solicitation." Given that Section 4.2. Page 73 of Draft RFP states there is no limitation to the number of qualifying projects an offeror can claim under the Experience sub factor for each Functional Category and that DHS does not want to limit points that could be scored but at the same time is placing draconian limits the number of awardees (i.e., 5 for each socioeconomic track), DHS is encouraging the creation of mega teams with the small business leading a teams of a large number of large businesses to maximize the number of points. This strategy runs directly counter to the intended purpose of the the PACTS vehicle which is to provide DHS with access to high performing socio-economically disadvantaged businesses. Given this, many businesses will chose not to compete, feeling that they cannot win unless they form teams of 50+ large businesses. Would the government please consider limiting the number of past performances that can be submitted to no more than 5 within the current existing 2 year window, much like was done for the PACTS II competition?Also, would the government please consider setting and providing vendors a minimum score to qualify for the vehicle? Doing so will meet DHS's intent to limit proposals only to companies who believe they qualify	Thank you for your recommendation.
574	3/21/2023	Draft RFP	73	Section 4.2	Section 4.2 states there is no limitation to the number of qualifying projects an offeror can claim under the Experience subfactor for each Functional Category. This favors more mature companies or large subcontractors who can get the highest scores as there is no points maximum. Especially since it states: "The DHS intends to make approximately five (5) awards for each socioeconomic track within each Functional Category as described in 52.216-27 of this solicitation.	Thank you for your recommendation.
575	3/21/2023	Draft RFP	77	Section 4.3.2.2b	Section 4.3.2.2b states signed by a Corporate Officer/Official of the commercial entity with cognizance over the submitted project and a representative of the Offeror. Allow as another option for a major tier 1 subcontractor to have government official fill out the Attachment 16 form vs. possible competitive prime who might delay response.	Thank you for your recommendation.
576	3/21/2023	Draft RFP	92	Section 1.1 Source Selection Methodology	Section 1.1 Source Selection Methodolody states The DHS intends to make approximately five (5) awards for each socioeconomic track within each Functional Category as described in 52.216 27 of this solicitation. To be considered as a HTRO-FRP Offeror, the proposal must score amongst the highest rated offers received for the track within the Functional Category. The DHS reserves the right to have as many awardees for each track within each Functional Category as it deems appropriate. Suggest deleting 5 as this could be problematic for task order bidding. For PACTS II for each functional category, you had 18 or 21 possible bidders. For PACTS 3 if a customer picks a functional area and socioeconomic category, the max bidders are 5 and in that case, you might get many bid where only 1 contractor bids and customer will stop using contract vehicle because they cannot get adequate competition.	Thank you for your recommendation.
577	3/21/2023	Draft RFP	105	Section 3.3.1.1	Section 3.3.1.1 states The Offeror's initial/minimum price may be evaluated, using one (1) or more of the techniques defined in FAR 15.404, to determine if it is fair and reasonable. For a price to be fair and reasonable, it must be no more than the Government estimate of____. Suggest filling this number in in so companies can better understand whether their price is too high or too low to submit a proposal.	Thank you for your recommendation.
578	3/21/2023	Draft RFP	106	Section 3.3.2.1	Section 3.3.2.1 states The DHS will evaluate the labor category prices for fairness and reasonableness in accordance with FAR 15.404. This evaluation will entail the DHS comparing the Offeror's proposed labor rates for the base and all option periods to the DHS's Labor Category Pricing, Attachment 3. (missing from attachments). Suggest sending out attachment 3 as soon as possible so companies can make sure their rates can pass the fair and reasonableness test.	Thank you for your recommendation.
579	3/21/2023	SOW -- Appendix A	7	Attachment 1	Appendix A states that contractor representatives should be provided "with Offeror" (*note: assume this means with offer*) and within five calendar days of substitution. Please confirm this means DHS requests Offerors to provide names of representatives with the submission of the offer? If yes, where should this information be included?	You are correct in that the language should state, "with offer" and that DHS requests Offerors to provide names of representatives with the submission of their offer. The Government will ensure that this requirement and language is clarified in the final solicitation.
580	3/21/2023	SOW	5	Attachment 1, Section C.7	Can the Government estimate what percentage of task orders issued will require contractor-provided facilities?	The Government is unable to provide this estimate.
581	3/21/2023	Self Scoring Sheets	n/a	Attachments 8-10+C8	Will the Government consider capping the maximum amount of points or projects used for experience? Doing so would create less onus both on proposal preparation and verification.	Thank you for your recommendation.
582	3/21/2023	Self Scoring Sheets	n/a	Attachments 8-11	Please clarify if subcontractor past performance can be included in the self-scoring sheets.	A project is relevant when the offeror is providing a proposal as a Joint Venture (JV), Teaming Arrangement or SBA Mentor-Protégé Arrangement, and the project for each Functional Category is from the JV, Teaming Arrangement or SBA Mentor-Protégé Arrangement itself or a member of the JV, Teaming Arrangement or SBA Mentor-Protégé Arrangement. If the subcontractor is not a member of a JV, Teaming Arrangement or Mentor Protege arrangement the offeror cannot claim its project.
583	3/21/2023	RFP	50	Section 10.1	If subcontractor past performance is allowed for self-scoring, is the subcontractor required to be exclusive to one prime bidder and use its past performance in the support of multiple teams?	See response above. Per 52.212-1 Addendum para. 4.3.1.1(c), for experience to be relevant it cannot be claimed more than once for each Functional Category. Additionally, be aware of the terms and conditions surrounding Organizational Conflicts of Interests and Cross-Teaming that are outlined in Part III, Terms and Conditions, paragraphs 10.0 and 10.1.
584	3/21/2023	RFP	50	Section 10.1	If subcontractor past performance is allowed for self-scoring, can the subcontractor use the same past performance for different prime bidders if the primes are not competing on the same tracks? For example Company XYZ teams with Company ABC on the 8(a) track and teams with Company DEF on the SDVOSB track. Can they use the same past performance in support of both bids?	Once a project is used, it cannot be used again for any reason.
585	3/21/2023	RFP	65	Part IV Section 1.2	With multiple tracks to consider, how will DHS determine what track to procure its task orders?	As stated in Part III, Section 18.2 of the draft RFP, the OCO will conduct market research in accordance with FAR Part 10 for each requirement to determine which track is best suited to meet the Component's needs.
586	3/21/2023	RFP	67	Part IV Section 1.3	Will the Government consider creating a cap for maximum points vice providing anticipated range of points as provided in Table 4?	Thank you for your recommendation.
587	3/21/2023	RFP	72	Part IV Section 3.1(k)	In specifying the requirements of the one-page diagram, the Government notes the inclusion of FAR 52.207-6. Please clarify if all team members must be considered small by the definition of the FC NAICS.	Yes, all members of a Teaming Arrangement must be small. The only exception to this are members of a Mentor Protégé
588	3/21/2023	RFP	73	Part IV Section 4.2	The third paragraph on the referenced page states, "There is no limitation on the number of qualified projects an offeror can claim under the Experience subfactor …" Will the Government consider creating a maximum number of points in each FC?	Thank you for your recommendation
589	3/21/2023	RFP	74	Part IV Section 4.3 (Subfactor 1.1)	Can offerors use the experience of subcontractors when completing the self-scoring sheet?	A project is relevant when the offeror is providing a proposal as a Joint Venture (JV), Teaming Arrangement or SBA Mentor-Protégé Arrangement, and the project for each Functional Category is from the JV, Teaming Arrangement or SBA Mentor-Protégé Arrangement itself or a member of the JV, Teaming Arrangement or SBA Mentor-Protégé Arrangement. If the subcontractor is not a member of a JV, Teaming Arrangement or Mentor Protege arrangement the offeror cannot claim its project.
590	3/21/2023	General	N/A	N/A	When should we expect for the final solicitation to be issued	The DHS is currently projecting the final RFP will be released in August 2023
591	3/21/2023	Attachment+11_Functional+Categories_Corresponding_NAICS_PSC.xlsx	N/A	Attachment+11_Functional+Categories_Corresponding_NAICS_PSC.xlsx	Please allow offerors to justify whether their projects align to the Functional Category NAICS/PSC Codes, if they are not listed within FPDS reports or contractual documentation. Many times contracting officers do not align the correct NAICS/PSC codes to contracts, however the functional work aligns.	Projects must be similar to the services outlined in the SOW pertaining to the Functional Category the offeror is submitting its offer for (Ref. 52.212-1 Addendum 4.3.1.1(a)). If the Offeror believes the NAICS/PSC code assigned to the contract was not correct then it shall follow the instructions provided in FAR 52-212-1 Addendum, para 4.3.2.1 (a)(ii) and 4.3.2.1 (c). This information will be evaluated based on 52.212-2, para. 3.2.2.1.1, Element 4.
592	3/21/2023	PACTS+III+Draft+RFP+and+SF1449.pdf	N/A	1.0 PACTS III Structure and Objectives	Please require SBA 8(a) recertification/verification at the time of proposal submission.	Thank you for your recommendation
593	3/21/2023	PACTS+III+Draft+RFP+and+SF1449.pdf	74	Table 8. Self-ScoringSheet(s) Point System	Please invert the point values assigned to larger contracts. Larger contracts receive fewer points which is counterintuitive, and is less advantageous for DHS.	Thank you for your recommendation.
594	3/21/2023	Draft RFP	98	3.2.2 Subfactor 1.1. Experience-	If a small business offeror persues a JV with a large business/ mentor protege firm, can we use the large business's recent and relevant projects in the self-scoring sheets? If yes, will the large business's projects count the same number of points?	Yes, projects from all members of a Teaming Arrangement, JV or Mentor Protégé may be claimed as long as it meets the requirements outlined in the RFP. Specifically, the project must meet the definitions of recent and relevant.
595	3/21/2023	Draft RFP	Pg. 51	Section 11	Section states, the Government will utilize a "next in line" approach for on-ramping. Will the Government notify companies of their position in this "line."?	Yes, this information will be provided during the debriefing.
596	3/21/2023	Draft RFP	Pg. 51	Section 11	Section states, the Government will utilize a "next in line" approach for on-ramping. Will the "next in line" approach be at the IDIQ level or per socioeconomic category track?	It will be at the socioeconomic track level
597	3/21/2023	Draft RFP	Pg. 52	Section 11	Section states, "The Government will, within 30 days, notify all existing PACTS III awardees of any on-ramped contractors." Will the non-awardees in line for potential onramping's information be include in the contract debriefing? If not, will the Government provide the debriefing of that particular company upon their award?	All offeror's will receive the same debriefing upon award of PACTS III. This debriefing will inform each offeror where they ranked for each track under each FC from highest to lowest.
598	3/21/2023	Draft RFP	Pg. 58	Section 18.2	What are the Agency's procedures for sole-source awards?	The Agency's procedures for sole-source awards will be outlined in the ordering guide as well as FAR regulations.
599	3/21/2023	Draft RFP	Pg. 59	Section 21.0	Section states, "Contractors are expected to meet the minimum contract sales requirement prior to the end of the base year of the Master Contract period of performance." Recommend changing year to base period.	Thank you for your recommendation.
600	3/21/2023	Draft RFP	Pg. 69	Section 2.5.6	Section states text size shall be no less than 12 pt new roman font. Will the Government consider allowing smaller font, no less than 10 pt new roman, for charts and graphics?	Per 52.212-1 Addendum, para. 2.5.6, "Page size shall be 8.5 x 11 inches and the text size shall be no less than 12-point Times New Roman font". Tables, figures, graphics cannot deviate from this requirement.
601	3/21/2023	Draft RFP	Pg. 72	Section 3.1	Section states, "Note: FAR 52.207-6 is applicable to this solicitation; therefore, small business teaming agreements are the only types acceptable." Please confirm that applying this FAR clause prevents all Primes from partnering with any large businesses per the respective NAICS.	All teaming arrangement must include small businesses only. Mentor Protege is the only arrangement that can have a large business.
602	3/21/2023	Draft RFP	Pg. 106	Section 3.3.2.1	Attachment 5 states the degrees must be directly related to the LCAT. How was this accounted for in section 3.3.2.1, fairness and reasonableness, as candidates holding a degree directly related to an LCAT would receive higher compensation than candidates with degrees outside of the LCAT.	Attachment 3, DHS Labor Category Pricing, will be used in the evaluating fairness and reasonableness of the Offeror's proposed labor rates (Reference Section 3.3.2.1 of the RFP). The fully burdened rates detailed in Attachment 3, DHS Labor Category Pricing, accounts for the maximum or desired educational and experience standards for each labor category.
603	3/21/2023	Attachment 5	All		Minimum requirements reqiore a BA/BS and four years of experience, and the candidate has 8 years of experience, they could qualify. We would recommend 2 years AA/AS, 4 years BA/BS, 6 years MA/MS/MBA, and 8 years for Doctorate. This would be above and beyond any minimum set at the task order level.	Thank you for your recommendation.
604	3/21/2023	Attachment 5	All		We recommend any minimum requirement that includes a degree should be removed and minimum degree requirements would be at the task order level. This allows maximum flexbility across the IDIQ and designates the hard requirements at the Task Order level.	Thank you for your recommendation.
605	3/21/2023	Attachment 5	All		We recommend that there be no minimum requirements at the IDIQ level and the only requirements at the IDIQ level be at the desired education and experience level.	Thank you for your recommendation.
606	3/21/2023	Draft RFP	Pg. 99	3.2.2.1.1	Section States, " i. The prima1y NAICS code stated in the Confonned Contract Award Document or Original Contract Award Document and associated modifications, matches the NAICS code associated with the Offeror's proposed Functional Categ01y;"Will the Government consider similar NAICS as long as the scope natches the SOW/PWS that needs to be provided. Often times, different NAICS codes are used due to size standard and not necesarilly used for scope.	Projects must be similar to the services outlined in the SOW pertaining to the Functional Category the offeror is submitting its offer for (Ref. 52.212-1 Addendum 4.3.1.1(a)). If the Offeror believes the NAICS/PSC code assigned to the contract was not correct then it shall follow the instructions provided in FAR 52-212-1 Addendum, para 4.3.2.1 (a)(ii) and 4.3.2.1 (c). This information will be evaluated based on 52.212-2, para. 3.2.2.1.1, Element 4.
607	3/21/2023	Draft RFP	Pg. 99	3.2.2.1.1	Section States, "ii. the PSC stated in the Confo1med Contract Award Document or Original Contract Award Document and associated modifications, matches the PSC stated in the Self-Scoring Sheet." Can we list N/A if there are no PSC listed in the contract documents? Not all solicitations require PSCs.	N/A is not an option in the self-scoring sheets for FC1, FC2, or FC3. If the Offeror adjusts or manipulates the Self-Scoring sheets in any way other than what is stated in the Self-Scoring Sheet Instructions, Attachment 13, the Offeror's proposal will be deemed grossly deficient and will render the proposal unawardable. believes the NAICS/PSC code assigned to the contract was not correct then it shall follow the instructions provided in FAR 52-212-1 Addendum, para 4.3.2. This information will be evaluated based on 52.212-2, para. 3.2.2.1.1 & 3.2.2.1.2, Element 4.

608	3/21/2023	Draft RFP	Pg. 81	6.1.1.1	Section states the number of bendor attendees is limited to 2 persons; however, the SOW states a maximum of 4 persons (C.8.3). Can the Government please confirm which is correct? We recommend a total of 4 persons due to the size and complexity of this IDIQ, and it being a small business set aside.	Clarity will be provided in the final RFP.
609	3/21/2023	Draft RFP	Pg 64	Paragraph 21.0	If 5 contractors receive award in each category, it is possible that a company can bid on each task order and not win. Per this section, contractor will be off ramped. Is the government planning to distribute task order awards to ensure every company receives a task order award. Otherwise, this criteria does not make sense or seem fair!	No, the DHS does not plan of distributing task order awards to ensure every company receives a task order award. Please review the final RFP for further information pertaining to this topic.
610	3/21/2023	Draft RFP	Pg. 20		Can the USG clarify if contracting companies must provide sick days in addition to PTP benefits?	Per 52.212-1 Addendum, para. 5.1, "The fully burdened ceiling rates shall include all direct labor and indirect costs applicable to that labor category (such as fringe benefits, overhead, and G&A), and profit.
611	3/21/2023	Draft RFP			Can the Ufy SG clarify ordeting period is the same as period of performance?	Per 52.212-1 Addendum, para. 1.2, the maximum ordering period for PACTS III is ten (10) years. The ordering period is defined as the time that tasks orders can be issued under this contract. The ordering period is broken out as follows: a three (3)-year base, plus three (3), two (2)-year options and one (1), one(1)-year option, if exercised. The performance period of a task order shall not extend more than one (1) year beyond the 10-year limit. For example, if the ordering period for the IDIQ ends on August 10, 2034 (10-years after the award of the IDIQ) and a task order is issued on August 10, 2034, all services, including options shall be rendered by August 9, 2035.
612	3/21/2023	Draft RFP			Will contract perform overseas?	Per section C.1.2 of Attachment 1, "As identified in TOs, the services provided under PACTS III will support DHS nationally. These services will be used within the 50 States and US territories." No performance will take place overseas.
613	3/21/2023	Draft RFP			Will all contractors fall under the FLSA?	Yes
614	3/21/2023	Draft RFP	pp. 70-71	DRAFT RFP, Para. 2.5.7 & 3.1	Is the Executive Summary the same document as the "Cover Sheet" (attachment 18), or should an additional cover sheet be provided by the offeror?	Yes, the executive summary is the same document as the cover sheet (Attachment 18).
615	3/21/2023	Attachment 9	N/A	Attachment 9_FC2_Self_Scoring_Sheet_V2	For FC2, PSC Codes "R799" (Support—Management: Other) "R408" (Support—Professional: Program Management/Support) are not selectable options. Were these omitted intentionally? Will the fact that the PSC Codes for our contracts are not listed count against us regarding our past performance and scoring? Those codes seem to be applicable for FC2, as the NAICS code is 561320 (Temporary Help Services) for our contracts that we are referencing.	The Government will review the list of all corresponding PSCs. Any changes will be incorporated in the final RFP. Projects must be similar to the services outlined in the SOW pertaining to the Functional Category the offeror is submitting its offer for (Ref. 52.212-1 Addendum 4.3.1.1(a)). If the Offeror believes the NAICS/PSC code assigned to the contract was not correct then it shall follow the instructions provided in FAR 52-212-1 Addendum, para 4.3.2.1 (a)(ii) and 4.3.2.1 (c). This information will be evaluated based on 52.212-2, para. 3.2.2.1.1, Element 4 or 3.2.2.1.2, Element 4.
616	3/21/2023	Draft RFP	p. 65	DRAFT RFP, Para. 1.1, Table 2	How many awardees are going to be selected for functional category two (FC2) in the SDVOSB track?	Per clause 52.216-27, "The Government will award multiple task order contracts for the same or similar services under this solicitation. The government estimates five (5) awards in each of the tracks and FCs and may deviate from these numbers".
617	3/21/2023	Draft RFP	pp. 65 & 70	DRAFT RFP, Para. 1.2 & 2.5.8	The DRAFT RFP states the expected award will be announced in August 2024. What is the projected proposal submission deadline?	The Government is unable to provide the projected proposal submission deadline at this time.
618	3/21/2023	Draft RFP	p. 67	DRAFT RFP, Para. 1.3, Table 4	What is the anticipated range of highest technically rated scores for the FC2 SDVOSB track?	The information in Table 4 will be provided in the final RFP