

Question Id	Question	Answer
6798	To clarify...the Exhibit 1 (REP) forms, are to be solely included in Offer Volume of the response, not in the Past Performance Volume?	Yes.
6799	As a large OEM submitting a proposal in Group A Products, we negotiate a commercial small business subcontracting plan annually in accordance with the FAR. Would NASA consider allowing those companies with commercial plans to add a 2% goal to the commercial corporate plan, rather than managing goals at the individual contract level?	No. AbilityOne goals are not included with Small Business Goals and are reported separately. The AbilityOne goal in SEWP VI applies to only those NAICS/PSC Codes designated with an asterisk in the RFP and are applied at the Task Order level when designated NAICS/PSC Codes are procured.
6800	Section A.3.7.2 describes the types of contracts allowed for Past Performance. Would the Government also allow Other Transaction Agreements (OTA) as Past Performance references?	No.
6801	Per Amendment 8, page 99, Offerors must demonstrate their financial capability to perform under this contract. If a JV is providing its separate JV members' Annual Financial reports/statements, and since that information is confidential in nature, will the government provide a secure method of submitting this information? If so, please describe how this will be accomplished.	No.
6802	If the NASA SEWP VI Contracting Officer has already received Past Performance references from an offeror, but the offeror finds it necessary to change the Past Performance references based on new information or recent amendments to the SEWP VI TOR, may the offeror clearly explain which previously received Past Performance references are no longer relevant and which new references should be considered instead using the submitted list required in Section A.3.7.2 (b)? Likewise, if new information or recent amendments change the relevance of an already received Past Performance reference (i.e. it aligns to a NAICS code that is different from the one selected for competition), will it be grandfathered and accepted?	Yes. The Government will review the most recently submitted Past Performance Questionnaires referenced in the Offeror's Proposal. If previous questionnaires were submitted for a NAICS code other than the Proposal's NAICS code being used for competition then the Offeror should describe how the work relates to the NAICS code being used for competition in order for that questionnaire to be accepted.
6807	Question #6010 references two distinct Table of Contents. This would seem confusing to navigate and establish appropriate bookmarks. Is this a requirement or can we explain in the narrative of each respective volume how we align with the evaluation criteria and use a single TOC that maps to the Proposal Content and Page Limitations section?	Yes. You can explain in the narrative of each respective volume how we align with the evaluation criteria and use a single TOC that maps to the Proposal Content and Page Limitations section.
6808	Our customers completed and submitted PPQs in early August based on the original proposal submission deadline. Are we required to have our customers submit new PPQs?	If the PPQ reflects the Offeror's Past Performance Volume, then the PPQs will not have to be re-submitted.
6809	Our customers completed and submitted PPQs in early August based on the original proposal submission deadline. These PPQs contained financial data captured at that time. Information, particularly the Average Annual Value likely changed based on calculations taken prior to the current proposal deadline. If order to avoid the burden of having our customers complete revised PPQs can we just provided the updated financial information for each project within the Past Performance Volume and explain in the narrative any differences from the PPQ?	No, if there are changes, re-submit.
6810	On July 18th 2024, our customer sent in our Past Performance Questionnaire, is this still valid and is there an acknowledgement that NASA SEWP has received it	If the PPQ reflects the Offeror's Past Performance Volume then the PPQs will not have to be re-submitted. The Government will not provide PPQ acknowledgement.
6811	The response to Question #6413 states "The RFP requires the completion of the full Representations and Certifications as part of the proposal submission. This includes all necessary fill-ins and acknowledgments as specified in the solicitation.", however, Amendment 8 of the RFP Section V, Page 121 states "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 . Can you confirm that the language in the RFP does not apply and we are required to submit the full Representations and Certifications as part of our proposal submission?	Offeror's shall propose in accordance with the latest amendment on sam.gov.
6812	Can completed Representations and Certifications be included as a separate PDF file within Volume I?	Yes.
6814	Question#4397 states "Amendment 8 clarified that all PDF documents within each Volume should be combined into a single PDF documents. Other files such as the excel spreadsheet should be added to the Proposal zip file as separate files." – however Section A.3.6(A), bottom of Page 93 states "Examples of how the respective documents within the folder are to be labeled are shown below:". This seems to indicate that individual files associated with a Volume should be provided as individual files. Please clarify as this seems to contradict the response to Q4397 as well as other similar responses (e.g. Q2331).	The current RFP prevails over old comments and responses. As stated in the current RFP there is no longer a requirement to merge the documents into a single PDF. Each document shall be submitted in a single searchable Adobe Portable Document Format (PDF) file. Each document should be placed in the appropriate folder (Volume I, II or III).
6815	Can you use a second Past Performance Questionnaire from the same Customer, just different awards?	Yes.
6816	If a scenario such as a main point of contact who has already submitted a PPQ on behalf of the offeror at the beginning of this proposal process retires or moves on from their agency/position, should the offeror list the secondary POC such as the Technical or Contractual POC on the list to whom the questionnaires were sent?	Yes.
6818	On Past Performance, what can you do if the customer refuses to send in the PPQ?	Offerors will not be negatively affected if the customer failed to provide a questionnaire as long as the Offeror has ensured that the references are notified and have verified that the questionnaire is completed and submitted.

6820	<p>Per Amendment 10, Page 103, the RFP states that SDVOSB Offerors, including SDVOSB Joint Ventures, must submit two (2) Relevant Experience Projects (REPs) from different mandatory experience technical areas, with at least one REP coming from the SDVOSB partner or the Joint Venture itself.</p> <p>Please clarify:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is it permissible for an SDVOSB Joint Venture to submit more than the required two (2) REPs (e.g., three [3] REPs), provided all REPs meet the mandatory experience requirements? 2. Are there any restrictions or evaluation considerations associated with submitting additional REPs beyond the minimum requirement? 	Only the required number of REPs should be submitted. Any additional REPs will not be reviewed and will have no effect on the proposal evaluation.
6822	Q&A Batch 6: The answer to Q2426 states that "Offerors should place their completed Representations and Certifications in Volume I under responsibility IAW A.3.7.1, bullet 10." There is no bullet 10 in A.3.7.1. Shouldn't the Reps and Certs be provided in Volume I with the fill-ins after the SF1449?	Yes. The Reps and Certs should be provided in Volume I.
6823	In a previous response NASA says : "All offerors are required to include an AbilityOne Commitment letter only if proposing under NAICS and PSC codes designated with an asterik, which requires the use of AbilityOne as subcontractors" Please confirm that use of AbilityOne subcontractors are only required for those offerors proposing under a required NAICS at the master contract level. Further, please confirm that if an offerors NAICS at the master contract level is not a required AbilityOne NAICS, but the offeror has identified NAICS codes in the NAICS crosswalk that are, the offeror can still compete under all NAICS identified on the NAICS crosswalk without utilizing AbilityOne subcontractors.	Yes. The AbilityOne goal is applicable under both the Master Contract Level and the Task Order Level only to designated NAICS/PSC Codes (marked with an asterisk in A.1.34).
6825	There are several questions related to the definition of "total value" for the REPs that appear to provide conflicting guidance. For example, Question #2508 "The total value size of an ongoing project is calculated as the total potential awarded contract value with all options exercised." - and - Question #4518 " Yes, "total value size" refers to the total contract value, including all options, not just the size of the project based on dollars obligated to date" both seem to indicate this would include the full potential award if all options are exercised. However, Question #6593 states "Total value only captures exercised options." - which seem to indicate that only options exercised to date are to be included. Please clarify how "total value" should be calculated.	The most recent comments prevail. The total value size of an ongoing project is calculated as the total potential awarded contract value with all options exercised.
6830	RFP Document Section A.1.49 POST AWARD SIZE STANDARD REPRESENTATIONS. "Upon identification of a contractor's change in the size standard the SEWP order request tool will be updated to reflect the size-standards listed in SAM.gov and a unilateral mod will be completed to update the contract accordingly." If a small business under Category B2 or C1 graduates the small business size will NASA SEWP issue a modification to move them to Category B1? Since there is no large business Category C, does this mean this offeror will no longer be able to respond to RFQs under Category C or does NASA plan to add a Category C for large business?	Contract Holders in Category C will be eligible for Government requirements for which they match the NAICS code and business size of that requirement. Contract holders that are no longer a small business under any Category C NAICS code will no longer be eligible for any Category C requirements. Any company will be eligible to apply for future on-ramp activity in Category B.
6831	Is an annual report of the parent company acceptable where a bidder does not report finances separately? "6. To determine if an Offeror is responsible in accordance with FAR 9.104-1(a), Offeror is instructed to submit information which demonstrates its financial capability to perform the contract."	Any information that demonstrates the Offeror's financial capability to perform the contract is acceptable.
6832	Amendments 9 and 10 issued a new SF1449 for Category B. Box 10 has Small Business checked and set aside 50%. We believe a different SF1449 is needed for Category B unrestricted, where Box 10 does not have Small Business checked and 50% set aside.	No.
6834	Is it acceptable to copy Part 1, 2, and 3 of Exhibit 1 into Microsoft Word and save our resulting response as a PDF? Exhibit 1 - REP Template Amendment 8 no longer has a text input field for Part III - Project Description, making it difficult to edit the PDF itself. If we use the PDF template for Part 1 and 2, but MS Word for Part III and save them all as PDFs in order to "attach" Part III, NASA will end up with 8 files, unless the offeror has the ability to merge to PDFs. It would be easier for offerors to mimic this template in Microsoft Word, complete all REPs and resave it as a single PDF with the proper file name and formatting, ensuring NASA has all the fields of information required, without needing to use PDF input fields.	No. The Offeror should attach up to a 3 page PDF to the Exhibit 1 PDF.
6835	Is it acceptable to remove the instructions in Exhibit 1 under Part III - Project Description when submitting a proposal?	No. The Offeror should attach up to 3 pages to the Exhibit 1 instruction page.
6837	1. Will the government provide an RFP documentation "Order of Precedence" for responding to the SEWP VI opportunity based on the RFP documents released to include the Q&A Batch releases? It appears there are some conflicts between the latest RFP Mod 10 released documents/Batch #6 and all the Batch Q&As.	Yes. The most recent RFP has precedence over all previous drafts and comments.
6838	2. Will the government please confirm that a contractor Teaming Agreement with an AbilityOne subcontractor (SourceAmerica/NIB) is acceptable in lieu of a subcontract agreement?	A Teaming Agreement is acceptable at the Master Contract Level to demonstrate a subcontracting relationship with an AbilityOne Nonprofit Agency (not directly with SourceAmerica/NIB). More Specific Subcontracting Agreements will apply at the Task Order Level dependent upon the requirements within the Task Order.
6839	3. Per the response provided in Q&A Batch #6, question #6674, is it correct to assume that primes are not required to adhere to the 2% AbilityOne requirement previously contained in the RFP?	No. 2% is a target goal to be reported annually based on total value of task orders that falls under the designated NAICS codes (marked with an asterisk in A.1.34).

6840	4. Please confirm that a contractor who bids a prime NAICS (e.g. 541330) for Category B or C, are still eligible for competing for opportunities for any NAICS which they qualify as provide in Exhibit #4 and verified in SAMS. (e.g. Prime NAICS 541330 and Exhibit #4 show eligibility to compete in NAICS 541512)	Confirmed.
6841	Based on the numerous modifications incurred since the release of the original RFP and the process for releasing Q&As, is it acceptable to have our customers respond with new PPQs for the past performance examples and mandatory technical subject areas by Category selected which may have changed since the original PPQs were sent out? Is there a notation or means to identify new PPQ submissions to the government to ensure the right PPQs are being used vice those previous submitted if needed?	If the PPQ reflects the Offeror's Past Performance Volume then the PPQs will not have to be re-submitted. The Government will review the most recent submitted PPQ matching the Offeror's POC table, if more than one was submitted per reference.
6844	<p>1) Is Past Performance History in Vol II Item 10 (RFA p. 109) part of the page limit for Vol 2? Is the information requested on de-scoped cancelled contracts (RFP p. 111) not part of the page limit for Vol 2?</p> <p>2) Who do we address the Bank letters and Letters of Credit to (for FAR 9.104-1(a) compliance)? Who should the proposal be addressed to?</p> <p>3) Should all pdfs in a volume folder be combined and submitted as 1 pdf or as separate pdf files in the volume folder (ex. 10 SF30 files, ISO certificate, Exhibit 1 with project description, Exhibit 2 Questionnaire, CTA, etc.) ? After that, do we still include the individual files in the folder to be zipped ?</p> <p>4) Which box or where in the SF 1449 do we specify the single proposal level NAICS code the offeror will use to compete ?</p>	Yes. The Past Performance History is part of the 10 page limit. The list of descope contracts is not part of the 10 page limit. Letters can be addressed to NASA c/o Jim Griffin. As stated in the current RFP there is no longer a requirement to merge the documents into a single PDF. The Offeror shall include in Block 17a of the SF1449 the NAICS Code the Offeror is proposing using for competition at the master contract level.
6845	The government responded as follows to the questions regarding how to submit the Mission Suit Materials "The documents associated with the Technical Approach should be placed in one folder and the documents associated with the Management Approach should be placed in a separate folder. Each subfactor should have its own unique cover pages, table of contents, list of figures, and list of tables. The two folders should then be combined into a single Volume III PDF File with the exception of Exhibit 5 which must be provided in MS Office Excel format with working cell formulas The Volume III PDF and Exhibit 5 Excel file should then be included in the Proposal zip file. (Note: if an O-TTPS Certification is provided in place of Exhibit 5, include the certificate in Volume III and do not provide Exhibit 5)." It is not physically possible to combine two folders into a pdf file. Does the government want a folder for technical with the technical submission, a folder for management with the management submission and Exhibit 5 form all in a Vol III folder (i.e., 2 folders and the excel file in the Vol III folder)? Please note that there are only three pieces that are required to be submitted for mission suit, thus, the folders seem unnecessary, as there will only be one file in each one. Or does the government want one pdf file with Technical and Management stitched together, each with it's own cover page, table of contents, etc, along with Exhibit 5 - for a total of 1 pdf file and 1 excel file in the Vol III folder.	The current RFP prevails over old comments and responses. As stated in the current RFP there is no longer a requirement to merge the documents into a single PDF. Each document shall be submitted in a single searchable Adobe Portable Document Format (PDF) file; i.e. PDF file for the Technical Approach; another file for the Management Approach, etc. Each document should be placed in the appropriate folder (Volume III) for the Mission Suitability Volume.
6851	Past Performance Questionnaires. Please confirm that if our bid complies with all Volume II requirements but somehow our clients do not get their PPQs submitted, we are still rated Neutral for Phase II and so proceed to Phase III?	Offerors will not be negatively affected if the customer failed to provide a questionnaire as long as the Offeror has ensured that the references are notified and have verified that the questionnaire is completed and submitted.
6852	<p>Why is only one (1) NAICS allowable for Past Performance? The various Q&A on this is not in synch with what was explained in industry day. NASA appears to be requiring that the NAICS of submitted Past Performance project all be the same NAICS and match what is used in submitting the IDIQ bid via the SEWP VI portal. We did note NASA allows the bidder to explain a different NAICS alignment, for example say where a bidder has 2 past performance projects in one NAICS and 1 past performance in another NAICS, the bidder can explain how the NAICS of the third past performance relates to NAICS used in the portal submission. But why limit past performance to just 1 of the NAICS in scope of the Category? Industry Day (Slide 5) and the Industry Day explanation of the portal NAICS noted:</p> <p>"The NAICS code used for obtaining an award is only for administrative purposes (FPDS-NG)."</p> <p>And</p> <p>"An Offeror can select from any of their associated NAICS code to compete for an award, as long as the selected NAICS code is in-scope for that Category."</p>	Please review A.3.7.2 of the RFP.
6853	FAR 9.104-1(a) Request for Annual Report. NASA requests letters from certified United States banks indicating the available amount of credit for the business and the company's annual report. Most small firms or privately held firms do not have an Annual Report. A publicly held business would have an Annual Report that they can provide that is publicly available. For firms without an annual report, would just the letter of credit suffice? Or would perhaps also a Profit & Loss or Balance Sheet suffice, and if so, can NASA ensure that such private financial information will be highly protected? Per A.3.7 OFFER VOLUME (a)(6).	The references to "letters from certified United States banks" and "annual reports" are example documents that could be used to demonstrate financial capability. Any information that demonstrates the Offeror's financial capability to perform the contract is acceptable. All uploaded files will be placed in a secure area that is only accessible by the Source Evaluation Board members.

6856	Commitment to Supply Chain Risk Management and IT Security. NASA added the IT Security text to that section title which seems minor. Minor issue but really the bidders were likely already addressing Cybersecurity in that section as that relates to Cybersecurity Supply Chain Risk Management (C-SCRM) and the NIST requirements and the term Cybersecurity is more accurate versus IT Security.	This is not a questions but the RFP will remain as stated.
6857	Proposal Technical or Management Approach Duplication Checks. There is a danger that NASA may violate proprietary restrictions of bidder proposals in their checking for duplicate proposal content. Per A.3.6 PROPOSAL PREPARATION—GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS (B)(7). If the government makes use of certain AI checking toolsets against public sources, the data becomes public domain which would violates proposal proprietary information. Please confirm that NASA will not make use of AI toolsets to check for bid duplication. Most industry educational plagiarism toolsets, for instance, run checks on public sources.	The Government is not planning on using AI Tools during the RFP process.
6859	Representations & Certifications. Why is NASA requiring that bidders submit these when they are updated on SAM.gov and this paragraph (b) section of the RFP page 121 on that allows bidders to just verify that their SAM.gov is updated? Perhaps will NASA review the submitted Reps+Certs or is this just an administrative requirement? "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 ."	Please propose in accordance with the RFP; i.e. "complete only paragraph (b) of this provision if the Offeror has completed the annual representations and certification electronically in the System for Award Management ".
6861	<p>In Amendment 10 Section A.1.35, the RFP states "Upon award, the SEWP Contract Holder shall have an established formal agreement with AbilityOne Non-Profit Agency (NPA)/Non-Profit Agencies NPAs as proof of commitment to meeting the mandatory requirement to utilize non-profit organizations, which will be incorporated into the contract as Attachment H."</p> <p>In Amendment 10 section A.3.7.1(a)(5) states "Offeror's subcontracting plan and AbilityOne Commitment Letter, if applicable: The AbilityOne Commitment Letter shall identify the POC from SourceAmerica/NIB and identify plans to subcontract with qualified nonprofit agencies for SEWP opportunities within identified NAICS Codes."</p> <p>Can the government please confirm that only the Letters of Commitment from NIB and Source America are what is required for proposal submission and companies do NOT need to enter into Teaming Agreements or Subcontracting Agreements prior to award of the master SEWP VI contract.</p>	Confirmed.
6862	A.3.7.1 OFFER VOLUME (a) GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS 6. This section currently requires bidders to submit letters from certified U.S. banks indicating the available amount of credit for the business and the company's annual report in accordance with FAR 9.104-1(a) to demonstrate financial capability to perform on the contract. Could the Government consider revising this requirement to accept either letters of credit or a company's annual report? Many privately held companies may prefer not to submit their financial statements due to confidentiality concerns, especially given the risk of such information being disclosed through FOIA requests. Furthermore, companies may have confidentiality agreements with banks or financial institutions that restrict the disclosure of specific financial details, and breaching these agreements could result in legal ramifications.	The references to "letters from certified United States banks" and "annual reports" are example documents that could be used to demonstrate financial capability. Any information that demonstrates the Offeror's financial capability to perform the contract is acceptable.
6865	As of now, the Government has not published Attachment H. Does it plan on providing it to offerors so that it can be completed before the time of award? Please advise.	The AbilityOne Formal Agreement is Attachment H. Attachment H is to be provided by the contractor in coordination with Source America/National Industries for the Blind. Reference Solicitation A.1.35 AbilityOne Subcontracting for guidance.
6866	The requirement to disclose detailed financial responsibilities, funding obligations, liability limitations, and other proprietary aspects of a teaming arrangement, joint venture, or business combination poses significant challenges, as this information is often highly sensitive and confidential. Public disclosure of such details could jeopardize competitive positioning and potentially breach existing confidentiality agreements. Additionally, it is unclear whether this information is part of the formal evaluation criteria. Given the proprietary nature of this information and the challenges associated with safeguarding its confidentiality, we respectfully request the Government consider eliminating this requirement from the RFP or significantly limiting the level of detail required to ensure proprietary and competitive information is protected.	The Question is unclear on which part of the RFP is being referred to. To determine if an Offeror is responsible in accordance with FAR 9.104-1(a), Offeror is instructed to submit information which demonstrates its financial capability to perform the contract. Acceptable information includes: letters from certified United States banks indicating the available amount of credit for the business and the company's annual report. If a teaming arrangement, joint venture, or other business combination is contemplated, disclose each participant's responsibility for financial management of the venture, funding requirements, limitation of liabilities, and any other information which describes the financial arrangement.
6868	Page 110 of the solicitation states "Offerors are advised that the matrix is a summary of the referenced contracts submitted for the past performance volume for a given scope category" Answer to question #2455 states "the matrix is required to show both Past Performance and Relevant Experience mapped to the Content Representative Areas and Mandatory Technical Areas". Question: Can the Government clarify the requirement for the past performance matrix. Are offerors listing up to 3 past performance contracts and the REPs in the matrix?	The current RFP prevails over old comments and responses. Comment 2455 is no longer relevant. REPs are not included within the Past Performance matrix.
6876	Offerors are instructed in both A.3.7.1 and in the form instructions to fill out block 12 in the SF1449. This field is currently filled in "net 30". Should the Offeror update this block?	Yes.

6877	Could the Government clarify what is meant by 'Annual Report' for small businesses, as there is no standardized format or requirement for such reports? Many small businesses do not produce formal annual reports like larger corporations, so additional guidance on acceptable formats or content would be helpful.	The references to "letters from certified United States banks" and "annual reports" are example documents that could be used to demonstrate financial capability. Any information that demonstrates the Offeror's financial capability to perform the contract is acceptable.
6878	With the release of Amendment 8, there was a change to SF1449, Category A, block 10. The small business box has been checked and it has a 50% set aside requirement. We understood that Category A is unrestricted, please confirm.	Category A is partial Small Business Set-Aside.
6881	Ability one commitment letter: We reviewed and understood that if the bidder is bidding under NAICS code 541519e, and per the Q&A response, the Ability One Commitment Letter is not required. Please confirm.	An AbilityOne Commitment letter is needed unless the offeror is not submitting under NAICS/PSC Codes delineated by an asterisk * in the RFP.
6882	With Amendment 10, included in the notice was an updated Exhibit 5. However, SAM.gov shows the Amendment 10 version of Exhibit 10 as (DELETED). Should offerors expect a new Exhibit 5 form or is the Amendment 9 version the latest version to be submitted?	An updated and corrected Exhibit 5 was put on sam.gov at the same time the previous version was deleted.
6883	For a small business under Category A- if the offeror submits recent and relevant past performance references that are below \$150,000, will the offeror receive a "Neutral" or "No Confidence" rating for past performance?	If the Offeror has no record of relevant past performance that meets the minimum value or for whom information on past performance is not available [see FAR 15.305(a) (2) (ii) and (iv)] a neutral level of past performance confidence would be given. Note that An Offeror that has relevant past performance but fails to provide the minimum requirements of the past performance volume will result in the contractor being excluded from competition.
6884	Our consolidated financial statements and independent auditors report of year 23-22 has a mention on the company's credit line and status. Please confirm if the financial statements are accepted by SEWP in lieu of Letters from certified United States banks indicating the available amount of credit for the business?	The references to "letters from certified United States banks" and "annual reports" are example documents that could be used to demonstrate financial capability. Any information that demonstrates the Offeror's financial capability to perform the contract is acceptable.
6885	Our customer completed and submitted PPQs in early August based on the original proposal submission deadline. Do we need to resubmit it, based on the new due date 02/17/2025? Please confirm.	If the PPQ reflects the Offeror's Past Performance Volume then the PPQs will not have to be re-submitted. The Government will review the most recent submitted PPQ if more than one was submitted per reference.
6886	Can you confirm that a single award Master Service Agreement can be used for a past performance and/or a REP example?	Commercial MSA's should follow the same rulesets as IDIQs/BPAs in the RFP.
6887	We appreciate the Government's clarification of several inconsistencies within the RFP; however, the Government has not fully clarified the format for submission. Are Volume documents, exclusive of Government provided Exhibits in Excel format, to be combined into a single PDF (example: LOAs, ISO 9001 certification, company financial documents, SF1449, SF30s, etc, etc) or should offerors submit SOME documents as separate PDF documents within a Volume folder? If the Government will not further clarify this, can the Government confirm offerors will not be eliminated for compliance if a best attempt was made to follow the provided submission instructions?	Offerors should follow the instructions in the current Amendment, which is the prevailing document,, not earlier comments or drafts. In section A.3.6 PROPOSAL PREPARATION—GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS; (A) PROPOSAL FORMAT AND ORGANIZATION. Specifically to the comment: "Each document shall be submitted in a single searchable Adobe Portable Document Format (PDF) file (compatible with ADOBE Reader version DC or 2017), with appropriate bookmarks to at least the section header. All files, with the exception of Exhibits: 3a, 4, and 5 should be converted to PDF. Exhibits: 3a, 4, and 5 must be provided in MS Office Excel format with working cell formulas."
6888	Please confirm that PPQs do not need to be resubmitted if information changes between first RFP release and now, such as total contract value changes, do not materially change a project references qualification within a given Category? For example, if a PPQ for a project reference submitted in August already met the minimum value for CAT B at that time, and still does as of today, then the PPQ does not need to be resubmitted showing the change in contact value.	No, if there are changes, re-submit.
6889	Are the Technical Approach Factor and Management Approach Factor to be submitted as two individual PDF files within the Mission Suitability Volume?	No.
6890	If our chosen NAICS code does not have an asterisks for AbilityOne use, can we still submit an AbilityOne Commitment Letter?	An AbilityOne Commitment letter is needed unless the offeror is not submitting under NAICS/PSC Codes delineated by an asterisk * in the RFP.
6892	The government has posted a final Q&A document that provides answers to all questions submitted from 1 to 6797. However, when going through the total question responses there are conflicting answers. As an example, responses to questions 4206 and 5475 state that a Small Business can team with a large business but cannot utilize their past performance and REPs. However, questions 4776 and 4779 state that a small business can utilize their past performance and REPs. Can the government provide guidance on how to handle these conflicts and others with the Q&As.	Questions were answered on a timeline and in reference to older and since amended RFP drafts. The more recent comments take precedence over older comments. Ultimately the current RFP Is the definitive document the Offeror should refer to in preparing their proposal.
6894	Please confirm only the latest (most recently released) SF1449 is to be submitted and not all prior SF1449 versions?	Yes.
6895	Industry appreciates the proposal due date extension; however, February 17 is President's Day, a Federal holiday and may impact when Government personnel are processing proposal submissions. Should industry anticipate the due date will be moved again to account for the President's Day holiday?	Any updates to the proposal due date will be provided through postings on sam.gov.
6899	If Exhibit 5 is excluded from page limitations, it stands to reason an O-TTPS certification submitted in lieu of Exhibit 5 in the Management volume would likewise be excluded from page limitations, but published Q&A Comment #6396 suggested such certifications are counted against the page limit. Please confirm an O-TTPS certification PDF provided as C-SCRM attestation (per A.3.7.3(b)v.) can be attached separately or as an Appendix and does not count against the Management volume's 15-page limit.	If ISO 20243 certificate is submitted as an alternative to the Exhibit 5 document, it would not count towards the page count. If the ISO 20243 is included in the proposal as part of the general Technical or Management Approach, outside of as an Exhibit 5 alternative it will count against the page count.
6900	Regarding #6. To determine if an Offeror is responsible in accordance with FAR 9.104-1(a)...Acceptable information includes: letters from certified United States banks indicating the available amount of credit for the business and the company's annual report. May Offerors provide a link to our company's annual SEC filing (publicly available online), rather than attaching a 100-plus-page PDF of the full annual report?	No. The references to "letters from certified United States banks" and "annual reports" are example documents that could be used to demonstrate financial capability. Any information that demonstrates the Offeror's financial capability to perform the contract is acceptable.

6901	Government guidance regarding JV & ISO 9001... "Joint Ventures (JV): Evidence shall be provided that the certification is in the name of the JV, prime contractor in the CTA, or in the name of one of the companies in the JV.- Page 98." Does this guidance also apply regarding O-TTPS and Exhibit 5 and Attachment J?	No. The references to "letters from certified United States banks" and "annual reports" are example documents that could be used to demonstrate financial capability. Any information that demonstrates the Offeror's financial capability to perform the contract is acceptable.
6902	Is the REP to be incorporated into the offer volume, AND as a separate Exhibit 1 attachment?	The current RFP prevails over old comments and responses. The referenced comment is no longer relevant. There is no longer a requirement to combine files into one PDF. The Exhibit should be included as a separate PDF file within the Volume I folder.
6903	Reference Comment 3902 - This was not resolved in a prior amendment. According to Amendment 6, Mandatory Experience Sub-Areas (page 102) list 10 areas, while the Scope of work for Category C lists Technical Area 11c: PROGRAM MANAGEMENT/ANCILLARY SERVICES (page 38)	Technical Area 11c is not one of the Technical Areas allowed to be used for the REP and Past Performance requirements.
6904	Regarding comment 5225, this has not been fixed by Amendment 6. For example, in A.3.7.1, item A says "The names, phone numbers, and email addresses of persons to be contacted for clarification of questions of a technical nature and business nature." In the proposal submission table on page 93, it lists item (a) as ISO 9001 and CMMI Certifications. Industry requests the same numbering/lettering be used in both sections, so we understand how to organize each volume.	Please refer to the current RFP Amendment, not Amendment 6. The ordering has been corrected.
6906	Regarding comment 1703, can you please provide an outline of exactly what should be included in the volume vs. what should be a separate attachment - please also outline if an item needs to go directly into a volume, while also being submitted as an attachment. In comment 5715, you also note that the Proposal Table is not an exhaustive list of items to go into the proposal. Please provide the exhaustive list by category.	Please note that the instructions provided in the current RFP, versus responses to old comments. Please refer to the current RFP for the specific instructions and guidance.
6907	Regarding comment 2122 - there seems to be quite a bit of ambiguity regarding what exactly is the requirement to be submitted with the proposal for AbilityOne. Can we assume the format provided by NIB is sufficient and should be included within Volume 1 AND as an attachment?	Yes. The letter should be included as a PDF file within the Volume I folder.
6908	Comments 2097 and 2325 contradict each other.	The current RFP prevails over old comments and responses. Exhibit 1 was amended to clarify that the referenced technical rare should be placed in the row marked Mandatory Experience Technical Area.
6909	Regarding comment 2793, 3850, 2797, 3901, 4045, 5716- they seem to contradict each other. Some note Volume III should be split into two files - one notes this should be combined into 1 file but with each Factor having its own cover page and contents page, one notes they should be put in separate folders, etc. - which is it?	The current RFP prevails over old comments and responses. Please follow the instructions and information provided in the current RFP. There is no longer a requirement to combine files into one PDF. The Letter should be included as a PDF file within the Volume I folder.
6910	Can the government tell us what section comment 3164 is referring to?	The current RFP prevails over old comments and responses. Please follow the instructions and information provided in the current RFP.
6911	Regarding question 4901 - We do not see bulleted paragraphs referenced.	The current RFP prevails over old comments and responses. Please follow the instructions and information provided in the current RFP.
6912	Regarding comment 5269 - these items were not provided by AbilityOne in the commitment letter from NIB. They do not provide confirmation of a pre-existing agreement. At this phase they also in the letter do not identify the qualified non-profit agencies. They don't list the NAICS, they just reference NAICS.	The current RFP prevails over old comments and responses. Please follow the instructions and information provided in the current RFP.
6913	Comment 5489 is in direct contradiction with previous responses which indicate that the AbilityOne letter should be included directly in Volume I (i.e. via a screenshot or incorporation after our word response is converted to PDF.)	The current RFP prevails over old comments and responses. Please follow the instructions and information provided in the current RFP. There is no longer a requirement to combine files into one PDF. The Letter should be included as a PDF file within the Volume I folder.
6914	Regarding Comment 5520, the government did not answer the question. Should a HUBZone or 8(a) write to all 11 content representative areas within Volume III Factor A, or just three?	The current RFP prevails over old comments and responses. The Offeror should follow the instructions as provided in the current RFP. Note that Amendment 8 updated the instructions for the Technical Approach to clarify it is based on the offeror's general technical capabilities with regard to the SEWP scope and Acquisition Objectives and not on the sample Technical Areas. .
6915	"In reference to comment 1925, instructions contradict previous instructions noting there should be one file (combined Tech and Mgt Approach with their own cover/indices into 1 PDF) placed in one folder labeled: Company__Category X_VolumeIII folder Are we nesting folders in Company__Category X_VolumeIII? Like within this folder there is 1 combined PDF, then there are two other folders (one for tech approach, one for mgt approach) with any attachments/exhibits? Also does the verbiage ""Exhibit 5 should then be included in the Proposal zip file."" Indicate that that this exhibit should be placed in the one folder named Company__Category X_VolumeIII folder."	The current RFP prevails over old comments and responses. Please follow the instructions and information provided in the current RFP.
6916	Comment 2143 contradicts other responses (example 2158) stating that everything should be converted to PDF and included with the single PDF file. Only Excel should be submitted in both the PDF and as a native file.	The current RFP prevails over old comments and responses. Please follow the instructions and information provided in the current RFP.

6917	Regarding comment 2331 - the government is saying include ISO as part of Volume 1 PDF AND as a PDF attachment?	The current RFP prevails over old comments and responses. Please follow the instructions and information provided in the current RFP.
6918	Does the government want us to include the FAR report from SAM in our Volume 1 with our representations and certifications (this would have things like Responsibility Matters? Also, should the reps and certs be inserted into Volume1 or submitted as a separate attachment?	No, do not include the FAR report from SAM in our Volume 1. Submitted reps and certs documentation should be submitted as a PDF in the Volume I folder.
6919	Regarding comment 2550, submission requirements are still vague - it does not seem the question was answered. The government responded "yes" when industry asked if Subfactor A and B should be combined into one PDF, but noted there would be "two folders" indicating that a separate subfactor would be in each. It is impossible to keep them in separate folders, but also combine them into 1 PDF.	The current RFP prevails over old comments and responses. Please follow the instructions and information provided in the current RFP.
6920	Regarding comment 2569, this contradicts directives within this batch that note certain files must be submitted as separate attachments.	The current RFP prevails over old comments and responses. Please follow the instructions and information provided in the current RFP.
6921	Regarding the answer to comment 2594, it contradicts the order of the proposal. As indicated on page 107 of amendment 6, Past Performance Questionnaires should appear after the matrix.	The current RFP prevails over old comments and responses. Please follow the instructions and information provided in the current RFP.
6922	Regarding comment 3380, what is the "past performance history"? Is this outside of the 12 items we need to provide specific to the one PP we are submitting?	The current RFP prevails over old comments and responses. The comment refers to an older RFP draft and is no longer relevant.
6923	Regarding comment 3691, should it be included within Volume 1 of the PDF, or a separate attachment in a Volume 1 folder?	The current RFP prevails over old comments and responses. Please follow the instructions and information provided in the current RFP.
6924	Does a vendor have to satisfy all of the Content Representative Areas in the PP and in the PP matrix?	As stated in the current RFP, for Other Than Small Businesses; 3 content areas are required; for Small Businesses 2 content areas are required.
6925	Regarding comment 4306, the government references an Excel format with three pages attached for Exhibit 1. Exhibit 1 is the REP in a PDF format. Please advise.	The current RFP prevails over old comments and responses. In the current Amendment Exhibit 1 is a PDF.
6926	Contradiction - Regarding comment 4394, this is contradictory to the last sentence of another comment that states. "it is acceptable for offerors to combine response elements such as SF1442, Exhibits, LOAs, Reps and Certs, Teaming Documentation, Meaningful commitment letters, ISO 9001 certification, etc. at the end of each Volume file as Appendices. The correct way to submit these documents as part of Volume I is to include them in the single PDF file for Volume I.	The current RFP prevails over old comments and responses. Please follow the instructions and information provided in the current RFP. As stated in the current RFP there is no longer a requirement to merge the documents into a single PDF. Each document shall be submitted in a single searchable Adobe Portable Document Format (PDF) file. Each document should be placed in the appropriate folder (Volume I, II or III).
6927	There are several conflicting Q&A comments about the scope of past performance Information from the Offeror item #11 (terminated contracts). Please clarify whether offerors should list all terminated contracts the offeror has had in the past 3 years, or list only terminated contracts from among the offeror's proposal's 3 past performance references.	The Offeror should follow the instructions in the current RFP: "1. List any contracts terminated (partial or complete) within the past three years and basis for termination (convenience or default)."
6928	Comment 4840: " Yes, the offeror needs to submit the narrative on past performances, past performance questionnaires, and CPARS for the past performances being submitted." Comment 4907 says "The proposal submission table on page 96 does not include customer evaluations as they are to be submitted directly to the Government Contracting Officer via email to PastPerformance@sewp.nasa.gov" also, during the industry day, NASA indicated that the offeror should not include these as those who complete them are instructed to submit them directly to the government. Please advise.	As stated in the more recent responses to questions and clarified in the current RFP, the referred to independent documentation including CPARs is not provided by the Offeror.
6929	Regarding comment 4800, can the government tell us which section this pertains to, and identify the page numbers of items 1-6?	The current RFP prevails over old comments and responses. Comment 4800 is no longer relevant as the instructions referred to were updated in Amendments 8 and 10.
6930	Regarding comment 4880, help us understand why a management section would be in the technical approach (IIa), and what specifically the government is looking for since the management approach is in Volume - IIIb.	The current RFP prevails over old comments and responses. Comment 4880 is no longer relevant as the instructions for the Management and Technical approach were updated in Amendments 8 and 10.
6932	Regarding comment 5376, our JV is newly formed. Can we provide a bank letter (in addition to the Meaningful Relationship Letter) and a letter from our parent company to establish financial responsibility?	The references to "letters from certified United States banks" and "annual reports" are example documents that could be used to demonstrate financial capability. Any information that demonstrates the Offeror's financial capability to perform the contract is acceptable.
6934	On page page 94 of Amendment 8 Changes, it notes that Exhibits 1, 4 and 5 should be submitted in Excel. The government has submitted Exhibit 1 (REP) in PDF format. Please confirm this should remain PDFs.	This was updated in Amendment 10 to remove exhibit 1 from the Excel file list.
6935	Amendment 8 changes - the order of volume 1 on page 94 differs from the order of items on page 97 (including numbering) which format should we follow?	Page 94 provide examples of naming conventions. There is no specified ordering of files. The requirement is that the files must have clearly defined filenames and placed in the correct Volume folder.
6936	"Previously the government asked for the below sections in Volume 1. Where do these go now? F. Information from First- Tier Subcontractors G. Joint Venture Work and Qualifications"	These are no longer in the current RFP and should therefore not be submitted.

6938	Lines 34 and 35 are blank in the NAICS crosswalk. Should something be there?	There are no blank lines in the current version of Exhibit 4.
6941	Amendment 8 changes, Volume 3b, item 4 Program Management sections i and ii. Both of these sections touch on staffing, processes. Can the government remove those requirements from one or the other so we are not duplicating content in a 15 page count volume?	There is no duplication. As noted in the RFP, section i is for Category A proposals and ii is for Category B and C proposals.
6942	Regarding comment 3108, can you outline the difference between a JV that would need to submit reps and certs from just the JV, vs. a JV that would need to have both company's reps and certs?	Comment 3108 has no reference to JVs. Reps and Certs must come from the JV itself.
6943	Regarding comment 3452, the government notes we should provide "work performed" in the past performance matrix. Please confirm that "work performed" is merely listing the technical area as a header. If not, the cells in the matrix are barely big enough to include one word, and this would be difficult (and take up many of the 10 allotted pages for PP) to put in a matrix.	The Offeror should place a P or an S in the cells that are relevant per the instructions and the provided example matrix.
6944	Regarding comment 4230, this contradicts other direction that these items should be included in Volume I.	The Offeror should follow the instructions in the current RFP. Those files should be part of the Volume I folder as stated in the RFP.
6945	Comment 4733 indicates that the offeror needs to submit Exhibit 2 with its proposal. Please confirm the government meant that the PPQ customer is to submit the form to the government.	Confirmed.
6946	Regarding comment 5127, what is meant by the two-year revenue threshold - is this a disqualifier for a newly formed JV?	Question is unclear. 5127 referred to a financial letter of intent.
6947	Comment 5310 references a 5th bullet in A.3.7.12 - there are only numbers and letters - please clarify what the response refers to and reiterate the answer.	There is no A.3.7.12 referenced in comment 5310 and / or the RFP. The current RFP itself has been subsequently amended and sections have been updated and moved. The referenced information in the comment is no longer in the RFP. Offerors should refer to the current RFP itself and not past comments on previous RFP drafts.
6948	Comment 5758 contradicts other directives that all files should be included in a single PDF. Please confirm the meaningful relationship letter should be included in the volume 1 as item 4.	Please note that the instructions provided in the current RFP, versus responses to old comments. Meaningful Relationship Letters should be in PDF form and included in Volume I. It is unclear what item 4 in the comment refers to.
6949	"Resubmitting comment 5817 -A.3.5 does not address all scenarios that may be applicable within a Category and Group. For example, can a large business offeror who is a member of a small business (e.g., Mentor Protégé) Joint Venture proposing in Category C in Group C1 - Small Business Set Aside also propose as a first tier subcontractor/CTA to another Small Business Offeror proposing within Category C, Group C-1?	No.
6950	Regarding comment 6010, we are confused about the notion that we will provide 2 tables of content. Please advise why and what information should be included in each. Also, is it applicable to all volumes?	The current RFP prevails over old comments and responses. Please refer to the current RFP for the specific instructions and guidance.
6951	In comment 6411, the vendor asks about a cover letter (letter to the government outlining pertinent facts), but the government responds that a cover page (first page with solicitation number, due date, company name, etc.). Can NASA confirm that a cover letter is permitted and excluded from page count?	The current RFP prevails over old comments and responses. In the RFP a cover page is equivalent to a cover letter and is excluded from the page count.
6952	Please confirm comment 6434 no longer applies for category C.	Comment 6434 is no longer relevant, please refer to the current RFP.
6953	The question in comment 6694 is indicating that a small business subcontracting plan is needed for a small business. Is this accurate - the government just notes the solicitation will stay as is. Is a small business required to provide a subcontracting plan?	Only Other than small businesses should submit a subcontracting plan. Note that the comment referenced is with regard to AbilityOne and not subcontracting plans.
6955	"We are a MPJV. To establish financial responsibility, the protege has included bank letters from its parent noting \$10M in liquidity - the bank does not issue ""lines of credit"" letters. The mentor has provided a bank letter noting a \$1M line of credit. We have also added our JV operating agreement which discusses liability of each company. Two questions: 1. Is this enough to satisfy the government's requirement of financial responsibility? 2. The Mentor does not disclose company reports. The protege has a 47 page audited financial from its parent company. Does this need to be included to be found responsible? "	The references to "letters from certified United States banks" and "annual reports" are example documents that could be used to demonstrate financial capability. Any information that demonstrates the Offeror's financial capability to perform the contract is acceptable.
6959	If the offeror has no relevant experience (REP) or past performance (which would impact REP submission and PP volume) will the offeror receive a neutral rating (for both REP and PP) and still advance to Phase 2?	No. REPs are required as stated in the RFP.
6960	Comment 4238 contradicts other directives that the files for Volume IIIa and IIIb should be combined into one. Please advise.	Please note that the instructions provided in the current RFP, versus responses to old comments. Please refer to the current RFP for the specific instructions and guidance

6961	Regarding comment 5585 from Batch 6 - we no longer see reference to Adobe PDF Portfolio within the solicitation - please confirm this was removed and is no longer required.	The current RFP is the correct version to follow; in this case the reference to the Adobe PDF Portfolio is no longer relevant.
6964	We need clarity on past performance. On page 108, we should provide items 1-9 based on the PP we are submitting for consideration. We are not to detail that PP, rather we are supposed to under item 10 provide a generalized overall past performance history of meeting the 10 CRAs in Category C?	No, as stated: Offerors are advised that the matrix is a summary of the referenced contracts submitted; i.e. based on the PPQs being submitted.
6965	What does the subscript mean on the past performance matrix?	The question is unclear. There are no subscripts in the sample past performance matrix. If the Offeror is asking about the "P"s in the example matrix, please review the instructions that accompany that section.
6966	Vendor requests NAICS 561210 be added to the crosswalk - similar to 541611, the 561210 NAICS has a broad scope, and is often used as a catch-all to bundle different types of work together. Specifically, IT O&M, RMF Cyber, and Levels I-III Help Desk can, and often do, appear in the 561210 NAICS. We strongly suggest the inclusion of 561210.	NAICS 561210 is not in scope.
6967	Prior to the solicitation being put on hold our Past Performance reference submitted the signed Exhibit 2 evaluation to PastPerformance@sewp.nasa.gov. Please confirm that we do not need to have the Exhibit 2 questionnaire re-submitted since the solicitation was re-activated.	Confirmed.
6969	A.3.7.1 (a)6 states "Acceptable information includes: letters from certified United States banks indicating the available amount of credit for the business and the company's annual report." Would other acceptable information include Bank Statements or Fiscal Year End P&L statements?	The references to "letters from certified United States banks" and "annual reports" are example documents that could be used to demonstrate financial capability. Any information that demonstrates the Offeror's financial capability to perform the contract is acceptable.
6971	Please confirm that if there is a discrepancy between the most recent version of the RFP and the published Q&As, then the most recent version of the RFP will be the final governance for offerors proposal submission.	Yes, the most current version of the RFP takes precedence.
6972	As stated in Question #4612 from the Q&As: For recent customer evaluations of past performance, may offers provide evaluations for projects outside of the 3 they are submitting as past performance? The government responded: "Yes, offers may provide evaluations for projects outside of the three they are submitting as past performance, provided that the evaluations are relevant and meet the requirements specified in the solicitation." Please provide the evaluation criterion for the additional projects that will be submitted outside of the 3 past performances.	Providing projects beyond the Past Performance minimum requirement will have no impact on the evaluation of the Offeror's proposal and therefore should not be submitted.
6973	Based on the response from Question #89 and the later response in Question #6224, these two answers contradict each other. Question #89: Does total value include unexercised option periods, or only obligated funds? Answer: Total value only captures exercised options. Question #6224: Referring to section, "Each Project must have had a minimum of \$2M in total value size of a single order or contract and must be described using the Exhibit 1 REP template." Is Total Value Size the Total Contract Value allocated to the project at time of award or Amount Spent till Date? Answer: The total value size of an ongoing project is calculated as the total potential awarded contract value with all options exercised. Please confirm that the total value size of an ongoing project for REPs is calculated as the total potential awarded contract value with all options exercised. This would benefit the government in allowing all qualified offerors to respond to this RFP.	Yes. The total value size of an ongoing project for REPs is calculated as the total potential awarded contract value with all options exercised.
6974	Will the government verify that the clarifications made in the Q&A responses provided by the government after the final RFP was released, will take precedence if the Current Modification 10 RFP (as released) is not further modified to incorporate omitted Q&A clarification responses?	The current RFP takes precedence. The most recent comments take precedence over previous comments.
6975	What does DRD mean?	Data Requirements Description
6976	Regarding #6, When the government references: "and the company's annual report", what exactly does that pertain to? Will a balance sheet and P&L statement from 2023 suffice?	The references to "letters from certified United States banks" and "annual reports" are example documents that could be used to demonstrate financial capability. Any information that demonstrates the Offeror's financial capability to perform the contract is acceptable.

6977	<p>"Government mentions ""Examples of how the respective documents within the folder are to be labeled are shown below:</p> <p>GetItDone_Category#- EXHIBIT # GetItDone_Category#- LOA # GetItDone_Category#- PP # GetItDone_Category#-Management Approach GetItDone _Category#-T echnical Approach"".</p> <p>Then the government mentions ""Each proposal volume shall be submitted in a single searchable Adobe Portable Document Fonnat (PDF) file (compatible with ADOBE Reader version DC or 2017), with appropriate bookmarks to at least to the section header. ...""</p> <p>If you are submitting a proposal to Category B, then there will be 3 folders in the zip named: Vendor_CategoryB_Volume 1, Vendor_CategoryB_Volume 2, and Vendor_CategoryB_Volume 3. Is that correct?</p> <p>In a folder for example Vendor_CategoryB_Volume 1 will there be individual files making up Volume 1 or will there be one single searchable Adobe PDF containing all the required Category B information for Volume 1?"</p>	The current RFP prevails over old comments and responses. Please refer to the current RFP for the specific instructions and guidance.
6978	<p>"Government mentions ""Examples of how the respective documents within the folder are to be labeled are shown below:</p> <p>GetItDone_Category#- EXHIBIT # GetItDone_Category#- LOA # GetItDone_Category#- PP # GetItDone_Category#-Management Approach GetItDone _Category#-T echnical Approach"".</p> <p>Then the government mentions ""Each proposal volume shall be submitted in a single searchable Adobe Portable Document Fonnat (PDF) file (compatible with ADOBE Reader version DC or 2017), with appropriate bookmarks to at least to the section header. ...""</p> <p>In a folder for example Vendor_CategoryB_Volume 1 will there will a searchable PDF containing all the Volume I RFP requirements per Proposal Submission Table except for Exhibit 4 - Offer NAICS Size Standard Crosswalk. Is that correct? Is the filename acceptable ""GetItDone_CategoryB_Volumel_Items.pdf""? Is it correct that ""GetItDone_CategoryB_Volumel_Items.pdf"" and ""GetItDone_CategoryB_EXHIBIT 4.xlsx"" files will be in folder that is named""GetItDone_CategoryB_Volumel""?"</p>	The current RFP prevails over old comments and responses. Please refer to the current RFP for the specific instructions and guidance.
6979	If the prime offeror has only 2 projects that meet the REPS and Past Performance for Category B and C proposal, can the prime add a subcontractor to the team and use that subcontractor's project that meets the REPS and Past Performance RFP requirements as part of the offeror's Category B and C proposals submission?	Please propose in accordance with the current RFP instructions which details the circumstances in which a subcontractor can be utilized.
6984	At the IDIQ Level besides the AbilityOne Commitment Letter, does the offeror required required to submit an Teaming Agreement or a CTA? Will the TA and/or CTA be required only at the Task Order level?	The question regarding Task Orders is unclear.
6985	Does the offeror required to submit a Meaning Relationship Commitment Letter at the IDIQ level if the ONLY potential subcontractor would be a Ability One Contractor as the requirement of the NAICS Code and we would be submitting an AbilityOne Commitment Letter in Volume I?	No.
6986	Does the offeror required to address the FAR 9.104-1(a) related per to the paragraph versus the prior amendment requiring all of FAR 9.104?	The current RFP prevails over old comments and responses. Please refer to the current RFP for the specific instructions and guidance.
6990	For Category B and C, does all the 3 REPS must have a NAICS Code of 541512?	No. Amendment 8 removed the NAICs code wording with regard to REPs
6991	For Categories B & C, can the REPS submitted be one of the NAICS Codes in Section A.1.34 on page 64 Table "Category C- Information Technology, Communication, and Audio Visual (ITC/AV) Mission Based Services"?	Amendment 8 removed the NAICs code wording with regard to REPs
6992	Does the offeror complete the entire Exhibit 4, for example if they are small business for more than one NAICS code, then they fill out SB for NAICS codes that they have in Sam.gov? Does offeror include a teammate's (subcontractor's) information in this form too?	Yes Exhibit 4 should be filled out fully with all NAICs codes and associated business sizes corresponding to the Offeror's sam.gov listing. If an offeror is submitting as a Small Business, they should indicate in Exhibit 4 any NAICs codes for which they qualify as a large business.
6993	For Category C, can the past performances submitted be one of the NAICS Codes in Section A.1.34 on page 64 Table "Category C- Information Technology, Communication, and Audio Visual (ITC/AV) Mission Based Services"?	As stated in the current RFP: The offeror must provide past performance submissions as it relates to the SEWP VI in scope NAICS code being used for competition at the master contract level, as noted on the SF1449.
6994	For Category B, can the past performances submitted be one of the NAICS Codes in Section A.1.34 on page 64 Table "Category C- Information Technology, Communication, and Audio Visual (ITC/AV) Mission Based Services"?	As stated in the current RFP: The offeror must provide past performance submissions as it relates to the SEWP VI in scope NAICS code being used for competition at the master contract level, as noted on the SF1449.
6995	During the industry day on June 4th, the government demonstrated the process of submitting a proposal on the NASA portal and was selecting various offeror information like NAICS Code, does all the offeror's Category B Past Performance INFORMATION FROM THE OFFEROR must all have the same NAICS Code that was entered on the proposal submission portal? For example, all being the NAICS Code 541512. If this is true all 3 past performance must be of the same NAICS Code then update the RFP document to state this requirement.	As stated in the current RFP: The offeror must provide past performance submissions as it relates to the SEWP VI in scope NAICS code being used for competition at the master contract level, as noted on the SF1449. If the NAICS code for the past performance submission does not match the Offeror's NAICS code used on the SF1449 or for references that are not assigned a NAICS code (e.g., commercial contracts), the offeror shall include the description within the past performance volume that explains how the work performed relates to the NAICS code used to compete as noted on the SF1449.

6996	During the industry day on June 4th, the government demonstrated the process of submitting a proposal on the NASA portal and was selecting various offeror information like NAICS Code, does all the offeror's Category C Past Performance INFORMATION FROM THE OFFEROR must all have the same NAICS Code that was entered on the proposal submission portal? For example, all being the NAICS Code 541512. If this is true all 3 past performance must be of the same NAICS Code then update the RFP document to state this requirement.	As stated in the current RFP: The offeror must provide past performance submissions as it relates to the SEWP VI in scope NAICS code being used for competition at the master contract level, as noted on the SF1449. If the NAICS code for the past performance submission does not match the Offeror's NAICS code used on the SF1449 or for references that are not assigned a NAICS code (e.g., commercial contracts), the offeror shall include the description within the past performance volume that explains how the work performed relates to the NAICS code used to compete as noted on the SF1449.
7000	During the industry day on June 4th, the government demonstrated the process of submitting a proposal on the NASA portal and was selecting various offeror information like NAICS Code, does all the offeror's Category C PPQs must all have the same NAICS Code that was entered on the proposal submission portal? For example, all being the NAICS Code 541512. If this is true all 3 PPQs must be of the same NAICS Code, then update the RFP to specify the requirement to the offeror.	As stated in the current RFP: The offeror must provide past performance submissions as it relates to the SEWP VI in scope NAICS code being used for competition at the master contract level, as noted on the SF1449. This is in reference to the NAICS code entered at the time of submission. Therefore, if 541512 is entered as the NAICS code at the time of submission, then all 3 PPQs must have a NAICS codes that either are or relate to 541512. Refer to the instructions in the current RFP for instructions on what is required.
7001	During the industry day on June 4th, the government demonstrated the process of submitting a proposal on the NASA portal and was selecting various offeror information like NAICS Code, does all the offeror's Category B PPQs must all have the same NAICS Code that was entered on the proposal submission portal? For example, all being the NAICS Code 541512. If this is true all 3 PPQs must be of the same NAICS Code, then update the RFP to specify the requirement to the offeror.	As stated in the current RFP: The offeror must provide past performance submissions as it relates to the SEWP VI in scope NAICS code being used for competition at the master contract level, as noted on the SF1449. This is in reference to the NAICS code entered at the time of submission. Therefore, if 541512 is entered as the NAICS code at the time of submission, then all 3 PPQs must have a NAICS codes that either are or relate to 541512. Refer to the instructions in the current RFP for instructions on what is required.
7002	The Exhibit 5: C-SCRM Attestation Form from Amendment 10 has an error message from entering the data in column B. The error is related to a link in the workbook back J.P-11_Alliant+34,+Contractor+C-SCRM+Responsibility+Assessment.xlsx. With this error Column B is locked and will allow the specified data to be entered by the offeror. Request the government to fix the issue in the workbook.	Exhibit 5 has been corrected and is available on sam.gov.
7003	We submitted PPQs under NAICS codes that we are not going to compete under. Do we need to request additional PPQs? Will the recently submitted PPQs be considered for evaluation, or only the previously submitted ones?	The Offeror should ensure they have requested PPQs that meet the current RFP. The Government will only review the most recent PPQs submitted by the POCs listed in the Offeror's proposal.
7005	What is the data the government is expecting on Section 1 item "G. Total Contract Value" for Exhibit 2b - PPQ form?	"total contract value" refers to the total contract value, including all options, not just the size of the project based on dollars obligated to date.
7006	What is the data the government is expecting on Section 6 "Contract Value" for Exhibit 2b - PPQ form?	"contract value" refers to the Total contract value awarded.
7007	What is the data the government is expecting on Section 6 Estimated Cost: "Current Value" for Exhibit 2b - PPQ form?	Current Value is Costs incurred up to date of submission.
7008	What is the data the government is expecting in Section 6 "Total Contract Expenditures" to date for Exhibit 2b - PPQ form?	Total Contract Expenditures Incurred to Date" provide the total contract expenditures incurred to date.
7009	What is the data the government is expecting in Section 6 "Annual Contract Value" to Date for Exhibit 2b - PPQ form?	The Average Annual Value to Date is determined by dividing the Total Contract Expenditures as of the submission date by the total months the contract has been active, then converting the total months to years.
7010	What is the data the government is expecting on Section 1 item "G. Total Contract Value" for Exhibit 2c - PPQ form?	total contract value" refers to the total contract value, including all options, not just the size of the project based on dollars obligated to date.
7011	What is the data the government is expecting on Section 6 "Contract Value" for Exhibit 2c - PPQ form?	"contract value" refers to the Total contract value awarded.
7012	#6 FAR 9.104-1(a): the new requirement in Amendment 6 to provide financial information including "available amount of credit for the business and the company's annual report" is irrelevant to VARs in particular and Category A in general. Such orders are not financed through the company's bank but by payment arrangements that reflect the government's purchase orders. Please remove this requirement from Category A.	The references to "letters from certified United States banks" and "annual reports" are example documents that could be used to demonstrate financial capability. Any information that demonstrates the Offeror's financial capability to perform the contract is acceptable.
7013	What is the data the government is expecting on Section 6 "Estimated Cost: Current Value" for Exhibit 2c - PPQ form?	Current Value is Costs incurred up to date of submission.
7014	What is the data the government is expecting in Section 6 "Total Contract Expenditures" to date for Exhibit 2c - PPQ form?	Total Contract Expenditures Incurred to Date" provide the total contract expenditures incurred to date.
7015	What is the data the government is expecting in Section 6 "Annual Contract Value to Date" for Exhibit 2c - PPQ form?	The Average Annual Value to Date is determined by dividing the Total Contract Expenditures as of the submission date by the total months the contract has been active, then converting the total months to years.
7017	Can you clarify which sections of Certs and Reps need to be filled out, in addition to confirming that we already have our Certs and Reps registration on sam.gov?	Please propose in accordance with the RFP; i.e. "complete only paragraph (b) of this provision if the Offeror has completed the annual representations and certification electronically in the System for Award Management".
7019	For JV offerors and other situations where everyone has to submit their own Exhibit 4 for example, should the naming convention be along the lines of GetItDone_Category#-EXHIBIT #4_Company A, etc?	Only one Exhibit 4 should be submitted for a proposal.

7020	<p>RFP Section A.3.7.2(a)(10) Past Performance History reads: The Offeror shall provide, at a minimum, the following information as part of its Past Performance Volume to demonstrate the relevance of its recent past performance, and to facilitate the evaluation of Past Performance as a whole and as related to the SEWP VI Contract Requirements. The Offeror shall provide a description of its relevant past performance history in meeting the technical and management requirements identified below.</p> <p>Can the government confirm that a description of past performance history should be provided relative to the scope of an Offeror's chosen Content Representative Areas, and NOT scope performed in ALL Content Representative Areas? For example, if a WOSB is providing the required past performance references for 2 CRAs (Cybersecurity & Cloud Services), should the Past Performance History narrative discuss only the two referenced CRAs (Cybersecurity & Cloud Services) or should the Past Performance History narrative discuss ALL 10 CRAs, in order to demonstrate "...Past Performance as a whole and as related to the SEWP VI Contract Requirements"?</p>	Confirmed, a description of past performance history should be provided relative to the scope of an Offeror's chosen Content Representative Areas.
7021	The updated SOW from Amendment 10, Section A.7 Electronic Processes (SOW p 7), includes a new reference to A.7 Communication Requirements. Which document includes section A.7 Communication Requirements to identify the electronic processes mentioned?	ATTACHMENT A SEWP STATEMENT OF WORK
7022	REPs Exclusive to Category. Can a Small Business firm bidding as a prime in Category C use a REP for their own bid and also use that same REP for a bid in Category C where they are a subcontractor on another team?	Yes, if they meet all of the stated requirements for submitting as a subcontractor.
7023	<p>RFP Section A.3.7.2(a)(10) Past Performance History reads: The Offeror shall provide, at a minimum, the following information as part of its Past Performance Volume to demonstrate the relevance of its recent past performance, and to facilitate the evaluation of Past Performance as a whole and as related to the SEWP VI Contract Requirements. The Offeror shall provide a description of its relevant past performance history in meeting the technical and management requirements identified below.</p> <p>Can the government confirm that the Past Performance History should only refer to the contract references provided in response to A.3.7.2(a)(1-9), or can the Past Performance History include additional contract references beyond the required minimum number? For example, if a WOSB is providing 2 contract references (Contract A and Contract B) to demonstrate performance in the required minimum 2 content representative areas (Cybersecurity and Cloud Services), should the Past Performance History only refer to Contract A and Contract B, or can the Past Performance History include Contract A, Contract B, and a Contract C and Contract D?</p>	Confirmed, a description of past performance history should only be provided relative to the scope of an Offeror's chosen Content Representative Areas. Providing information beyond meeting the requirement will not have any positive effect on the evaluation of the Offeror's proposal.
7024	For a small business under Category A- If the offeror only has 1 past performance reference that meets the minimum value of \$150,000 and this reference only covers 1 technical area, would the offeror receive a "Neutral" or "No Confidence" rating for past performance?	Yes, as long as the Offeror does not have any relevant past performance.
7025	<p>RFP A.3.7.2 states, The offeror must provide past performance submissions as it relates to the SEWP VI in scope NAICS code being used for competition at the master contract level, as noted on the SF1449. If the NAICS code for the past performance submission does not match the Offeror's NAICS code used on the SF1449 or for references that are not assigned a NAICS code (e.g., commercial contracts), the offeror shall include the description within the past performance volume that explains how the work performed relates to the NAICS code used to compete as noted on the SF1449.</p> <p>Can the government confirm that a Past Performance Reference with a NAICS that is not in-scope can be used if we adequately explain how the work performed relates to the NAICS code used to compete as noted on the SF1449. For example, may we use a Past Performance reference with a 334512 or 541611 NAICS if the scope performed on the contracts demonstrate performance history related to NAICS 541512 - which is the NAICS we intend to use to compete?</p>	Yes.
7026	As per the response of question 5788, it does appear the language was removed; however, since the response to Question 4068 stated that a CTA cannot be between a small business and a large business, clarification would be important. Can a small business prime have a CTA with an other than a small business partner and use that other than small business partner's past performance and or REP and still be evaluated for award?	A CTA with a large business is allowed as long as the past performance and/or REP of the OTSB are not used.
7029	Most of the Q&As instruct offerors to submit one PDF document for all required elements of Volume I and one PDF for all required elements of Volume III (excluding Exhibits 3a, 4, and 5). However, #1899 says, "Each REP shall be submitted separately using the Exhibit 1 Relevant Experience Project template," and #2038 states, "Exhibit 1 is a separate attachment that is part of Volume I." Could the Government please confirm that offerors should provide just one PDF for all required elements of Volume I, including the Exhibit 1 REP table and 3-page write-ups?	The current RFP prevails over old comments and responses. As stated in the current RFP there is no longer a requirement to merge the documents into a single PDF.

7030	A.3.7.3: Could the Government please confirm where offerors should "specifically state which Category the Offeror is proposing?"	The Offeror will formally note the Category by submitting the appropriate SF1449 form for that Category and indicating the Category when using the Proposal Upload Tool. He Category should also be referenced in filenames per the examples provided in the solicitation.
7031	Q&A 1895 and 4551 require JV offerors to provide a copy of their JV Agreement. Could the Government please indicate where the JV Agreement should be included in the proposal response?	Volume I folder.
7032	Could the Government please confirm that, IAW Q&As 2885, 3686, 4776, MPJVs (with OTSB minority partners) are permitted to submit for Category C? (As opposed to Q&A 2250, which states: "Category C is strictly for Small Businesses, meaning no SB JV or CTA comprised of an OTSB is allowed.")	The most recent set of comments take precedence over older comments. As stated most recently: "a large businesses (other than small) can be subcontractors to a small business prime (or small business JV or CTA) as long as they are not utilized for REPs and/or past performance."
7033	Q&A 3006 states that a landscape page will count as two pages. If the landscape page is an 8.5x11" page with 1" margins, would the Government please confirm that it would be considered one page of a proposal submission document?	Yes.
7034	Q&A 2486 states: "A reference to a certification or other document that does not imply the need for the Government to refer to a separate document does not count against the page count." Q&A 2487 states: "...including a reference to the ISO 9001:2015 certificate from Volume I would count against the page count of Volume III." Could the Government please confirm that a simple reference to a certification or other document does not require the offeror to add the cert/doc as part of the page count of that volume?	If ISO 20243 certificate is submitted as an alternative to the Exhibit 5 document, it would not count towards the page count. If the ISO 20243 is included in the proposal as part of the general discussion outside of the alternate to Exhibit 5, it will count against the page count.
7035	IAW A.3.7.2.(b) and Q&As #4907 and #5524, could the Government pls confirm that PPQs should be sent directly from our customers to the evaluators and should not be included as part of the PP volume? (Ref Q&As 4676, 4840, 6602 --"...Past Performance Questionnaires, and Letters of Authorization should be submitted as separate files within the corresponding category folder. ")	Yes.
7036	We are a SDVOSB planning to submit a Category C proposal. For clarification purposes, why was 13 CFR 125.2(g) removed from the RFP in amendments 8 and 10? Would REP and past performance from a small business subcontractor be considered?	The Question is unclear. The RFP defines the circumstances in which an REP and past performance from a small business subcontractor would be considered.
7039	Question #4240, confirms that templates, forms, and excel exhibits provided by the Government and already formatted using different fonts and font sizes are exempt from the formatting instructions identified in Section A.3.6.(B)(2). Could the Government please confirm that offerors are also not required to add a page number, offeror name, RFP number, and date on every page of the Government-provided templates, forms, or excel exhibits IAW A.3.6.(A)(2)? (Previous Batch Q&As #4795 and #2532 gave conflicting instructions.)	Confirmed.
7040	In Q#5301, the Government's response included: "The 2 listed items as updated in Amendment 8 should be separately addressed." Could the Government please confirm that this sentence applies to the two items listed in Subsection A.3.7.3.(a) for Technical Approach (Subfactor A) For All Categories (top of page 113 of Amd 10)?	Yes.
7042	In Section A.3.7.2.(a), page 110, could the Government confirm that the past performance information should be matched with the "relevant experience identified in paragraph (a)(10) of this section"? (Numbering changed due to revised requirements).	Confirmed.
7043	"The RFP states, ""To determine if an Offeror is responsible in accordance with FAR 9.104-1(a), Offeror is instructed to submit information which demonstrates its financial capability to perform the contract. Acceptable information includes: letters from certified United States banks indicating the available amount of credit for the business and the company's annual report."" Some offerors may not need a Line of Credit. Please verify that offerors may submit a Line of Credit letter from a bank ""AND/OR"" financial reports."	The references to "letters from certified United States banks" and "annual reports" are example documents that could be used to demonstrate financial capability. Any information that demonstrates the Offeror's financial capability to perform the contract is acceptable.
7046	Do the volume coversheets require a date to be compliant?	No
7048	Please confirm that volume III: Mission Suitability should be submitted in the following manner: Folder: companyname_Category#_Volumelll Subfolder: Technical Approach File: companyname_Category#-Technical Approach or companyname_Category#-Technical Approach Volume III-A Subfolder: Managemenet Approach Files: companyname_Category#-Management Approach or companyname_Category#-Management Approach Volume III-B companyname_Category#-Exhibit5 If this is not the correct submission format, please adjust this example to reflect what you envision.	The described format is acceptable as long as all necessary documents are included in the Volume folders.
7051	With regard to bank letters: No company finances these deals through banks. We use extended payment arrangements at distribution and IT flooring accounts. Please delete the requirement for bank letters as they are irrelevant.	The references to "letters from certified United States banks" and "annual reports" are example documents that could be used to demonstrate financial capability. Any information that demonstrates the Offeror's financial capability to perform the contract is acceptable.

7054	For OTSB offerors who may also be publicly traded, annual reports can exceed 100 pages in length. Can the Government confirm that offerors are to provide the whole report as an appendix to Volume I, or should offerors provide just relevant sections of the report?	An annual report was an example document that could be provided. Any information that demonstrates the Offeror's financial capability to perform the contract is acceptable.
7055	Given the current proposal due date of Feb 2025 corresponds with the finalization and publication of annual reports for 2024, can the Government confirm that offerors will be compliant if they provide the most recent published annual report, which will likely be 2023?	An annual report was an example document that could be provided. Any information that demonstrates the Offeror's financial capability to perform the contract is acceptable.
7056	A.3.7.1 (c) OFFER VOLUME I G 101 Can the government clarify whether it is acceptable to provide a Letter of Authorization (LOA) from a wholly-owned subsidiary of a provider listed in Enclosure 1 SEWP VI Major Providers, rather than the provider itself? For example, if the provider list includes "Samsung," would an LOA from "Samsung Electronics of America," a wholly-owned subsidiary of Samsung, be acceptable?	Yes.
7057	A.3.7.2 (b) PAST PERFORMANCE VOLUME I G 111 If a company sent its Past Performance Questionnaires (PPQs) to its references prior to the strategic pause and received confirmation that the references completed and submitted them to the Government Contracting Officer via email PastPerformance@sewp.nasa.gov, is the company required to resubmit the PPQs if details such as contract expenditures to date, annual contract value to date, and current value have changed due to the execution of option years since the previous submission?	If the submitted Past Performance Questionnaires are no longer valid, an updated version will need to be submitted.
7058	A.3.7.1 (c) OFFER VOLUME I G 102 Symphony Technology Group (STG) acquired McAfee Enterprise and FireEye, merging them to create Trellix. Enclosure 1 SEWP VI Major Providers Amendment 08 has removed Trellix and instead lists STG. Given that STG will not issue Letters of Authorization (LOAs) on behalf of Trellix, will the Government consider adding Trellix back to Enclosure 1 SEWP VI Major Providers?	LOAs can be provided by the subsidiary, in this case Trellix.
7060	As Batch 3 Q&A numbers 1920, 2320, 2446, 2820, and 4799 provide conflicting answers, can the Government please clarify whether past performance items 9-12 are to relate specifically to the 3 contracts submitted, or if they are general past performance information that are not specific to the 3 contracts submitted?	The references including the number sequence has been updated in the current RFP. Points 1 through 10 are for the 3 referenced past performance contracts.
7063	As Batch 2 Q&A numbers 1702 and 2793 and Batch 3 Q&A numbers 1925, 1973, and 3039 include conflicting answers, can the Government please clarify whether Volume III-A Technical Approach and Volume III-B Management Approach are to be in two separate files or combined into one single file?	The current RFP prevails over old comments and responses. As stated in the current RFP there is no longer a requirement to merge the documents into a single PDF. The Technical Approach and Management Approach shall each be submitted in separate single searchable Adobe Portable Document Format (PDF) files. The two documents should be placed in the appropriate folder; i.e. Volume III.
7064	Will the Government please provide an updated Attachment F or confirm that it is no longer part of the RFP.	Attachment F is the SEWP database of record which is filled in post award as described in Section A.1.23 TECHNOLOGY REFRESHMENT. It is not submitted as part of the Offeror's proposal,
7065	Page 100 of Amendment 0010 Section A.3.7.1(a)(6) states: To determine if an Offeror is responsible in accordance with FAR 9.104-1(a), Offeror is instructed to submit information which demonstrates its financial capability to perform the contract. Acceptable information includes: letters from certified United States banks indicating the available amount of credit for the business and the company's annual report... Question: are the two documents' "letters from certified US Bank" and the "annual report" excluded from page count? If the answer is yes, offeror ask NASA please update the solicitation to capture this change.	All documents submitted in response to this section are excluded from page count limitations including any files in response to the information which demonstrates its financial capability to perform the contract.
7067	Page 110 of Amendment 0010 Section A.3.7.2(a) states: Offerors identified as HUBZone, SDB, VOSB, SDVOSB, WOSB, EDWOSB, 8a in Category B and/or C shall provide past performance references showcasing relevant work in at least two content representative areas for content to be rated relevant. Question: can an offeror showcase more than two content representative areas on each past performance citation they submit, the term "at least two" conveys that more than two content rep areas can be showcased? If the answer is yes, offeror ask NASA please update the solicitation to capture this change, if only two are to be showcased will NASA please remove the "at least" statement and replace with "no more than" this would apply to category A & C as well.	The minimum number of content areas ("at least") are noted in the RFP. A reference may be associated with more than the minimum requirement of areas, therefore the wording is correct as stated. Note, however, providing information beyond the minimum requirement will not affect the past performance evaluation.
7068	Page 110 of Amendment 0010 Section A.3.7.2(a) states: Offerors identified as HUBZone, SDB, VOSB, SDVOSB, WOSB, EDWOSB, 8a in Category B and/or C shall provide past performance references showcasing relevant work in at least two content representative areas for content to be rated relevant. Question: as an SDVOSB we will submit two past performance citations for Category B and two for Category C, is the offeror required to cover separate content representative areas on each past performance citation? for example, if category B citation #1 covered content representative areas #2, and #6 then category B citation #2 would have to cover areas other than #2, and #6? If the answer is yes, offeror ask NASA please update the solicitation to capture this change/clarification.	No, the Past performance requirement does not state that the offeror is required to cover separate content representative areas on each past performance citation.

7069	<p>Clarification requested on answers provided to questions 6389 and 6209:</p> <p>6389: answer states: You are required to submit three (3) past performance references that show relevant work in at least three (3) different content areas listed for Category B. The three past performance references may not be from the same content area.</p> <p>6209: answer states: The RFP does not specify if the representative areas for each PP have to be different. Offerors should submit the best three (3) recent and relevant past performance references for evaluation regardless if there are any overlaps in the representative areas. Clarifying Question: Nowhere in the solicitation does it state offerors are to cover "different" content representative areas, the solicitation states "offerors are to showcase relevant work in at least four, three or two content representative areas (depending on category and size)" for content to be rated relevant, will NASA please clarify if the offeror is to provide what is stated in the solicitation and answer 6209 or the answer provided for 6389 ? Offeror ask NASA to provide a clear answer and update the solicitation to reflect the requirement.</p>	The current RFP takes precedence over comments and therefore the RFP instructions should be followed.
7070	<p>Clarification requested on answer provided to question 4676:</p> <p>4676: answer states: Copies of the Past Performance Questionnaires (PPQs) can be appended to the Past Performance Volume proposal document. Clarifying Question: the solicitation states "offerors are to provide PPQs directly to the government contracting officer, who then will send the completed PPQ to PastPerformance@sewp.nasa.gov." there is no requirement in the solicitation for the offeror to provide Exhibit 2 PPQs with their proposal submission, only a table is required that list of who the PPQs were sent to, is it now NASAs intent to have the offeror provide Exhibit 2 PPQs with their proposal submission? If the answer is yes, offeror ask that NASA please update the solicitation to capture this change.</p>	The current RFP takes precedence over comments. As noted, the RFP does not require the Offeror to submit Exhibit 2.
7071	<p>Clarification requested on answer provided to question 6715:</p> <p>6715: answer states: Proposal Components such as the Exhibits, ISO 9001 and LOAs should be saved separately within the same folder of their corresponding volume. (Refer to section A.3.6 (A), page 92 of the RFP). Clarifying Question: Page 94 of Amendment 10 gives examples of the naming conventions for the documents within the folder of their corresponding volumes, will NASA please provide clear instructions on which documents they want saved as individual documents within the folder of their corresponding volumes? For example, are offerors submitting ISO, CMMI, All Exhibits, REPs, PP, LOAs as individual documents? Or are we to only submit the excel files (Exhibit 3a, 4 & 5) as individual documents within the folder of their corresponding volumes? Please provide clarification and provide an update to the solicitation with what NASA requires as the documents to be submitted individually within the folder of their corresponding volumes.</p>	The current RFP states that each document shall be a separate file within the Volume folder.
7072	<p>Clarification requested on answer provided to question 4007:</p> <p>4007: answer states: Amendment 8 updated the instructions for the Technical Approach to clarify it is based on the offeror's general technical capabilities with regard to the SEWP scope and Acquisition Objectives and not on the sample Technical Areas. Question: it appears that NASA has removed the requirement for offerors to discuss their capabilities as they relate to Technical Areas for Cat A, B and C. Is the offeror only required to discuss points 1 & 2 (on pg. 113 of Amend 10), Section A.1 and A.2 of Attachment A SEWP Scope and there should be NO discussion relating to any of the technical areas for any category? If offerors are to remove discussions about their capabilities as they relate to Category B and C technical areas, then the technical and Management sections of Volume III will be the same, discussion relating to the technical areas is what makes the volumes different, so there would be no need to have two Volume III proposal submissions, one for cat B and one for Cat C. Please clarify the requirements in the solicitation.</p>	The Offeror should respond to the Technical Approach and Management Approach using the instructions provided in A.3.7.3 MISSION SUITABILITY VOLUME. Each of the subfactors have separate and different instructions provided.
7073	Question: From previous Q&A's released there have been many of the same questions answered very differently, by looking at the amount of questions that are being asked during this iteration of Q&A (Dec 18-20), will NASA consider opening another Q&A session once answers are provided so offerors can ask clarifying questions?	No.
7074	We have already submitted the Past Performance Questionnaire (PPQ) to the agency; however, we need to update the previously shared document. Can we resubmit the PPQ with the updated information? Should we include a note in the email informing the agency about the updates?	Yes to both questions.
7075	If a company provides letter from bank mentioning the current line of credit, will that suffice the requirements of FAR 9.104?	Any information that demonstrates the Offeror's financial capability to perform the contract is acceptable.

7076	Answers to questions (3239, 3672, 3755, 4279, 4305, 4316, 4794, and 4998) have created some confusion in how offerors are to submit Volume III files because it is not typical to turn a folder into a PDF file. Can the Government confirm that offerors are to provide a single PDF file in its Volume III Mission Suitability folder (which is part of an offeror's larger ZIP file submission) that includes Technical Approach (with its own cover page, TOC, and Tables of Exhibits and Tables) and Management Approach (with its own cover page, TOC, and Tables of Exhibits and Tables) as noted in the answer to question 4660? Or, are offerors supposed to provide the Technical and Management approaches as separate PDF files in separate subfolders within its Volume III Mission Suitability folder as suggested by the answer to questions 3850, 3901, 3953, 5716, 6059, and 6064?	The current RFP prevails over old comments and responses. As stated in the current RFP there is no longer a requirement to merge the documents into a single PDF. The Technical Approach and Management Approach shall each be submitted in separate single searchable Adobe Portable Document Format (PDF) files. The two documents should be placed in the appropriate folder; i.e. Volume III.
7078	In section A.3.7.1 OFFER VOLUME (a) GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS, point number 5 reads: "Offeror's subcontracting plan and AbilityOne Commitment Letter, if applicable: The AbilityOne Commitment Letter shall identify the POC from SourceAmerica/NIB and identify plans to subcontract with qualified nonprofit agencies for SEWP opportunities within identified NAICS Codes." Question: Is a small business prime submitting under Category C and/or Category B required to identify plans to subcontract i.e. submit a subcontracting plan?	No.
7079	Is it acceptable to submit the annual report of a parent company if the Offeror is not a publicly traded company?	Any information that demonstrates the Offeror's financial capability to perform the contract is acceptable.
7081	Is it acceptable to submit a bank letter of credit from a parent company?	Any information that demonstrates the Offeror's financial capability to perform the contract is acceptable.
7082	Is it acceptable to submit unaudited financial statements, in leu of an annual report, if the Offeror is not a publicly traded company?	Any information that demonstrates the Offeror's financial capability to perform the contract is acceptable.
7083	As many of the 6000+ questions are the same or similar, unfortunately the answers provided are very inconsistent and contradictory, request NASA review answers to the same or similar questions and provide one answer that is the same. while the Q&A is of value offerors are held to the requirements of the RFP not the Q&A so if there are requirements in the Q&A in which the offerors are required to meet, request NASA please ensure they are stated clearly in the RFP as this is the governing document. for instance, the answer to question 6393 states "You are required to submit three (3) past performance references that show relevant work in at least three (3) different content areas listed for Category A. The three past performance references may not be from the same content area." and the answer to question 6209 states "The RFP does not specify if the representative areas for each PP have to be different. Offerors should submit the best three (3) recent and relevant past performance references for evaluation regardless if there are any overlaps in the representative areas." these are just two examples there are many more just like this.	The current RFP takes precedence over previous comments and should be followed as such.
7086	Question Response 5633, 3036, 4238, 6211 – General Instructions - With regard to the file composition for the proposal submission, the response to question 5633 states: "Amendment 8 clarified that all PDF documents within each Volume should be combined into single PDF documents. Other files such as the excel spreadsheet should be added to the Proposal zip file as separate files." Likewise the response to questions 3036 and 6211 also states that each volume should be combined into one file. The response to question 4238 states: "Volume III should be delivered as two separate files (III-A and III-B)." Further, Amendment 8 removed the requirement to combine all Volume documents into a single PDF file. Would the Government confirm that the file composition as provided in Amendment 8 is accurate and all documents for each Volume may be submitted in Volume folders and labeled accordingly vice combined into single PDF files for each Volume?	The current RFP prevails over old comments and responses. As stated in the current RFP there is no longer a requirement to merge the documents into a single PDF and therefore there is no required file structure. Each document shall be submitted in a single searchable Adobe Portable Document Format (PDF) file. Each document should be placed in the appropriate folder (Volume I, II or III).
7088	Question Response - 1863, 2942, 3161, 4151, 4172, others - Entering the NAICS selected for competition on the SF 1449 - Multiple responses to questions indicate that offeror's are to insert their NAICS selected for competition on the SF 1449, however the SF 1449 already has the NAICS section completed with: "See Section A.1.34." Should the offeror remove the pre-populated entry and add their NAICS selected for competition? Alternatively, would the Government provide an SF 1449 without the field complete or another mechanism for offeror's to state the NAICS chosen for competition?	The Offeror shall include in Block 17a of the SF1449 the NAICS Code the Offeror is proposing using for competition at the master contract level. Amendment 11 reflects this clarification.
7089	Can the Government confirm that offerors should embed proposal components, required certifications, letters, and/or additional information (i.e., LOAs, Mandatory Experience Cover Letters, REPs, ISO 9001 and CMMI certifications, credit letters, annual reports, CPARS, Award Fee notices/letters, etc.) into the PDF files for the corresponding Volume (exceptions being Exhibits 3a, 4, and 5 which will be returned as Excel files) as suggested in answers to questions 2518, 2549, 2550, 2565, 2569, and 2815? Or, does the Government want copies of the required certifications, letters, and additional information (i.e., LOAs, Mandatory Experience Cover Letters, ISO 9001 and CMMI certifications, REPs, annual reports, etc.) as individual PDF files included in the appropriate Volume File (e.g., ISO 9001 and CMMI certifications, LOAs, Mandatory Experience Cover Pages, REPs, credit letters, annual reports would be separate PDF files included in GetItDone_CategoryA_VolumeI folder) as suggested by answers to questions 2705, 2708, 4343, 4394, 4630, 6602, 6715?	The current RFP prevails over old comments and responses. As stated in the current RFP there is no longer a requirement to merge the documents into a single PDF and therefore there is no required file structure. Each document shall be submitted in a single searchable Adobe Portable Document Format (PDF) file. Each document should be placed in the appropriate folder (Volume I, II or III).

7090	<p>The RFP requires the Offeror to submit information which demonstrates its financial capability to perform the contract. Acceptable information includes: letters from certified United States banks indicating the available amount of credit for the business and the company's annual report. Privately owned businesses are not required by law to file an annual report with the U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission (SEC).</p> <p>a. Would submission of the offeror's annual audited financial statements along with a letter(s) from certified United States banks indicating the available amount of credit be acceptable?</p> <p>b. Are letter(s) from commercial companies such as Information Technology Distributors and OEMs that provide lines of credit also acceptable?</p>	Any information that demonstrates the Offeror's financial capability to perform the contract is acceptable.
7091	<p>Section A.3.7.1 (a)(6) requires offerors to submit an "annual report" on their company's finances. While this documentation is readily available for publicly traded companies through their SEC filings, we are seeking clarification on how private companies and small businesses should satisfy this requirement.</p> <p>What format and level of detail is expected from private and small companies that do not produce public annual reports?</p> <p>Would alternative financial documentation (such as annual financial statements, tax returns, or compiled financial reports) be acceptable substitutes?</p> <p>If alternative documentation is acceptable, what specific financial information must be included to meet the intent of this requirement?</p> <p>Clarification on this new requirement will help ensure offerors who are not publicly traded companies can provide the appropriate documentation to comply with the RFP requirements.</p>	The reference to an annual report is an example of one type of documentation that could be provided not a requirement. Any information that demonstrates the Offeror's financial capability to perform the contract is acceptable.
7093	<p>The current RFP requires financial information to be submitted within the "Offer Volume" as a single PDF file. Given that financial data is privileged and confidential business information under federal law, we request clarification on how this sensitive information will be protected from inadvertent disclosure during the evaluation process.</p> <p>Would the government consider establishing either a separate volume for financial submissions or an alternative secure submission method to ensure adequate protection of proprietary financial data? Additionally, how will individual entities under a JV or CTA be able to submit privately? Allowing offerors to submit their financial information in a confidential manner will mitigate the government's risk of violating FAR 15.506(e), FOIA Exemption 4 (5 U.S.C. § 552(b)(4)), and The Trade Secrets Act (18 U.S.C. § 1905).</p>	No.
7095	If the Government maintains the annual report requirement, please clarify what document(s) are requested/required. For a publicly traded company, does "annual report" mean a 10-K? What is the equivalent expectation for privately held companies?	There is no requirement for an annual financial report. The reference to an annual report is an example of the documentation that could be submitted in response to Section A.3.7.1(a)(6).
7098	Can NASA confirm whether the "Name of Company" field in Section I (Contract Information A) of the Exhibit 2 (PPQ) attachment should list the name of the Offeror or the name of the company performing the contract being evaluated in the PPQ?	Name of the company being evaluated.
7100	A.3.7.1 (a.3) requests documentation for CTAs, but makes no reference to documentation for JVs. Will the government please confirm that A.3.7.1 (a.3) is also requesting the JV Operating Agreement and JV Mentor Protégé Agreement for JVs? If not, please specify where those documents should be included.	Yes. Agreement documentation should be included as separate PDFs within the Volume I folder.
7101	Can the Government please confirm that Offerors do not need to have their customers resubmit Exhibit 2, Past Performance Questionnaire, if it has already been submitted via email to PastPerformance@sewp.nasa.gov?	Yes.
7102	Can the Government please confirm that each submission document, including ISO 9001 certification, CMMI certification, meaningful relationship commitment letter, subcontracting plan, AbilityOne commitment letter, financial capability statements, customer evaluations, etc should be their own individual PDF file located in their respective volume folder?	Yes.
7103	We have already submitted the Past Performance Questionnaires (PPQs). As outlined in the 'Past Performance Volume Information from the Offeror' section, are we still required to provide additional information, such as Award Fee Evaluation results, Fee Determination Official letters, Annual Performance Evaluation Forms, or other written performance feedback?	Yes.
7104	If a teaming arrangement (Prime-Sub) is contemplated, are we required to provide letters from certified United States banks indicating the available amount of credit for each business and the company's annual report for all participants in the Prime sub teaming arrangement, or is this requirement only applicable to the Prime Offeror?	Section A.3.7.1(a)(6) includes instructions as to the information to provide for teaming arrangement, joint venture, or other business combination.
7105	Section A.3.7.1(a)(6) requires financial capability information but doesn't specify how recent the documentation must be. What is the recency requirement for the financial documents?	The documentation should be as current as possible.

7106	Section A.3.7.1(a)(6) cites acceptable information as letters from certified United States banks indicating the available amount of credit for the business and the company's annual report. Does this mean that Offeror's have to provide both sets of documentation? Or can the Offeror provide a letter of credit only? Or annual report only?	The references to "letters from certified United States banks" and "annual reports" are example documents that could be used to demonstrate financial capability. Any information that demonstrates the Offeror's financial capability to perform the contract is acceptable.
7108	RFP section A.3.6(b)(2) states that headers, footers, callout boxes, captions, tables, artwork shall use no smaller than 10-point Times New Roman font. However, many of the Q&A answers have stated that other fonts are acceptable as long as they are equivalent to 10pt Times New Roman. Can you please update the final RFP to reflect this update?	There is no need to change the RFP as it does not require the font be Times New Roman. As stated, the text must not be smaller than 10 point Times New Roman; it does not state the font must be Time New Roman.
7111	The Q&A batches are inconsistent as it relates to the Mission Suitability Volume. It states that the Technical and Management section need to be both separate and combined in multiple locations. Will the USG please confirm if the Mission Suitability Volume should be ONE singular Volume with SubFactor Sections differentiated for Technical and Management? OR, if the Mission Suitability Volume should be separate SubFactor documents, with their own respective Covers, Table of Contents, etc? OR, if the Mission Suitability Volume should be separate files for Technical and Management SubFactors, AND then combined into a single Volume III Mission Suitability as well?	The current RFP prevails over old comments and responses. As stated in the current RFP there is no longer a requirement to merge the documents into a single PDF. The Technical Approach and Management Approach shall each be submitted in separate single searchable Adobe Portable Document Format (PDF) files. The two documents should be placed in the appropriate folder; i.e. Volume III.
7113	The Q&A provides inconsistent responses relative to some of the Exhibit Files, and how they are to be completed and provided. For clarity, for each Exhibit, please clarify the following: Exhibit 1: REP: Confirm that the 3 page narrative is to be attached to the cover page and NOT as a separate file?	Yes. As stated within the current Exhibit 1: The completed REP description may not exceed a total of three (3) pages and should be attached to this Exhibit cover page.
7115	We have submitted Past Performance Questionnaires (PPQs) to the Contracting Officer (CO), but we have not received confirmation from them on whether they have been forwarded/submitted the PPQs to the NASA Contracting Officer. In this case, can the NASA SEWP VI team provide clarity on the process for PPQ and how it will be evaluated?	If a PPQ is not provided by a customer listed in the Offerors POC list, the Government will contact the customer as needed. If the PPQ request was valid and the customer declined to submit the form, the Offeror will not be held accountable.
7116	The Q&A provides inconsistent responses relative to some of the Exhibit Files, and how they are to be completed and provided. For clarity, for each Exhibit, please clarify the following: 1) Q&A alluded to a revised Exhibit 2 that may be forthcoming with USG edits – can the USG confirm if an updated Exhibit 2 is to be expected? IF an Offeror has already completed PPQs (Exhibit 2) in a prior iteration – can the USG confirm that these prior formats will be accepted? 2) IF an Offeror has already completed PPQs (Exhibit 2) in a prior iteration – can the USG confirm that these prior formats will be accepted? 3) Q&A Batch 2 noted Exhibit 2 files needed to match naming conventions – however these files are not supplied with the bid response or zip file, instead by our customer POCs – will the USG please confirm they will accept file naming conventions outside those identified for bid submission? 4) Q&A Batch 2 noted inclusion of Exhibit 2 in bid response – please confirm that Exhibit 2 is NOT required of Offerors, as these are to be directly forwarded to the SEWP email from our customer POCs?	1) No; 2) Yes; 3) The RFP does not require a file naming convention for the customer submitted Past Performance Questionnaires; 4) Confirmed
7118	A.3.7.1(a).6 - Acceptable information includes: letters from certified United States banks indicating the available amount of credit for the business and the company's annual report. As a VAR, we don't feel that having a line of credit is relevant to showcase being responsible in accordance with FAR 9.104-1(a). We have arrangements with the OEMs and distributors for invoicing and payment. Would you consider removing the language that a bank letter should include a company's available amount of credit?	The references to "letters from certified United States banks" and "annual reports" are example documents that could be used to demonstrate financial capability. Any information that demonstrates the Offeror's financial capability to perform the contract is acceptable.
7119	A.3.7.2 (b) states "The Offeror shall include a list of those to whom the questionnaires were sent, including name of individual, phone number, organization, and contract number." Can this information be excluded from the 12 page limit?	Yes.
7120	The Q&A provides inconsistent responses relative to some of the Exhibit Files, and how they are to be completed and provided. For clarity, for each Exhibit, please clarify the following: 1) Confirm that File is to be supplied in ONLY excel and not in pdf as well? 2) Confirm that file is to be supplied as ONLY a separate file and NOT also within the Volume I submission? 3) If the Offeror will be competing under a NAICs other than the NAICs that is listed at the top of the Exhibit 4 – shall the Offeror correct the NAICs at the top of Exhibit 4?	1) Yes; 2) Yes, each document should be a separate file within the appropriate Volume folder; 3) No.

7121	<p>The Q&A provides inconsistent responses relative to some of the Exhibit Files, and how they are to be completed and provided. For clarity, for each Exhibit, please clarify the following:</p> <p>1) Confirm that File is to be supplied in ONLY excel and not in pdf as well?</p> <p>2) Confirm that file is to be supplied as ONLY a separate file and NOT also within the Volume III submission?</p>	1)Yes; 2) Yes.
7122	Can we participate as a prime contractor with a subcontractor without forming any formal Contractor Teaming Arrangement (CTA)?	Yes as long as the subcontractor is not utilized for REPs and/or past performance.
7126	If my company is submitting a proposal as the prime contractor with ABC as a subcontractor, and ABC is also participating as a subcontractor with other companies, is this allowed under the solicitation rules?	A company can be a subcontractor for multiple Offerors as long as long as they are not utilized for REPs and/or past performance.
7127	Batch 3 Q&A stated that files do not have to be zipped if under the 120mb threshold, however instructions require files to be provided in a zip folder. Will the USG please clarify?	As stated in the current RFP: "All Electronic files shall be uploaded as a single zip archive file less than 120MB."
7128	Batch 4 Q&A states both that the 120mb maximum is for each file within the zip folder, as well as for the zip file as a whole. Will the USG please confirm whether the maximum file size is 120mb for the complete zip file, OR for each file within the zip folder?	As stated in the current RFP: "All Electronic files shall be uploaded as a single zip archive file less than 120MB."
7129	<p>Q&A is inconsistent about other ancillary files for submission and whether they should be standalone files provided within the "single pdf" for each Volume.</p> <p>Will the USG confirm if the SF1449 should be provided as a standalone file? Provided within the Volume I response? OR provided as a standalone file AND in the Volume I response?</p> <p>Will the USG confirm if the Source America and/or NIB letters should be provided as standalone files? OR provided within the Volume I response? OR provided as a standalone file AND in the Volume I response?</p>	The current RFP prevails over old comments and responses. As stated in the current RFP there is no longer a requirement to merge the documents into a single PDF and therefore there is no required file structure. Each document shall be submitted in a single searchable Adobe Portable Document Format (PDF) file. Each document should be placed in the appropriate folder (Volume I, II or III).
7130	• If the bidder is a wholly owned subsidiary of a company provided on the approved vendor list, is an LOA required from the parent company?	No.
7131	Will the USG confirm if the CMMI and ISO certifications should be provided as standalone files? OR provided within the Volume I response? OR provided as standalone files AND in the Volume I response?	CMMI and ISO Certifications should be provided as separate PDF files within Volume I.
7132	• There were several companies removed from the original approved vendor list that weren't on the amended list - can the Government please combine the two lists into one for use?	The comment is too vague as to which providers were of concern.
7134	• Q&A Batch 5 indicated that all exhibits are to be submitted as individual files in excel format separate from the consolidated PDF for each volume, and then Q&A Batch 6 indicated that the entire volume needs to be combined into a PDF format including the exhibits which need to be converted to PDF. Which is correct?	Neither. The current RFP states that all documents including excel files are submitted as separate files within the appropriate Volume folder.
7135	<p>Q&A noted that a program management approach should be provided for both the Technical and the Management SubFactor for Volume III – Mission Suitability</p> <p>Will the USG please confirm this is accurate?</p> <p>IF a program management approach is to be discussed within the Technical SubFactor, would the USG please provide instruction for where and how this should be provided?</p>	As stated in the current RFP, Program Management is only a subsection within the Management Approach.
7138	• Some Q&A indicated that any font type can be used in the volumes in minimum 10-point font size, and some Q&A indicated that only Times New Roman should be used in minimum 10-point font size. Please clarify the requirement and whether Times New Roman is the font type requirement.	Any font can be used as long as the resulting text is not smaller than the equivalent Times New Roman font size requirement.
7139	• Is the Government planning to release additional amendments and should offerors expect to have to complete new versions of exhibit attachments?	The Government plans to provide one more amendment. All information and exhibits associated with the Final amendment must be used for the Offeror's submission.
7140	<p>Q&A batch 3 notes that offeror should review and also complete any contractor fill-ins that exist within clauses that are referenced in the solicitation, but Q&A batch 4 notes that only contractor fill-ins within Section V subsections A.5.1-A.5.6 should be completed if not already done so within sam.gov.</p> <p>Will the USG please confirm which is accurate?</p>	The Offeror should reference and follow the instructions provided within the current RFP which take precedence over previous comments.

7141	<p>Q&A batch 4 notes that Reps and Certs should be completed and provided with the SF1449, and also notes should be provided as a component of the General Instructions. Q&A batch 6 further notes completion of these clauses and submission based on Section A.3.7.1 bullet 10 (which does not exist in Amendment 10).</p> <p>Will the USG confirm if the completed Reps/Certs should be in the same heading/section/file as the SF1449, OR provided as separate headings / sections?</p> <p>Should the SF1449 be completed as a separate file or embedded within Volume 1? Or Both?</p> <p>Should the Reps / Certs be completed as a separate file or embedded within Volume 1? Or Both?</p> <p>Should Amendments (SF30s) be completed as separate files or embedded within Volume I? Or Both?</p>	As stated in the current RFP, each document, e.g. SF1449, Reps and Certs, etc should be submitted as a separate PDF tile.
7143	<p>Q&A batch 4 notes that Reps and Certs should be completed and provided with the SF1449, and also notes should be provided as a component of the General Instructions. Q&A batch 6 further notes completion of these clauses and submission based on Section A.3.7.1 bullet 10 (which does not exist in Amendment 10).</p> <p>Will the USG confirm if the completed Reps/Certs should be in the same heading/section/file as the SF1449, OR provided as separate headings / sections?</p> <p>Should the SF1449 be completed as a separate file or embedded within Volume 1? Or Both?</p> <p>Should the Reps / Certs be completed as a separate file or embedded within Volume 1? Or Both?</p> <p>Should Amendments (SF30s) be completed as separate files or embedded within Volume I? Or Both?</p>	As stated in the current RFP, each document, e.g. SF1449, Reps and Certs, etc should be submitted as a separate PDF tile.
7147	<p>Exhibit 5 – SCRM</p> <p>Confirm that File is to be supplied in ONLY excel and not in pdf as well?</p> <p>Confirm that file is to be supplied as ONLY a separate file and NOT also within the Volume III submission?</p>	Confirmed as stated in the current RFP.
7148	<p>Category A</p> <p>Technical Area 1a: IT COMPUTER SYSTEMS / COMPUTE FACILITIES Page 26 ... NMR class waiver utilizing NAICS 334111 and NAICS 334112</p> <p>Technical Area 2a: IT Storage Systems Page 27 Paragraph 1 references The Offerings are defined via the UNSPSC 43212xxx and 43201xxx The Offerings fall under PSC Codes 7K20. NMR Waiver applies to offerings under this Technical Area utilizing NAICS 541519- footnote 18</p> <p>Technical Area 3a: Networking and Communication Equipment ...covered by an NMR Class Waiver utilizing NAICS 334210.</p> <p>Technical Area 4a: Imaging Equipment and Supporting Technology... NMR Waiver applies to offerings under this Technical Area utilizing NAICS 541519- footnote 18...NMR Class Waiver exists utilizing NAICS 334</p> <p>Technical Area 5a: IT Power and Cabling Equipment... The Offerings are defined via the UNSPSC 39121xxx (Power conditioning equipment), and 43202xxx (Sub- assemblies for electronic devices). The Offerings fall under PSC Codes 7H20 and 7J20. NMR Waiver applies to offerings under this Technical Area utilizing NAICS 541519- footnote 18.</p> <p>Technical Area 6a: Audio / Video Equipment... NMR Waiver applies to offerings under this Technical Area utilizing NAICS 541519- footnote 18...NMR Class Waiver exists utilizing NAICS 333316</p> <p>Technical Area 7a: Security and Sensor Equipment... NMR Waiver applies to offerings under this Technical Area utilizing NAICS 541519- footnote 18.</p> <p>Technical Area 8a: Software and Cloud Technology... NMR Waiver applies to offerings under this Technical Area utilizing NAICS 513210</p> <p>Question</p> <p>Is there a reason why Technical area 2a and 5a reference UNSPSC's and PSC Codes and the other categories do not reference UNSPSC's?</p>	The references are only significant for the NMR waiver and have no significance to the Offeror's associated UNSPSC codes.
7149	Is only the Prime required to submit Representations and Certifications?	Yes.
7153	Lines of Credit and Financial Statements are sensitive information. How is the government going to ensure this information remain private?	All documents aer handled in a secure system available only to the Government Source Evaluation Board members.
7154	As a small company we do not have annual reports. The statement in the RFP is Letter indicating the available amount of credit for the business AND the company's annual report. What other acceptable information would the government accept? Could the government change this language to be an AND/OR Statement.	The references to "letters from certified United States banks" and "annual reports" are example documents that could be used to demonstrate financial capability. Any information that demonstrates the Offeror's financial capability to perform the contract is acceptable.

7156	<p>Amendment 10, Page 112 A.3.7.3 MISSION SUITABILITY VOLUME (a) TECHNICAL APPROACH (SUBFACTOR A)</p> <p>For All Categories</p> <p>For points 1 and 2 of this section the Offeror must provide a summary description of their overall technical offerings and general capabilities in accordance with the proposed Category scope (see Attachment A-SEWP Scope, Section A.2. SCOPE). Additionally, the Offeror must address how their technical offerings support the first three of the Four Acquisition Objectives as provided in Attachment A-SEWP Scope, Section A.1. ACQUISITION OBJECTIVES. Offerors Technical Approach shall also include information in the following areas:</p> <p>1. The offeror shall describe the technical scalability and extensibility of the offeror's products, solutions and/or services that demonstrates their ability to fulfill a range of ITC/AV Solutions and/or Services requirements centered on the Offeror's core technical capabilities within the breadth of the given Category scope.</p> <p>Question: Does an offeror need to respond to all Technical Areas for a given Category or just the Technical Areas relevant to their Core Technical Capabilities?</p>	Amendment 8 updated the instructions for the Technical Approach to clarify it is based on the offeror's general technical capabilities with regard to the SEWP scope and Acquisition Objectives and not on the sample Technical Areas.
7158	Batch 3 response to question #5353 states that PPQs not received may be excluded from evaluation. However, Batch 3 response to question #4722 states offerors will receive a neutral rating for PPQs not received. Could the Government please clarify?	Offerors will not be negatively affected if the customer failed to provide a questionnaire as long as the Offeror has ensured that the references are notified and have verified that the questionnaire is completed and submitted.
7160	What is Category C technical area 11c for if it is not used for REP and PP? Where in the proposal volumes does it come in?	The Technical Area is provided as a sample technical area within scope of Category C. It is not in itself a required part of the Offeror's proposal.
7161	Batch 3 response to question #1764 states that bullet 10 is excluded from page count, however Solicitation A.3.6(B) proposal submission table does not identify it as being excluded. Can the Government please clarify/correct?	The "Past Performance History" is part of the 10 page "Information from the Offeror"
7162	Batch 3 response to question #4676 states that "Copies of the Past Performance Questionnaires (PPQs) can be appended to the Past Performance Volume proposal document." However, Batch 3 response to question #6602 states that "Exhibits, Past Performance Questionnaires, and Letters of Authorization should be submitted as separate files within the corresponding category folder. These should not be included as an appendix within a single PDF for their respective volume." Can the Government please clarify if these should be attached to the end of the Past Performance Volume Proposal Document (as stated in the response to #4676) or included as separate files within the category folder (as stated in response to #6602)?	The current RFP prevails over old comments and responses. As stated in the current RFP there is no longer a requirement to merge the documents into a single PDF. Each document shall be submitted in a single searchable Adobe Portable Document Format (PDF) file. Each document should be placed in the appropriate folder (Volume I, II or III).
7163	If attachments (e.g., LOA's) are provided as separate attachments within a category folder, should these be included in the table of contents?	Table of contents can be provided within the Offeror provided and page limited documents. They are therefore not needed for the LOA documents.
7164	Batch 3 response to question #4345 states "The SF1449 PDF is intended to serve as the cover page for Volume I. If a separate cover page is used, it should be excluded from the page count." If a different cover page is provided, in what order should the SF1449 be provided?	There is no order to files submitted. Each file should be a separate document in the appropriate Volume folder.
7166	Batch 3 response to question #5362 states "The requirement for 12-point Times New Roman font applies to all proposal content, including converted documents and spreadsheets, unless otherwise specified." Can the Government please confirm that font/size requirements do NOT apply to Government provided documents (e.g., Exhibit 5, Exhibit 4) for inclusion within/as part of the proposal?	Text/font requirements only apply to documents with a page limit and therefore do not apply to Government provided documents.
7167	Are OEM Product Sales permitted under Category C if aligned with associated services?	Yes, ancillary products may be included in a task order when it is integral to and necessary for the IT services-based effort.
7168	Can the Government please confirm that text/font requirements do NOT apply to certifications (e.g., ISO Certification) that are included as part of proposal submission files as these documents are not editable?	Text/font requirements only apply to documents with a page limit and therefore do not apply to certificates unless they are provided as part of a page limited document.
7169	If offerors are expected to provide copies of PPQs as part of our past performance volume, would the Government like offerors to provide these as they were provided to the customer for completion?	There is no requirement for the Offeror to submit copies of PPQs.
7170	If offerors are expected to provide copies of PPQs as part of our past performance volume, would the Government like offerors to provide all pages of the PPQ in its entirety as it was provided to the customer for completion, or just certain pages?	There is no requirement for the Offeror to submit copies of PPQs.
7171	Since offerors are expected to provide the Past Performance Questionnaires (PPQ) Recipient List, would the Government consider removing the requirement for offerors to submit copies of PPQs as they were provided to the customers as part of the complete proposal submission?	There is no requirement for the Offeror to submit copies of PPQs.
7175	If Past Performance NAICS differ from the NAICS being used for competition (NAICS in which we are submitting our proposal under), where should offerors provide their written justification as to how the PP NAICS relates to the NAICS being used for competition?	The information should be provided within the 10 page Information from the Offeror documentation.

7176	Amendment 10 A.3.6(B) Proposal Submission Table does not identify where the AbilityOne Commitment Letter should be provided. Can the Government please identify where this letter should be included and in what order within the identified volume?	The AbilityOne letter should be included in the Volume I folder.
7177	Amendment 10 A.3.6(B) Proposal Submission Table does not identify where the PPQs should be provided. It identifies "Customer Evaluations" but it is our understanding that these differ from the PPQs in which the Government stated within the Q&As should be included as part of the proposal.	PPQs are submitted by the customer and are not included in the Offeror's proposal.
7178	Batch 2 response to question #2053 states "The Government clarifies that spreadsheets should be submitted in their native Excel format with working cell formulas as well as converted to PDF in the most readable manner practicable and submitted as part of a single PDF file." Can the Government please confirm that Excel spreadsheets do not need to be converted to PDF and can be submitted in their native Excel format only?	The current RFP prevails over old comments and responses. As stated in the current RFP there is no longer a requirement to merge the documents into a single PDF. Each document shall be submitted in a single searchable Adobe Portable Document Format (PDF) file. Each document should be placed in the appropriate folder (Volume I, II or III).
7179	Batch 2 response to question #2053 states "The Government clarifies that spreadsheets should be submitted in their native Excel format with working cell formulas as well as converted to PDF in the most readable manner practicable and submitted as part of a single PDF file." Can the Government please clarify what they mean by "submitted as part of a single PDF file" and what else should be included as part of this single PDF file?	The current RFP prevails over old comments and responses. As stated in the current RFP there is no longer a requirement to merge the documents into a single PDF. Each document shall be submitted in a single searchable Adobe Portable Document Format (PDF) file. Each document should be placed in the appropriate folder (Volume I, II or III).
7180	Batch 3 response to question #4326 states "There are two-page count requirements in Volume I related to the Letter of Agreement (LOA) and Exhibit 1 REPs." However, REPs are three (3) pages including the Exhibit 1 cover page. Can the Government please verify that this is correct?	No. As stated in the current RFP, the Exhibit 1 Cover page is excluded from the page count. Therefore REPs are limited to three pages exclusive of the Exhibit 1 Cover Page.
7181	Batch 3 response to question #2594 states "A list of recipients of past performance questionnaires is not included in the page count for Volume II. Offerors should include this information at the beginning of Volume II Past Performance." However, within Amendment 10 A.3.7.2, the Prior Customer Evaluations (PPQ Recipient List) is not required until A.3.7.2(b), meaning it would be placed after the requirements within A.3.7.2(a) for proposal development/formatting. Can the Government please verify that they would like the list of PPQ recipients at the beginning of Volume II, even though it would be out of order from the solicitation requirements?	The list of recipients should be placed in the Past Performance Cover Page document and will not be counted against the 10 page limit.
7182	Batch 3 response to question #2937 states "To ensure that NASA can associate the Past Performance Questionnaire (PPQ) with the appropriate proposal, the Offeror should include the name of the bidding entity (e.g., the name of the Joint Venture) in the comments section of the PPQ or in an accompanying cover page." However, response to question #4998 states "Yes, the Government will accept completed Past Performance Questionnaires (PPQs) (Exhibit 2) that reflect the names of the JV Member companies that performed the work." For PPQs that have already been submitted in the name of a JV member company in which the requirement to include the name of the JV in the comments section was not yet identified, will the Government allow the already completed and submitted PPQs in the name of the JV member company to be used for the bidding entity (e.g., the name of the JV)?	Yes.
7184	Response to question #2973 states "The requirement is for a total of "3 content representative areas" to be reflected across the past performance references, not per past performance citation." Please confirm that offerors bidding small business under Category C should only identify 3 content representative areas within their past performances (NOT REPs).	Confirmed.
7185	Response to question #2788 states "Only the required number of technical areas for the offerors business size can be used for REPs and past performance to meet the mandatory requirements." Please confirm that offerors bidding small business under Category C should only identify 3 content representative areas within their past performances (NOT REPs) and should NOT identify all technical areas that relate to each individual past performance within their Volume II Past Performance Volume.	Confirmed.
7186	If offerors bidding small business under Category C are only required to identify 3 content representative areas within their description of past performance history (per Amendment 10 A.3.7.2(a)10.), how does this differ from the REPs? It was our understanding that REPs were to provide specific capability related to a singular content representative area for each REP provided whereas the past performances were to relate to as many of the content representative areas as applicable.	REP and Past Performance are two different requirement areas. Each have their own requirements as to responses related to the Technical Areas. Amendment 10 clarified that Past Performance responses were to be based only on the specified required number of content areas.
7188	Response to question #6627 states "The PP volume can NOT consist of PP examples from contracts with other in-scope NAICS beyond the single NAICS being used for competition" However other responses state that the PP examples CAN consist of NAICS that are relevant to the single NAICS being used for competition, as long as justification is provided that explains the relevance of the PP example NAICS as it relates to the single NAICS being used for competition. Can the Government please confirm?	The current RFP takes precedence over previous comments. As stated in the current RFP: The offeror must provide past performance submissions as it relates to the SEWP VI in scope NAICS code being used for competition at the master contract level, as noted on the SF1449. If the NAICS code for the past performance submission does not match the Offeror's NAICS code used on the SF1449 or for references that are not assigned a NAICS code (e.g., commercial contracts), the offeror shall include the description within the past performance volume that explains how the work performed relates to the NAICS code used to compete as noted on the SF1449.
7189	Amendment 10 A.3.6(B) Proposal Submission Table does not identify where the SF1449 forms should be included. Could the Government please advise?	SF1449s should be included in the Volume I folder.
7190	Does the Government require all SF1449s that have been provided to date to be included as part of the proposal?	No. The most recent SF1449 should be submitted.
7192	Amendment 10 A.3.6(B) Proposal Submission Table does not identify where Offerors should provide SF30s, can the Government please advise?	SF 30 should be included in the Volume I folder.

7193	Can the Government please update Amendment 10 A.3.6(B) Proposal Submission Table to include ALL files that the Government is requesting offerors to include as part of their proposals for EACH Category? (e.g., SF1449s, SF30s, AbilityOne Commitment Letters, PPQs, etc.) Due to the various amendments and Q&As containing conflicting information, a concise list of all requirements in the order in which the Government would like them would assist offerors in providing complete proposals, ensuring no requirements are missed.	There is no order for submitting documentation other than to include each document as a separate PDF or Excel file (as noted in the RFP) within the associated Volume folder.
7197	There is a critical Cloud Service Provider OEM from Enclosure 1, after attempting for months, have stated they are not willing to adjust their Letter of Authorization template to add a reference to SEWP VI, and the Role of the signer included listed on the LOA. Requesting an exception to this requirement if the OEM is unwilling to adjust their LOA template.	The requirement will remain as stated. Note that the LOA documentation requirement, including the SEWP VI reference, can be met either within the body of an LOA, or as a note the provider includes with the LOA as long as the total number of pages submitted is limited to no more than 3 pages.
7198	If we are submitting as an SDVOSB but within Exhibit 4 there is a NAICS code in which we are considered a large, should we leave that singular NAICS code empty within Exhibit 4 or should we identify we are a large under that NAICS, even though we are submitting as an SDVOSB?	Offerors only should fill in rows in Exhibit 4 in which they have a small business designation for that NAICS code. This is independent of what size designation the Offeror is submitting under.
7199	Response to question #4230 states the vendor needs to submit separate attachments for SF1449, REP, and other documents. However, in response to question #4666 the Government stated that "The signed SF1449 and pages containing the completed clauses, provisions, and attachments can be appended to the Offer Volume proposal document." Can the Government please clarify if these should be appended to the Offer Volume or if they should provide as attachments within the Offer Volume ZIP folder?	The current RFP prevails over old comments and responses. As stated in the current RFP there is no longer a requirement to merge the documents into a single PDF. Each document shall be submitted in a single searchable Adobe Portable Document Format (PDF) file. Each document should be placed in the appropriate folder (Volume I, II or III).
7200	Can the Government please provide a list similar to that of the Amendment 10 A.3.6(B) Proposal Submission Table that states what should be included in each volume submission as part of each individual file as well as what should be included within the volume ZIP folder as a separate attachment within the folder? It is currently unclear what needs to be embedded into each volume (e.g., it is standard for offerors to embed the SF forms as part of the proposal file for Government proposals) and what should be provided as a separate attachment.	As stated in the current RFP, each document should be submitted as a separate PDF or Excel file. There is no longer a requirement to embed files into a single file.
7202	If an offeror used a consultant at the beginning of the proposal process but has since terminated the relationship, is the offeror still required to identify the use of the consultant?	No.
7203	To meet the requirement of identifying any consultant used in writing this proposal, are offerors to identify the name of the consultant by name or simply state that they used a consultant without identifying the consultant by name?	Identification means the name of the consultant should be provided.
7204	Response to question #5512 states "Offerors must show how the cited past performance is similar to one or more of the SEWP VI in-scope NAICS codes". This is different than what is stated in the solicitation, as we do not identify the requirement to show how the cited past performance relates to one or more of the SEWP VI in scope NAICS codes. It is our understanding that all cited past performances must be the same as the proposed NAICS code being used for competition or RELATE to the proposed NAICS code being used for competition, but not show how it relates to one or more of the NAICS codes. This response reads as though the past performance can be to any of the in scope NAICS codes. Can the Government please clarify?	The current RFP takes precedence over previous comments. As stated in the current RFP: The offeror must provide past performance submissions as it relates to the SEWP VI in scope NAICS code being used for competition at the master contract level, as noted on the SF1449. If the NAICS code for the past performance submission does not match the Offeror's NAICS code used on the SF1449 or for references that are not assigned a NAICS code (e.g., commercial contracts), the offeror shall include the description within the past performance volume that explains how the work performed relates to the NAICS code used to compete as noted on the SF1449.
7205	Response to question #5758 states that the Meaningful Relationship Commitment Letters should be included as separate files, however the Meaningful Relationship Commitment Letter is part of the "General Instructions" which does not have a page count. Can the Government please confirm that the Meaningful Relationship Commitment Letter should be a separate file included in the Volume I ZIP file or if it should just be embedded/included as part of the Volume I proposal file?	As stated in the current RFP there is no longer a requirement to merge the documents into a single PDF. Each document shall be submitted in a single searchable Adobe Portable Document Format (PDF) file. Each document should be placed in the appropriate folder (Volume I, II or III). Therefore an MRCL should be placed in the Volume I folder as a separate PDF.
7206	If a company is submitting as an unpopulated MP JV and submitting the JV Agreement in lieu of the Meaningful Relationship Commitment Letter, should the JV Agreement be embedded within the Volume I General Instructions?	Any documents, such as a JV agreement, should be submitted as a separate PDF file in the appropriate Volume folder. A JV agreement would be included in the Volume I folder.
7207	Where within the Past Performance Volume would the Government like offerors to provide rationale for past performance NAICS that do not match the NAICS in which we are proposing but instead relate to the NAICS in which we are proposing?	Any documents, such as a JV agreement, should be submitted as a separate PDF file in the appropriate Volume folder. A JV agreement would be included in the Volume I folder.
7208	Response to #2760 states "Supplemental documentation may be provided in their native format. Note that all documentation will be included within the associated page counts based on the minimum font size requirements." Does this mean that for certifications that are included within the actual proposal file (not a separate attachment in the associated volume ZIP file) are also held to the font type/size requirements even though offerors are unable to edit these documents?	No.

7209	Response to question #4203 states "Only Offerors with Past Performance rating of Satisfactory Level of Confidence or Neutral will have their proposal proceed to Phase 3 of evaluations". This leads offerors to believe that even though they possess recent and relevant past performance, they are better off NOT submitting a past performance and receiving a "neutral" rating to ensure they are not potentially found less than satisfactory and eliminated from proceeding to Phase 3 of evaluations. We believe that by automatically allowing neutrally rated offerors who possess no past performance at all and potentially eliminating offerors who possess past performance that the Government may potentially deem as less than satisfactory could open NASA SEWP up for mass protest from offerors who are eliminated from proceeding to Phase 3 of evaluations. Would the Government please reconsider their review process of the past performance volume as how currently written presents a disadvantage from those who submit a past performance volume.	As stated in the current RFP, "An Offeror that has relevant past performance but fails to provide the minimum requirements of the past performance volume will result in the contractor being excluded from competition."
7210	Can the Government please clarify on if they would like offers to base proposal format off of the instructions in Amendment 10 A.3?	The question is unclear. Offerors should submit a PDF file for the Technical Approach and a PDF file for the Management Approach and include both files in the Volume III folder.
7211	Can the Government please clarify on if they would like offers to base proposal format off of the Evaluation Criteria in Amendment 10 A.4.1?	The question is unclear. Offerors should submit a PDF file for the Technical Approach and a PDF file for the Management Approach and include both files in the Volume III folder.
7212	Response to question #6615 states that the Government would like Exhibit 5 (as provided in Amendment 10) to be included as part of the Management Volume Document. However, the Proposal Submission Table nor the Management Approach instructions clarify where in the Management Approach this Exhibit should be included. Could the Government please clarify where exactly, in what order of other Management Approach requirements, Exhibit 5 should be included?	Exhibit 5 should be included as a separate Excel file in the Volume III folder.
7215	Please confirm that Exhibit 5 is NOT required from offerors who are submitting O-TTPS certification.	Confirmed.
7216	1. We have noticed that there are many answers to questions that contradict each other, both between batches of questions and within the same batch. When Q&A responses conflict with each other, which will take precedence?	The current RFP take precedence over previous responses and RFP amendments.
7217	2. We have noticed that there are many answers to questions that contradict the solicitation, even in the recent batches of questions and in the Amendment 10 version of the RFQ. When Q&A responses give different instructions than the RFP document, which will take precedence?	The current RFP takes precedence.
7219	3. Reference A.3.7.2 PAST PERFORMANCE VOLUME, page 111-112. There are numerous conflicting Q&A responses about whether offerors are required to submit CPARS, whether they will be evaluated if submitted by offerors, and if they will be exempted from page limits. The RFQ is also unclear about these compliance issues. QUESTION: Are offerors required to submit CPARS (if they exist) with the proposal?	No.
7221	4. Reference A.3.7.2 PAST PERFORMANCE VOLUME, page 111-112. There are numerous conflicting Q&A responses about whether offerors are required to submit CPARS, whether they will be evaluated if submitted by offerors, and if they will be exempted from page limits. The RFQ is also unclear about these compliance issues. QUESTION: If CPARS are submitted with the proposal, will they be exempt from the page limits?	Generally, CPARS should not be submitted. If they are, they would be part of the "Information from the Offeror" 10 page limit.
7222	5. Reference A.3.7.2 PAST PERFORMANCE VOLUME, page 111-112. There are numerous conflicting Q&A responses about whether offerors are required to submit CPARS, whether they will be evaluated if submitted by offerors, and if they will be exempted from page limits. The RFQ is also unclear about these compliance issues. QUESTION: If CPARS are to be submitted as part of Volume II, should they be in the same file with the narrative, or should they be in a separate file?	Generally, CPARS should not be submitted. If they are, they would be part of the "Information from the Offeror" 10 page limit.
7224	The Government identifies that "first-tier small business subcontractor past performance information will only be evaluated for small business prime offerors when they do not independently demonstrate past performance necessary for award." Will the Government please define how they will be determining the size of the "first-tier small business"?	The RFP has been Updated. Offerors shall provide UEI Numbers for a first-tier subcontractors so the Government can verify small business size. The size of the subcontractor will be based on their business size representation on sam.gov for the Offeror's NAICS code being used for competition.
7225	6. Reference Q&A Batch 6, question 2456, "The past performance summary matrix is included in the page limit of 10 pages." This conflicts with an answer in Batch 3 Q&A Question 4966, which states, "Yes, the Government will exclude the matrix from the 10-page limit for the Past Performance Volume." Is the past performance summary matrix exempted from page limits?	The most current RFP take precedence over previous responses and RFP amendments. AS stated in the most recent responses, "The past performance summary matrix is included in the page limit of 10 pages."
7226	7. Reference RFP A.3.6, (A) Proposal Format and Organization, RFQ pages 94-94 and numerous Q&A including Batch 5, Questions 3981, 4397, 2538; Batch 4 Question 4230; Batch 3 Questions 1973, 2143, 2565, 2549, 2518, 1982, 2331, and 2711. Even the last two batches of questions and answers contain conflicting instructions about the files to be submitted, (single pdf file for each volume or separate files within each volume), what sounds like pdf files with embedded pdf files within them that would have to utilize the Adobe Acrobat Binder tool, or separate pdf files within a folder. It appears that the Government has an expectation that is not clear to industry. Will the Government please explain and provide a chart showing which items should be folders, files, and embedded or combined pdf files?	The current RFP prevails over old comments and responses. As stated in the current RFP there is no longer a requirement to merge the documents into a single PDF. Each document shall be submitted in a single searchable Adobe Portable Document Format (PDF) file. Each document should be placed in the appropriate folder (Volume I, II or III).

7227	8. Reference RFP A.3.6, (A) Proposal Format and Organization, (c) Procedure for uploading proposal files, RFQ page 92. The RFP specifies, "...The electronic files shall not include embedded attachments in PDF. See A.3.6.(A)(3) for specific details." However, many Q&A responses instruct the offerors to place pdf files within a single volume pdf file, which conflicts with this instruction. Will the Government please explain what its instructions for how a volumes document(s) must be assembled – Is it acceptable or preferred to have multiple files for each volume, which would be submitted in a volume-specific folder within the zip file?	The current RFP prevails over old comments and responses. As stated in the current RFP there is no longer a requirement to merge the documents into a single PDF. Each document shall be submitted in a single searchable Adobe Portable Document Format (PDF) file. Each document should be placed in the appropriate folder (Volume I, II or III).
7228	Amendment 9. According to Exhibit 3a, if there is more than one designated provider in a technical area may we modify the spreadsheet to provide the POC information for each provider?	No. Only one designated provider and their POC and LOA is required and should be submitted.
7230	10. Reference RFP A.3.7.1, (a) General Instructions, 6., page 100 (Responsibility IAW FAR 9.104-1(a)). Will NASA permit financial statements to be submitted directly to NASA in a separate sealed package submission to protect the sensitive data of privately held companies?	No.
7232	It appears as though different people provided answers to questions between the same batch and throughout the various batches as many of the answers contradicted each other as well as the solicitation. Understanding that there have been 10 amendments, thousands of Q&As, and there still appears to be a mass number of questions makes it fairly evident that the solicitation requirements are unclear and the solicitation has not been developed in an easy to understand format for offerors. Understanding that the Government believes the requirements are "straight forward" and "we are our only competition" (per the industry day), we do not believe that Government fully understands the amount of money and time that offerors have invested in this effort to still be left with contradictory answers and confusing instructions and requirements. We suggest the Government pull the solicitation and speak with other contracting personnel to develop a more clean solicitation that provides clear instructions and requirements for each category prior to release again. The current amendments are simply making an attempt to clean something that was not ready for release and was not thoroughly reviewed prior to release. Industry takes this solicitation and effort very seriously as it can completely change the future of each offeror, and we request that the Government give us the best advantage possible by providing us with a clean and clearly defined solicitation that separates each category, provides clear instructions as to what needs to be provided in a PDF vs an attachment with the ZIP file, etc. Releasing amendments is not helping industry and is in turn causing more confusion and time and money that many offerors simply do not have. We have invested a large amount of time and money into this effort, the confusion and unclear amendments have impeded our ability to compete on other efforts, and we request the Government provide the best product they possibly can, which does not appear to be what we are currently receiving.	Comment noted.
7233	Can offerors submit as a prime on an independent company and as part of a JV for same category and same socio-economic category? (e.g., submit as prime independently and as part of a MP JV both for Category C SDVOSB)	Yes.
7234	The Government responded to question #5003 with "no". Can the Government please explain the "no" response?	Question 5003 was unclear. If an Offeror has a project that meets REP requirements in multiple proposals, the same REP project can be used.
7235	The Government responded to question #5003 with "no", which contradicts question #5843 and #5939. Can the Government please clarify the contradiction with the response to the other questions?	If an Offeror has a project that meets REP requirements in multiple proposals, the same REP project can be used.
7236	Amendment 10 FAR 9.104-1(a) states the company annual report is acceptable, but these are issued/filed by publicly traded companies. What is an acceptable replacement for private companies?	Other forms of financial information that demonstrate that the Offeror has "adequate financial resources to perform the contract, or the ability to obtain them" are acceptable.
7238	Reference Section A.3.7.3, (a) Technical Approach (Subfactor A) - The new instructions in this section are very confusing to follow to make sure offerors submit a compliant proposal. It appears offerors are being asked to address: 1. items from Attachment A, Section A.2 against items 1 (technical scalability and extensibility demonstrating ability) and 2 (describe overall ITC/AV based solutions and/or services and how they provide technological leadership in supporting the next generation of Govt tech requirements...) on RFP Page 113 in the form of overall technical offerings and general capabilities; 2. how technical offerings support the first 3 Acquisition Objectives in Attachment A, Section A.1. 3. Technical Approach against items 1 (technical scalability and extensibility demonstrating ability) and 2 (describe overall ITC/AV based solutions and/or services and how they provide technological leadership in supporting the next generation of Govt tech requirements...) on RFP Page 113. Is this a correct interpretation? Also seeking if you can please answer this question directly and not use an answer to a similar question that is not entirely the same and can lead to uncertainty in how to proceed. Thank you.	Yes. The first paragraph of (a) TECHNICAL APPROACH (SUBFACTOR A) provides general instructions for the Offeror to reference when providing responses to points 1. and 2. in that section.

7240	<p>Please verify that offerors are required to list contracts that were de-scoped due to contractor poor performance and not contracts that were descope by the government for reasons unrelated to poor contractor performance.</p> <p>The current solicitation language on Page 111 concerning contract scope changes presents a significant risk for protests. Requiring offerors to list all terminations or de-scopes captures an overwhelming number of government-initiated scope changes unrelated to contractor performance. These changes, often due to budget shifts or mission realignments, will far outweigh instances tied to poor performance and obscure the intent of identifying the most qualified offerors. Offerors may struggle to ensure they've captured every instance of a contract change, putting their proposals at risk of elimination. Without clarifying that the focus is solely on contracts where the contractor's performance negatively impacted the outcome, the broad requirement could result in unclear evaluations and increase the likelihood of protests from offerors who were eliminated due to appearing as if they haven't met this vague requirement.</p>	The solicitation will remain as stated.
7241	<p>Reference Section A.3.7.3, (a) Technical Approach (Subfactor A) - In batch 5 Q&A, the answers to items 3683, 4527, 4873, 4874, 4974, 5041, 6265, and 6753 all indicate to not write against the sample Technical Areas (assuming this is RFP Section A.1.2; pages 25 - 39), and only provide "offeror's general technical capabilities with regard to SEWP scope and Acquisition Objectives...". We interpret that SEWP scope is defined as Attachment A, Section A.2 and Acquisition Objectives are Attachment A, Section A.1</p> <p>Can you confirm offerors do not write against any of the information in Attachment A, Section A.3 Scope Technical Areas, which then references A.1.2 in the RFP document?</p> <p>Also seeking if you can please answer this question directly and not use an answer to a similar question that is not entirely the same and can lead to uncertainty in how to proceed. Thank you.</p>	Yes, the SEWP scope is defined as Attachment A, Section A.2 and Acquisition Objectives are Attachment A, Section A.1. Offerors should refer to the current RFP for the specific instructions and guidance.
7242	<p>Could you clarify if the NAICS selected for competition and the NAICS of selected Past Performance have to match exactly? In several responses regarding the relationship between past performance NAICS codes and the NAICS chosen for SEWP VI competition, the term "related to" was used. Does "related to" indicate that past performance must strictly match the NAICS code selected for competition, or can past performance under a different NAICS code be used if it aligns with the scope of work for SEWP VI?</p>	Amendment 8 clarified that if a NAICS code of a referenced contract or award, does not exist or match the NAICS code being used for competition then the Offeror should describe how the work relates to the NAICS code being used for competition.
7243	<p>Are Offerors required to complete the Trade Agreements Certificate in the representation and certifications found on page 131 – 132? If required, does SEWP want the list provided as separate document? What format; PDF, Word or Excel?</p>	No. The certificate may be required at the order level to document the TAA information provided by the Contract Holder post award.
7244	<p>What criteria is being used to evaluate the offerors' Commitment to Sustainability and how does it impact the overall confidence level?</p>	The Government will evaluate if the Offeror's response indicate they understand the requirements and demonstrate an ability to be successful in performing the contract with little or no Government intervention.
7245	<p>It's imperative that NASA obtains an Individual Waiver of the Nonmanufacturer Rule (NMR) for the entire SEWP VI contract. The FAR restricts Small Business awardees from selling most IT products on set-aside contracts, as these are primarily manufactured by large businesses like Dell, Cisco, and HP. The Class Waivers referenced in the solicitation cover only a narrow set of items. For example, the Class Waiver for NAICS 334111 applies only to commercial laptops, tablets, and mainframe computers. It does not include other critical products that are included under this NAICS code, such as servers, storage systems, and networking equipment. For task orders involving these products, Contracting Officers will need to secure individual waivers for each task order, adding an additional layer of complexity that diminishes the effectiveness of set-asides in fostering Small Business participation.</p> <p>The success of SEWP V in promoting Small Business competition is undoubtedly tied to the application of an Individual Waiver of the NMR at the contract level. This approach has enabled Small Businesses to participate confidently, free from compliance risks, while delivering the cutting-edge IT products NASA requires. SEWP VI should follow this same proven path to ensure continued success.</p>	The process used for the SEWP V NMR waiver is no longer available. NASA has worked with SBA to ensure SEWP VI follows the current NMR waiver process.
7246	<p>Exhibit 4 – NAICS Size Standard Crosswalk – Should the Offeror include their size standard for all NAICS codes that correspond to their SAM.gov entity information that are in-scope for the Category they are proposing, or should the size standard be provided only for the NAICS Codes that are represented in the product offering included in their proposal response for that Category? It may be beneficial for the Offer to include the size standard for all NAICS codes that correspond to their SAM.gov entity information that are in-scope for the Category they are proposing since Offerors will expand their product offering post award.</p>	The Offeror should include their size standard for all NAICS codes that correspond to their SAM.gov entity information that are in-scope for the Category they are proposing,

7247	According to the answer to question number 5655 there is a process to add OEMs to the designated provider list for inclusion in SEWP VI. Can you explain the process? Does the government expect that OEMs can complete the process in time to be included as a designated provider / designated OEM for the submission of SEWP VI proposals?	An internal process based on historic data was utilized. Companies were not notified or consulted and there is no external process for companies to complete to be added to the list.
7249	Exhibit 4 Column C states "Size Standard", which would be large or small according to SAM.gov. However, it is our understanding that the Government would like offerors to specify their socio-economic category in which they qualify and are submitting under within Column C (e.g., SDVOSB, WOSB, VOSB, etc.) Can the Government confirm that they would like the socio-economic category to be populated in Column C rather than the size standard?	Yes.
7250	Response to question #2240 states "exhibit 4 should reflect all applicable small business categories that we qualify for". Does this mean that under Column C, Size Standard, if a company qualifies as an SDVOSB and a VOSB for certain NAICS that both of these should be listed in Column C for that NAICS?	Yes.
7251	FAR 52.212-3 NAICS Code Table for each company lists NAICS, Size Standard (value), and whether it is a Small Business. However, Exhibit 4, Column C Size Standard, is not looking for a "value" as it is shown in SAM, correct?	The Offeror's information must match that in sam.gov at the business size level; e.g. OTSB, small business, etc. For example, if the Offeror states their business size for NAICS 12345 is SDVOSB then they must be a small business in sam.gov for that NAICS code.
7252	FAR 52.212-3 NAICS Code Table for each company lists NAICS, Size Standard (value), and whether it is a Small Business. However, it does NOT identify which socio-economic categories (e.g., SDVOSB, SDB, VOSB, WOSB, etc.) that each company qualifies for under each NAICS. FAR 52.212-3 identifies socio-economic category, but NOT by individual NAICS. Therefore, the Government's response to question #2240, which states "exhibit 4 should reflect all applicable small business categories your company qualifies for" does not make sense. Could the Government please clarify what exactly they would like?	If an Offeror is an SDVOSB and certified as a small business under NAICS 12345, then they should enter SDVOSB in the row for NAICS 12345.
7254	Per Section A.1.6 (Electronic Submission Instructions) and Section A.3.5 (Volume I Administrative Documentation) of the SEWP VI RFP, the solicitation does not specify instructions for submitting Standard Forms (e.g., SF33, SF1449). Due to technical limitations with fillable PDF forms, Adobe Acrobat prevents multiple forms from being combined into a single PDF document without losing fillable field properties. Are Offerors permitted to submit Standard Forms (e.g., SF33, SF1449) as separate attachments within the proposal submission package? Please confirm how respondents should prepare and submit these documents to comply with the solicitation's requirements.	As stated in the current RFP, each document should be submitted as a separate PDF or Excel file.
7257	Do prime offerors still need to provide financial management information about their subcontractors if they intend to assume 100% financial responsibility? As the prime, it would be our sole responsibility for financial management of the venture, funding requirements, and limitation of liabilities.	No.
7258	In the August 6 response to questions, the Government stated that an offeror must select a single NAICS code that would be used to compete for a master SEWP VI contract. Q1. Please confirm that Mandatory Experience Relevant Experience Projects (REP) can be from more than one NAICS code and not tied to the Offeror's one identified NAICS code at the master contract level? Q2. In contrast, please confirm that Past Performance instances must tie to the one NAICS Code the Offeror identifies at the master contract level?	Amendment 8 removed the NAICS code wording with regard to REPs. Amendment 8 clarified that if a NAICS code of a referenced contract or award, does not exist or match the NAICS code being used for competition then the Offeror should describe how the work relates to the NAICS code being used for competition.
7262	The Government's response to Q&A #6413 indicates that an Offeror should submit its full Representations and Certifications from its SAM.gov record in contrast to the A.3.7.1 language simply requiring the completion of fill-ins in the Representation and Certifications. Specifically for FAR 52.212-3, it allows as stated, "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 ." This indicates Offerors can check Paragraph B. Question: Can the Government confirm that full Representations (REP) and Certifications (CERT) are not required to be submitted in the Offer Volume from its SAM.gov record as long as all fill-ins for Representations and Certifications are completed as instructed?	The current RFP prevails over old comments and responses. Follow the current RFP instructions.
7263	If the RFP has not incorporated the high volume of answers to questions, or if the answers to questions conflict with the instructions or requirements within the latest amendment of the RFP, and the RFP has not been updated to reflect these answers, which document takes precedence? Does the final amended RFP supersede the questions and answers?	Yes. The final amended RFP supersedes questions and answers and previous RFP's.
7264	The RFP states: "If any reference to documentation is made by the offeror such documentation shall be cited at the page, section, and paragraph level." Will the Government please clarify what they mean by "documentation"? Our assumption is that you do not need references back to the Government solicitation documents, is that correct? Please confirm this applies to only references within the offeror's proposal submission (e.g., referencing the Management Approach within the Technical Approach) and not solicitation document references (e.g., referencing the SOW Acquisition Objectives).	"Documentation" refers to the Offeror's documentation.

7267	<p>Reference Section A.3.7.3, (a) Technical Approach (Subfactor A) - In Amendment 10, our understanding as a Category B OTSB is offerors need to 'provide a summary description of their overall technical offerings and general capabilities' in reference to Attachment A, Scope A.2 as it relates to our category, as well as in reference to the three Acquisition Objectives.</p> <p>In the 'point 1' bullet, the government indicates 'describe the technical scalability and extensibility of the offeror's products, solutions and/or services that demonstrates their ability to fulfill a range of ITC/AV Solutions and/or Services requirements centered on the Offeror's core technical capabilities within the breadth of the given Category scope', in this case Category B OTSB.</p> <p>Aside from addressing how our offerings and general capabilities are in alignment with Attachment A, A.2. Category B Scope and the three acquisition objectives, can our core technical enterprise-wide capabilities and other enterprise-wide capabilities reference the core technical areas (the four areas that Category B OTSB offerors select) as well as the other additional technical areas - to show how we support SEWP? Also seeking if you can please answer this question directly and not use an answer to a similar question that is not entirely the same and can lead to uncertainty in how to proceed. Thank you.</p>	Offerors should respond to A.3.7.1. with documentation that they determine is appropriate given the instructions provided.
7268	Please disregard the Original Question #6969 and answer this question instead: As per A.3.7.1 (a)6 states "Acceptable information includes: letters from certified United States banks indicating the available amount of credit for the business and the company's annual report." Would other acceptable information include Bank Statements or Fiscal Year End P&L statements in lieu of A bank letter or annual report?	Any information that demonstrates the Offeror's financial capability to perform the contract is acceptable.
7275	General Can the Government please confirm that if a conflict exists between an RFP requirement and an answer to an industry question, the RFP requirement takes precedence?	Yes.
7277	Per the instructions in Section V. of the RFP, "Offerors shall complete only paragraph (b) of this provision if the Offeror has completed the annual representations and certifications electronically in the System for Award Management (SAM) accessed through https://www.sam.gov ." This statement is interpreted to mean that Offerors would not need to fill out every check box and provision, if we have already completed this information on SAM.GOV. Is that a correct interpretation?	Correct.
7279	Section A.1.34, NORTH AMERICAN INDUSTRY CLASSIFICATION SYSTEM (NAICS) & NAICS CODES WITHIN SCOPE (Pg 62-64) identifies NAICS 541519e (footnote 18) as marked with a double asterisk indicating SEWP NMR individual waiver with select items. Can the government please confirm that NAICS 541519e (footnote 18) does not require an AbilityOne Commitment Letter?	Confirmed. There is no single asterisk in the table for that NAICS code.
7281	<p>Can an offeror use the same REP and past performance reference(s) within the same category and socioeconomic classification (e.g., Small Business) on their bid, as well as on another bidder's bid where they are a subcontractor? Previous NASA Q&As appear to contradict one another, as shown below.</p> <p>Q5003 = Will the Government please clarify if an offeror can re-use the same REP more than once in the same Category? For example once as an 8(a) and a SDVOSB as a Subcontractor? Please advise. NASA's answer was "No."</p> <p>Q5011 = Can we use the projects for REPs and PPs if we submit the proposals for multiple teaming arrangements? e.g. As an 8a Prime and Small business JV partner or Subcontractor to SDVOSB? NASA's answer was "Yes, you can use the same projects for REPs and PPs if you submit proposals for multiple teaming arrangements."</p>	The questions were answered at different times with different assumptions at the time. The current RFP takes precedence. . "Yes, you can use the same projects for REPs and PPs if you submit proposals for multiple teaming arrangements."
7282	Should the proposal be submitted as 1 pdf, or should the attachments be submitted separately?	Per the RFP instructions: Each document should be a separate file within the appropriate Volume folder
7284	In Batch 3 Q&A 2449 and 5356, the Government confirms that the total cost incurred is the amount invoiced to date. The Government is not requiring updated PPQs, and many Offerors already had their customers submit the PPQs to the Government in accordance with the original deadline. Therefore, is it acceptable if the total cost incurred is now higher in the proposal than what was noted originally on the PPQ?	There are no specific requirements as to how such information would be conveyed - that is determined by the Offeror. There is no requirement to explicitly list which capabilities are provided by the prime contractor versus those provided by subcontractor(s)
7287	In a recent Q&A, offerors are limited to providing one REP per first-tier subcontractor. Are offerors also limited in the number of past performance references that a single first-tier subcontractor can provide?	The RFP defines the circumstances in which an REP and past performance from a small business subcontractor would be considered.
7289	In Batch 3, Q&A 2531, the Government confirms that Offerors may choose to include a compliance (or cross-reference) matrix outside of page limits. Would the Government prefer that the compliance matrix follow the Table of Contents at the beginning of each volume or an appendix at the end of each volume?	There is no preference.
7290	In Batch 3, Q&A 2532, the Government states that offerors can insert Government-provided templates including exhibits as photos within the proposal Word document that includes the required formatting. However, this will cause the font within those images to appear smaller than required. Please confirm offerors will not be penalized for this.	Confirmed.

7291	<p>The last paragraph in section A.1.8 PROCEDURES FOR ORDERS (Pg 42) states that if Offeror has a standalone award in a given category, Offeror is prohibited from competing at the order level as both prime and part of a JV/contractor teaming agreement. Can the government please clarify the meaning of this statement? Does it mean:</p> <p>a. If Offeror is awarded SEWP as a Prime then Offeror cannot bid ANY orders as a contract team,</p> <p>OR</p> <p>b. Offeror can't bid on the same order as both a prime and part of a contract team (i.e. Offeror must choose one when bidding that specific task order)?</p>	b) is the correct interpretation.
7292	<p>Within the Volume I: Offer Volume requirements, the RFP states: 'To determine if an Offeror is responsible in accordance with FAR 9.104-1(a), the Offeror is instructed to submit information demonstrating its financial capability to perform the contract. Acceptable information includes letters from certified United States banks indicating the available amount of credit for the business and the company's annual report.'</p> <p>Most privately held firms do not produce an Annual Report. Can NASA confirm that providing a letter of credit, along with a Profit and Loss statement and Balance Sheet, will suffice to demonstrate financial capability?</p> <p>Most privately held firms do not have an Annual Report. Can NASA confirm that providing the letter of credit, along with a Profit and Loss / Balance sheet will suffice to demonstrate financial capability?</p>	The references to "letters from certified United States banks" and "annual reports" are example documents that could be used to demonstrate financial capability. Any information that demonstrates the Offeror's financial capability to perform the contract is acceptable.
7293	<p>In Batch 3, Q&As 4840 and 6602, the Government states the Offeror needs to submit the Past Performance Questionnaires (PPQs) as part of their submission. However, Amendment 10, section A.3.7.2(b), requires the Offeror to instruct each of its References to return the questionnaire to the Government Contracting Officer. Because Offeror's References are submitting the PPQs directly to the Government in accordance with the Amendment 10, section A.3.7.2(b) instructions, please confirm that what the Government is referencing here is the contact information for the references cited and not the PPQs.</p>	The referenced questions are no longer relevant. Offerors should follow the instructions within the current RFP which take precedence over previous comments.
7294	<p>In Batch 3, Q&A 6650, the Government provides a naming convention for the PPQs (i.e., PP) and states, "Offerors should submit a single Exhibit 2 document named 'OfferorName_Category #-PP#.' Offerors will not have copies of the PPQ submissions because Offeror's customers are submitting the PPQs directly to the Government as required by Amendment 10, section A.3.7.2(b), with many of them already submitted before this Q&A was released. Although Offerors can ask customers to use a naming convention, Offerors will not know and cannot be held responsible for customers not following the Offeror's guidance. Additionally, the Offeror understands that the naming convention "PP" for "how the respective documents within the folder are to be labeled," as shown in the examples in RFP, Amendment 10, section A.3.6(A)(3), is for the Volume II Past Performance (PP) submission and not for submission of the Past Performance Questionnaires (PPQs) that the Offeror's customers are required to submit directly to the Government Contracting Officer in accordance with RFP, Amendment 10, section A.3.7.2(b). Is this question actually referencing the contact information for the PPQ and not the PPQ itself? Please clarify.</p>	Question 6650 is no longer relevant as the referenced wording is no longer a part of the RFP.
7295	<p>In Batch 3 Q&A 6650, the Government provides a naming convention for the PPQs (i.e., PP) and states, "Offerors should submit a single Exhibit 2 document named 'OfferorName_Category #-PP#.' Offerors will not have copies of the PPQ submissions because Offeror's customers are submitting the PPQs directly to the Government as required by Amendment 10, section A.3.7.2(b), with many of them already submitted before this Q&A was released. Although Offerors can ask customers to use a naming convention, Offerors will not know and cannot be held responsible for customers not following the Offeror's guidance. Additionally, the Offeror understands that the naming convention "PP" for "how the respective documents within the folder are to be labeled," as shown in the examples in section A.3.6(A)(3), is for the Volume II Past Performance (PP) submission and not for submission of the Past Performance Questionnaires (PPQs) that the Offeror's customers are required to submit directly to the Government Contracting Officer in accordance with Amendment 10, section A.3.7.2(b). Please deconflict the contradiction between Q&A 6650 and the RFP, Amendment 10, section A.3.7.2(b), and release an updated amendment to reflect all revised instructions for submission of the PPQs based on the Q&As.</p>	Question 6650 is no longer relevant as the referenced wording is no longer a part of the RFP.
7296	<p>Before Mandatory experience was removed from Category A, we had planned to include our relevant company information in this section. Now that it has been removed, where should offerors include this information?</p>	Note that Relevant Experience Projects were never a Category A requirement and therefore should not be provided for Category A proposals.

7297	Within the Q&A Batches 1-7, there are Government answers to questions that are contradictory and that contradict the 80TECH24R0001 Amendment 10 Request for Proposals instructions/requirements. Additionally, the 80TECH24R0001 Amendment 10 Request for Proposals does not reflect all RFP changes resulting from Government answers to questions. Because of contradictory answers within the Q&A batches and between Q&As and the 80TECH24R0001 Amendment 10 Request for Proposals, and because the 80TECH24R0001 Amendment 10 Request for Proposals does not include all revised proposal instructions from the Q&As, please confirm that the final SEWP VI Amendment takes precedence over all Q&As for the Government's determination of a compliant proposal response.	Confirmed.
7298	The Offeror is not required under 80TECH24R0001 Amendment 10 Request for Proposals, section A.3.7.1(a)(6) to provide evidence that meets the broad scope of FAR 9.104 as indicated in the evaluation criteria under sections A.4.1 (i.e., "Is determined to be a responsible source IAW FAR 9.104") and A.4.2 (i.e., "The Government will evaluate the information to determine if the Offeror is a responsible source IAW FAR 9.104"). Rather, the Offeror is required to demonstrate financial capability via evidentiary documentation, only one element under the FAR 9.104-1 General Standards. Please confirm that submitting financial capability documents required in the 80TECH24R0001 Amendment 10 Request for Proposals, section A.3.7.1(a)(6), meets the FAR 9.104 evaluation criteria requirements under sections A.4.1 and A.4.2, and that no additional documentation or information is required.	Confirmed.
7299	The 80TECH24R0001 Amendment 10 Request for Proposals, section A.3.6(A)(3), states, "Each document shall be submitted in a single searchable Adobe Portable Document Format (PDF) file (compatible with ADOBE Reader version DC or 2017), with appropriate bookmarks to at least the section header." Please confirm Exhibits 1, 3a, 4, and 5 do not require bookmarks.	Confirmed.
7300	The 80TECH24R0001 Amendment 10 Request for Proposals, section A.3.2, states, "Questions regarding the SEWP VI RFP Application (e.g., access, system issues, and upload issues) must be submitted via email to sewp6@sewp.nasa.gov at least 72 hours in advance of the RFP deadline. ... The Offeror is solely responsible for its inability to submit a proposal due to issues with the application that were not submitted to the Government 72 hours in advance of the RFP deadline." Section A.3.3(e) states, "The offeror is responsible for ensuring its proposal reaches the Government office designated in the solicitation by the date and time specified in the solicitation." However, the proposal due date of 17 February 2025 is a Monday and President's Day, a Federal holiday, and the 72-hour window in advance of the proposal due date includes Saturday and Sunday (February 15-16). Will the Government please move the RFP deadline to Friday, 21 February 2025, to allow the Offeror to receive assistance in a timely manner from the Government within a 72-hour window in advance of the RFP deadline?	Any changes to the final proposal due date will be announced on sam.gov.
7301	The 80TECH24R0001 Amendment 10 Request for Proposals, section A.3.7.1(b), "For Category B," states, "It is acceptable to provide proof that the certification approval is in process by providing the Point of Contact information including the name of appraisal body and name, phone number, and email of a representative from whom the Offeror is obtaining the verification." However, section A.4.2, "For CATEGORY B," states, "In addition to the valid ISO 9001, Section A.3.7.1(b) consists of providing a valid CMMI certification, or the requisite in progress documentation." Please confirm the "requisite in progress documentation" refers to providing ONLY the Point of Contact information as required in the RFP Amendment 10, section A.3.7.1(b), "For Category B."	Confirmed.
7302	Please confirm that no pricing or CLIN information is required at time of proposal submission for offerors in Category B and C.	Confirmed.
7303	Amendment 10 added references to an Attachment F. Could the government clarify what this is and where it's located? For example on page 45 under A.1.13 Fair Opportunity and Requests for Quotes, it states, "...Contractor may only respond with items available on their Contract and the price of each item shall be no greater than the price in Attachment F SEWP database of record at the time the quote is issued."	Attachment F is the SEWP database of record which is filled in post award as described in Section A.1.23 TECHNOLOGY REFRESHMENT.
7313	Section A.3.6 Proposal Preparation (pg 93): The submission structure remains unclear in Amendment 10 and there are conflicting Q&A answers on the PDF/folder structure regarding which sections and supporting documents are to be combined into one PDF and which are to be submitted as separate files. Can the Government provide a table explicitly demonstrating the expected file structure?	The current RFP prevails over old comments and responses. As stated in the current RFP there is no longer a requirement to merge the documents into a single PDF and therefore there is no required file structure. Each document shall be submitted in a single searchable Adobe Portable Document Format (PDF) file. Each document should be placed in the appropriate folder (Volume I, II or III).
7314	Exhibit 3a – Category A Solutions Spreadsheet - Will NASA please confirm that there is no longer a requirement to indicate TAA, EPEAT or Sec 508 compliance for the proposed products?	Confirmed.
7315	A.1.15 – "If the product is not available on the Contractor's current GSA schedule, then the SEWP contract price must be equal to or less than the same offering on the Contractor's current commercial price list and/or any Contractor's comparable Federal Government contracts unless any pricing difference can be justified." Would the Government consider removing "and/or any Contractor's comparable Federal Government contracts unless the pricing difference can be justified"?	The solicitation will remain as stated.
7316	The Government's answer to Question #6442 combined with the Amendment 10 A.3.7.1 (c) instruction leaves the Exhibit 4 - NAICS Size Standard Crosswalk requirements unclear. Please confirm if offerors are expected to fill in their size standard for all NAICS listed in Exhibit 4, or if they are required to fill in *only* the single NAICS code we select for our master SEWP VI contract.	Yes. As stated in the current RFP, the Offeror "must complete Exhibit 4 reflecting their Size Standard(s) for each NAICS within the category in which they are proposing".

7319	<p>Ref A.3.7.2 (a) item 10 Past Performance History ("The Offeror shall provide a description of its relevant past performance history in meeting the technical and management requirements identified below [followed by a list of content representative areas.]). Although the Government has amended A.3.7.2 for clarity in Amendment 10, we still have some questions with regard to item 10.</p> <p>-Confirm that the response to item 10 should include a narrative and a matrix in the format of Table 1, Sample Past Performance Matrix, and not consist solely of the matrix</p> <p>-If a narrative is required, confirm that it should address the offeror's overall experience with regard to all content representative areas of the Category, and is not limited to the experience of the 1 to 3 Past Performance projects which we identify in response to A.3.7.2 (a) items 1 through 9</p>	<p>As stated in the current RFP, the required documentation includes: "The Offeror shall provide a description of its relevant past performance history in meeting the technical and management requirements". The RFP is updated in Amendment 11 to further clarify that the response is in relation to "past performance as provided by the submitted Past Performance references and for the stated number of content representative areas".</p>
7320	<p>Ref A.3.7.2 (a) Past Performance ("The Government will not consider performance on a newly-awarded contract that has no documented performance history (i.e., projects that have been under contract for less than six months prior to proposal due date.)" Sub bullet 9 goes on to state: "For the references submitted with the Offeror's proposal, Offeror shall provide recent customer evaluations of previous performance including Award Fee Evaluation results, Fee Determination Official letters, Annual Performance Evaluation Forms, or any other written performance feedback, if applicable.") In the initial statement, the Government defines a project as having documented performance history as one that is at least six months old (without referring to a requirement that the client have provided a documented performance evaluation). Further, sub-bullet 9 only asks for evaluations "if applicable." Finally, we note that some non-Federal clients do not provide periodic performance evaluations.</p> <p>Therefore, we ask that the Government confirm that a response that does not include a documented performance evaluation, if the customer has not provided one, is acceptable, as long as the project is at least 6 months old (as of the due date). Also, we note that the Past Performance Questionnaire (PPQ; Exhibit 2) that offerors' customers are providing for this bid constitute documented performance evaluation.</p>	<p>As stated in the current RFP, the required documentation is that which is available. Therefore, if no such documentation exists, it is not required.</p>
7321	<p>The RFP mentions: "To determine if an Offeror is responsible in accordance with FAR 9.104-1(a), Offeror is instructed to submit information which demonstrates its financial capability to perform the contract. Acceptable information includes: letters from certified United States banks indicating the available amount of credit for the business and the company's annual report. If a teaming arrangement, joint venture, or other business combination is contemplated, disclose each participant's responsibility for financial management of the venture, funding requirements, limitation of liabilities, and any other information which describes the financial arrangement."</p> <p>1. Can the government clarify whether the requirement for "letters from certified United States banks indicating the available amount of credit for the business" can be removed or modified? It is unclear what is an acceptable amount of credit for submission. Would submitting a bank reference suffice to meet this requirement?</p> <p>2. Please confirm if submitting the latest audited financial statements (Income Statement and Balance Sheet) would satisfy the requirement to submit 'company's annual report'?</p>	<p>The references to "letters from certified United States banks" and "annual reports" are example documents that could be used to demonstrate financial capability. Any information that demonstrates the Offeror's financial capability to perform the contract is acceptable.</p>
7322	<p>Our client confirmed that they submitted the completed Past Performance Questionnaire (PPQ) to NASA on 07/09/2024, but did not receive any confirmation from NASA on the receipt of the same. Since then, the RFP was put on hold and now that the submission date is revised to 02/17/2025,</p> <p>1. With multiple updates to the RFP and the PPQ template, would the Government still consider our PPQ submitted on 07/09/2024 to be valid or should the offeror resubmit the PPQ using the new template?</p> <p>2. How can the offeror confirm the successful submission of the PPQ?</p>	<p>1) Yes; 2) the Offeror does not have to confirm successful submission.</p>
7324	<p>Suppose ABC is a large business company, that is bidding as Prime on category B and Category C and bidding as subcontractor on Category B and Category C with other company. Can we as small Business bring Company ABC as Subcontractor on category B and Category C?</p>	<p>Yes, as long as the subcontractor is not utilized for REPs and/or past performance.</p>
7325	<p>Referring to section: "Independent Past Performance Information.", Is it necessary to Provide the CPARS for the projects shortlisted as Past Performances?</p>	<p>The Offeror does not submit independent past performance information.</p>
7326	<p>Referring to section: "Independent Past Performance Information.", we are submitting State and commercial projects as Past Performances. What shall we submit in place of CPARS?</p>	<p>The Offeror does not submit independent past performance information.</p>
7327	<p>Referring to section, "A.2. SCOPE", "The second category, Category B, is focused on Enterprise-wide Strategic Solutions that improve and enhance the Agency's ITC/AV infrastructure through methodologies including cloud services; managed services such as computer or printer services; and shared services such as Agency-wide help desk ticketing systems" Is Category B somehow related to providing the hardware services? Does the contractor need to provide any hardware services if bidding for category B?</p>	<p>No to both questions.</p>

7328	Referring to the section: "A.1.8 Procedures for Orders", Supplies or services to be furnished under this contract shall be specified by the issuance of delivery orders from any Government agency priced in accordance with Section A.1.15 Discounts for Technology Equipment and Attachment F, SEWP Database of Record, Attachment is not attached with the package. Can government Clarify?	The SEWP Database of Record will be added post award through the Technology Refreshment process identified in Section A.1.23.
7329	Referring to the section: "A.1.8 Procedures for Orders", Any additional terms and conditions including licensing agreements proposed by a Contractor must be clearly identified in writing in the quote. What licenses are being referred to?	Whatever licenses are requested by the Issuing agency such as software licenses.
7330	Referring to the section: "PROPOSALS REQUESTED", "The above limitations do not preclude a prime contractor from acting as a first-tier subcontractor on one or more proposals within a category if they are not providing REP or Past Performance references for another Offeror's proposal.", If a company ABC is bidding as a subcontractor on multiple proposals on multiple Categories, can that Company ABC repeat the past performances or REPs in the multiple Proposals or categories?	No. AS stated in the current RFP, a subcontractor's REP or Past Performance cannot be used in multiple proposals in the same Category.
7331	Referring to the section: "PROPOSALS REQUESTED", "The above limitations do not preclude a prime contractor from acting as a first-tier subcontractor on one or more proposals within a category if they are not providing REP or Past Performance references for another Offeror's proposal.", If a company ABC bids as prime on Category C and bids as Prime on Category C, Can the Past Performances and REPS be repeated?	The question is unclear.
7332	Referring to the section: "PROPOSALS REQUESTED", "The above limitations do not preclude a prime contractor from acting as a first-tier subcontractor on one or more proposals within a category if they are not providing REP or Past Performance references for another Offeror's proposal.", If a company bids as prime on Category B and bids a subcontractor on Category C, Can the Past Performances and REPS be repeated?	If the company qualifies to submit a Past Performance or REP as a subcontractor, then the same project can be submitted as a Prime and a subcontractor.
7333	Can a company ABC bid as prime on Category B and Category C? If Yes, Can Company ABC repeat Past performances and REPS?	Yes.
7334	Can a company ABC bid as prime on Category B and Category C? If Yes, Can Company ABC repeat Past performances and REPS?	Yes.
7335	Can a company ABC bid as prime on Category B and Category C? If Yes, Can Company ABC repeat Past performances and REPS?	Yes.
7336	If Company ABC is bidding as Subcontractor on Category B with Company XYZ, Can Company ABC also bid as Subcontractor on Category B but with another Company DEF?	Yes, as long as they are not used more than once as an REP or Past Performance reference.
7337	Offeror previously submitted PPQs for Category C in support of SEWP VI. However, Offeror's new PPQ submission will be for Category B - Category B- Enterprise-wide ITC/AV Service Solutions – NAICS 541512. What is the Government's process for reviewing and incorporating revised past performance information to assure the past performance information aligns to the correct category?	The Offeror should contact their Point of Contact and ask them to resubmit the questionnaire under Category B.
7338	Comment 6409 addresses the Management Approach requirement to describe ancillary products and services related to SCRM. However, this answer still does not clarify the intent of the requirement. Could NASA provide one example of what might be included in this section to help offerors respond accurately.	No. The instructions will remain as stated.
7341	There have been potentially conflicting responses concerning what projects should be included in the past performance matrix. Will the government confirm the following: "Only the 1-3 chosen Past Performance projects listed in the proposal should be listed within the Sample Past Performance matrix table." It is particularly confusing because the text of the amendment 10 version of the solicitation states "Prime Offerors shall furnish the information requested below for a minimum of one but no more than three recent similar contracts." and then the sample table has 4 sample project rows.	The matrix should map the one to three projects to the required number of content representative areas.
7344	RFP Amendment 10, A.3.5, pg. 93-Can the Government consider accepting proposals from the vendors for all the set-asides they are eligible for across each category? E.g. Company A submitting proposals as a Prime for Category C as an 8a and Small Business.	No. Note that Contract Holders will be eligible for all RFQs post award for which they meet the Issuing Agency's NAICs, business size set asides and any other relevant requirements.
7345	RFP Amendment 10, A.3.7.2(b), pg. 111-If the questionnaires for past performances have already been sent out by government stakeholders/Prime, should we ask them to resend the questionnaires?	No.
7346	If a vendor reaches out to NASA, can you confirm which clients have submitted past performance questionnaires for the submissions made in July? This inquiry is to ensure that all expected responses were received.	No.

7347	<p>The RFP A.3.7.2 (a) Item 10 on p. 109 asks the Offeror to provide Past Performance History as a whole and as related to the SEWP VI Contract Requirements. In the same section but on p. 110, the paragraph after the Category C enumeration, asks the Offeror to provide past performance references, showcasing relevant work in at least three (3) content representative areas for content to be rated relevant. This seems to imply that Item 10 Past Performance History should showcase at least 3 of the 10 Category C Content Representative Area. Is this a correct understanding of the text?</p> <p>However, on the same page, p.110, paragraph 3, when the Table 1 Past Performance Matrix is required, the RFP says that the information shall match the past performance information with the relevant experience identified in paragraph (a)(12) of this section. Should that be (a)(10) Past Performance History since there is no (a)(12) anymore? Would that mean that Table 1 Past Performance Matrix should cover at least 3 of the 10 Category C Content Representative Areas as mentioned in paragraph 1 of p.110?</p> <p>But then, paragraph 3 on p.110, the same paragraph, continues with "Offerors are advised that the matrix is a summary of the referenced contracts submitted for the past performance volume for a given scope category." This means that Table 1 Past Performance Matrix should correspond to the at least 1, at most 3 past performance projects submitted. But that would mean that whether we submit 1 or 2 or 3 past performance projects, these should cover at least 3 content representative areas which is described in item 10 Past Performance History and put in the Table 1 Past Performance Matrix. Is this the correct understanding of the text?</p>	Yes.
7349	Can we use past performances apart from the ones we will be submitting in the technical resposne section to showcase our capabilities?	Providing more than the minimum requirements will have no effect of the evaluation and rating of the Offeror's proposal. Any information beyond the minimum for Phase 1 and 2 will not be reviewed.
7350	Suppose a company ABC bid as a Prime and Subcontractor on category B? Can Company ABC Bid as a subcontractor on another company XYZ that is bidding as prime on Category B? In that case can ABC reuse the Past performances and REPs?	The question is unclear. As stated in the current RFP, in a given Category, an offeror can use their REP / Past Performance as a Prime and, if they qualify to do so, once as a subcontractor.
7351	Can we include past performances outside of those listed in the technical response section to demonstrate our capabilities?	Providing more than the minimum requirements will have no effect of the evaluation and rating of the Offeror's proposal. Any information beyond the minimum for Phase 1 and 2 will not be reviewed.
7352	<p>How does the agency expect the submission of technical and management approaches?The instructions for the submission of Technical and Management Approaches in Volume III - Mission Suitability Volume seem to conflict with the file naming conventions provided. Specifically:</p> <p>The file naming instructions (Amendment 10 RFP page numbers 94 and 95) refer to files named "GetItDone_Category#-Management Approach" and "GetItDone_Category#-Technical Approach", which suggests separate files.</p> <p>However, the Volume III instructions (Amendment 10 RFP page numbers 96, 112, 113, and 114) indicate the submission of these approaches (Subfactor A and Subfactor B) within a single volume.Could the agency clarify:</p> <p>Should the Technical and Management Approaches be submitted as separate files or combined into a single file?</p> <p>If a single file is required, how should the Table of Contents (TOC) be structured?</p> <p>Option 1: A single TOC at the beginning, with Technical and Management Approaches in separate sections.</p> <p>Option 2: Separate TOCs for Technical and Management Approaches within the file.</p> <p>Option 3: Is there any other approach that the agency sees fit?</p>	As stated in Amendment 10 each document shall be a separate PDF file. Therefore, a Technical Approach PDF file and a separate Management Approach PDF file should be included in Volume III folder.
7353	Can we use past performances apart from the ones we will be submitting in the technical resposne section to showcase our capabilities? Suppose we have already submitted three past performances for which we also provided Past Performance Questionnaires (PPQs). Can we now reference additional past performances (limited to the agency name and a brief description of the work performed) to further demonstrate our capabilities in the technical response section?	Providing more than the minimum requirements will have no effect of the evaluation and rating of the Offeror's proposal. Any information beyond the minimum for Phase 1 and 2 will not be reviewed.
7354	Is it permissible to reference additional past performances, beyond the three submitted with their respective Past Performance Questionnaires (PPQs), in the technical response section? For instance, can we include the agency name and a brief description of the work performed to further showcase our capabilities?	Providing more than the minimum requirements will have no effect of the evaluation and rating of the Offeror's proposal. Any information beyond the minimum for Phase 1 and 2 will not be reviewed.
7356	As a small business prime contractor bidding on SEWP VI, can I submit past performances where I acted as a subcontractor to fulfill the requirement for three past performances? Additionally, if I was a Tier 2 or Tier 3 subcontractor on those projects, can I still use them for submission?	The RFP allows work as a subcontractor to be submitted with the requirement that "If the work was done as a subcontractor, then the size and work described as a subcontractor must be only that work specifically defined in the subcontract."
7357	As a small business prime contractor bidding on SEWP VI, can I submit past performances where I acted as a subcontractor to fulfill the requirement for three past performances?	The RFP allows work as a subcontractor to be submitted with the requirement that "If the work was done as a subcontractor, then the size and work described as a subcontractor must be only that work specifically defined in the subcontract."
7358	As a small business prime contractor bidding on SEWP VI, can I submit past performances where I acted as a subcontractor, including those where I served as a Tier 2 or Tier 3 subcontractor, to fulfill the requirement for three past performances?	The RFP allows work as a subcontractor to be submitted with the requirement that "If the work was done as a subcontractor, then the size and work described as a subcontractor must be only that work specifically defined in the subcontract."
7359	As a small business prime contractor bidding on SEWP VI, can I submit past performances where I acted as a subcontractor, including those where I served as a Tier 2 or Tier 3 subcontractor, to fulfill the requirement for three past performances? Please answer in YES or NO.	The RFP allows work as a subcontractor to be submitted with the requirement that "If the work was done as a subcontractor, then the size and work described as a subcontractor must be only that work specifically defined in the subcontract."

7360	Exhibit 3a Technical Area tabs do not include a column for unit for customers to calculate cost for customer orders. Can Offerors adjust the customer provided exhibit and add a column to include this information? This level of detail will help NASA better understand cost of the proposed offerings and technical solutions to be provided.	No, the stated information is not relevant to the proposal. As stated in the current RFP, the Government will not be reviewing pricing.
7361	The RFP allows the use of 10 pt. font for headers, footers, callout boxes and captions. Would the government allow the use of 10 pt. font for footnotes as well?	No.
7362	Can the SF 1449, Reps and Certs, Meaningful Relationship Commitment Letter, AbilityOne Commitment Letter, FAR 9.104 Information, ISO 9001 Certification, and Letter of Authorization all be individual and separate PDF files within the Volume I submission folder?	Yes.
7363	Certain documentation, such as the SF1449, FAR 9.104 Information, and Letter of Authorization, etc. cannot be formatted to include headers, footers, and page numbers consistent with the volume within which they are included. In doing so, offerors would create scanned images or embedded PDFs, which is non-compliant with the requirements. Can offerors include these source documents as individual, original PDF pages inserted within the overall PDF volume files without matching headers, footers, and page numbers? This would allow the entire volumes to be searchable PDFs.	Yes. Headers, footers, and page numbers are only required for documents with a page limit and therefore are not required in source documents unless they are included as part of a page limited document.
7364	This section shall include a discussion on the staff, resources and processes planned or in place to manage more than 100 requirements in a day for Category A and ten requirements in a day for Category B and C including but not limited to sorting, reading, assigning, making bid/no bid decisions, responding as appropriate, following-up, etc. Do "requirements" mean Task Orders/Purchase Orders or items (products/services) within orders?	"requirements" refers to customer requirements such as Request for Quotes.
7365	Do small businesses also need to provide letters from certified United States banks indicating the available amount of credit for the business and the company's annual report to meet the requirements of FAR 9.104-1(a)?	No. The references to "letters from certified United States banks" and "annual reports" are example documents that could be used to demonstrate financial capability. Any information that demonstrates the Offeror's financial capability to perform the contract is acceptable.
7366	For completing the NAICS Size Standard Crosswalk (Exhibit 4) for Category C, what is the impact of the offeror representing as a small business for a NAICS Code but their first-tier subcontractor entering NA? Can the Government confirm that the offeror still receive an award for that NAICS Code as long as the first-tier subcontractors don't represent as Large? Please also confirm that the offer is eligible for award if their subcontractor enters NA for the NAICS Code listed by the offeror on the SF1449? First-tier subcontractors won't always represent the same NAICS Codes as the offeror in SAM.gov.	First tier subcontractors should not enter information in Exhibit 4.
7367	In amendment 8 and 10 it is mentioned "To determine if an Offeror is responsible in accordance with FAR 9.104-1(a), Offeror is instructed to submit information which demonstrates its financial capability to perform the contract. Acceptable information includes: letters from certified United States banks indicating the available amount of credit for the business and the company's annual report." Do small businesses also need to provide these letters to meet the requirements of FAR 9.104-1 (a).	No. The references to "letters from certified United States banks" and "annual reports" are example documents that could be used to demonstrate financial capability. Any information that demonstrates the Offeror's financial capability to perform the contract is acceptable.
7368	Amendments 8 and 10 specify: "To assess an Offeror's responsibility under FAR 9.104-1(a), Offerors must submit information demonstrating their financial capability to perform the contract. This may include letters from certified United States banks indicating available credit for the business and the company's annual report." Are small businesses also required to provide these letters to meet the FAR 9.104-1(a) requirements?	No. The references to "letters from certified United States banks" and "annual reports" are example documents that could be used to demonstrate financial capability. Any information that demonstrates the Offeror's financial capability to perform the contract is acceptable.
7370	Amendments 8 and 10 specify: "To assess an Offeror's responsibility under FAR 9.104-1(a), Offerors must submit information demonstrating their financial capability to perform the contract. This may include letters from certified United States banks indicating available credit for the business and the company's annual report." Are small businesses also required to provide these letters to meet the FAR 9.104-1(a) requirements?	No. The references to "letters from certified United States banks" and "annual reports" are example documents that could be used to demonstrate financial capability. Any information that demonstrates the Offeror's financial capability to perform the contract is acceptable.
7371	As a small business prime contractor bidding on SEWP VI, can I submit past performances where I acted as a subcontractor, including those where I served as a Tier 2 or Tier 3 subcontractor, to fulfill the requirement for three past performances?	The RFP allows work as a subcontractor to be submitted with the requirement that "If the work was done as a subcontractor, then the size and work described as a subcontractor must be only that work specifically defined in the subcontract."
7372	As a small business prime contractor bidding on SEWP VI, can I submit past performances where I acted as a subcontractor to fulfill the requirement for three past performances? Additionally, if I was a Tier 2 or Tier 3 subcontractor on those projects, can I still use them for submission?	The RFP allows work as a subcontractor to be submitted with the requirement that "If the work was done as a subcontractor, then the size and work described as a subcontractor must be only that work specifically defined in the subcontract."
7373	Is it permissible to reference additional past performances, beyond the three submitted with their respective Past Performance Questionnaires (PPQs), in the technical response section? For instance, can we include the agency name and a brief description of the work performed to further showcase our capabilities	Providing more than the minimum requirements will have no effect of the evaluation and rating of the Offeror's proposal. Any information beyond the minimum for Phase 1 and 2 will not be reviewed.

7374	Suppose we have already submitted three past performances for which we also provided Past Performance Questionnaires (PPQs). Can we now reference additional past performances (limited to the agency name and a brief description of the work performed) to further demonstrate our capabilities in the technical response section	Providing more than the minimum requirements will have no effect of the evaluation and rating of the Offeror's proposal. Any information beyond the minimum for Phase 1 and 2 will not be reviewed.
7376	If offerors who possess and do not submit any past performance are rated "neutral" and automatically make it to the next round of evaluations, it would make it "safer", as well as easier, for all companies to simply not submit a past performance volume. If there is no requirement for companies to be held to the same requirements and all offerors simply made a decision to not submit any past performance and receive a neutral rating to ensure they proceed forward, it makes the purpose of a past performance volume pointless. Since this is the case, would the Government consider eliminating the past performance volume requirement in its entirety since essentially, all offerors could simply not submit a past performance volume and receive a neutral rating?	No. An Offeror that has relevant past performance but fails to provide the minimum requirements of the past performance volume will result in the contractor being excluded from competition.
7377	A.3.7.1 OFFER VOLUME (a) GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS The Offeror shall complete SF1449 Blocks 12 (if applicable), 17, and 30 and the indicated Offeror required fill-ins in the clauses, provisions/representations and certifications, and attachments. Question: If the offeror is current in SAMs do we need to provide the entire representations and certifications from the RFP?	No.
7378	A.3.6 PROPOSAL PREPARATION—GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS Examples of how the respective documents within the folder are to be labeled are shown below: GetItDone_Category#-EXHIBIT # GetItDone_Category#-LOA # GetItDone_Category#-PP # GetItDone_Category#-Management Approach Question part 1: Please clarify which requirements must be submitted as a separate attached pdf file (Excluding the Excel spreadsheets). Question part 2: Excluding the Excel spreadsheets, can we submit each volume a single pdf file that contains all the required documentation?	Each document is a separate PDF or excel file. Offerors should not submit each volume in a single pdf file that contains all the required documentation.
7385	Amendment 10, RFP, Section A.3.7.1(c) Category B and C, page 103 to 105 provides details for minimum values a company must meet for Mandatory Experience Offerings and page 107 provides details for minimum values a company must meet for Past Performance. Under Mandatory Experience Offerings, companies must meet a total value size of a single order or contract and past performance must meet an average annual cost/fee incurred. It is unclear why Experience contract minimum values are different from past performance contract minimum values. Will the Government please update the solicitation to make the minimum values for both experience and past performance reference the same categories, type of value requested, and same thresholds across both experience and past performance sections?	No.
7386	Amendment 10, RFP, Section A.3.7.1(c) Category B and C, page 103 to 105 provides details for minimum values a company must meet for Mandatory Experience Offerings and page 107 provides details for minimum values a company must meet for Past Performance. Under Mandatory Experience Offerings, companies must meet a total value size of a single order or contract and past performance must meet an average annual cost/fee incurred. It is unclear why Experience contract minimum values are different from past performance contract minimum values. Will the Government please update the solicitation to make the minimum values for both experience and past performance reference the same categories, type of value requested, and same thresholds across both experience and past performance sections?	No.
7388	Amendment 10, RFP, Section A.3.7.1(a).6, page 100 requests offerors to supply information to determine if the Offeror is responsible in accordance with FAR 9.104-1(a) to include a certified letter and annual report. However, annual reports are only filed on publicly traded companies. Will the Government restate the requirement to say, "...annual report, if a publicly traded company."?	The references to "letters from certified United States banks" and "annual reports" are example documents that could be used to demonstrate financial capability. Any information that demonstrates the Offeror's financial capability to perform the contract is acceptable.
7389	In the RFP General Instructions, specifically compliance with FAR 9.104-1(a). Paragraph 6 states offerors and its partners must submit Bank letters or and corporate annual reports. Can the government please provide a process or mechanism for offerors and their subcontractor/other partners to submit this sensitive financial information in a sealed package? Most companies regard such information as proprietary and hence most likely will be unwilling to expose that information outside corporate management channels. Thank you.	No. The references to "letters from certified United States banks" and "annual reports" are example documents that could be used to demonstrate financial capability. Any information that demonstrates the Offeror's financial capability to perform the contract is acceptable.

7391	Amendment 10, RFP, p. 100 Section A.3.7.1(a)(6): Financial Capability to Perform Contract "If a teaming arrangement, joint venture, or other business combination is contemplated, disclose each participant's responsibility for financial management of the venture, funding requirements, limitation of liabilities, and any other information which describes the financial arrangement." Can the Government offer clarification on which teaming arrangements/ agreements fall under this language?	No.
7395	The solicitation does not clarify the purpose of selecting a primary NAICS code or its implications. Specifically, it is unclear how the primary NAICS impacts access to task orders under other NAICS codes within the same category, as well as the determination of subcontractor size status for compliance. Will the Government please clarify the purpose of selecting a primary NAICS code, its impact on access to task orders under other NAICS codes in the same category, and whether a subcontractor's size status is determined by the primary NAICS?	The selection of a primary NAICS code is used for the REP and Past Performance requirements of the proposal and will be the Contract level NAICS code. It does not impact accessing task orders under other NAICS codes in the same category. It does determine the subcontractor's business size if the subcontractor is used to meet the REP or Past Performance requirements.
7396	It is unclear whether a subcontractor can contribute a REP or past performance to the proposal if they classified as small under the primary NAICS code, but are large in multiple NAICS listed in Exhibit 4+NAICS+Size+Standard++Crosswalk+Amendment+9+11.21.24. Will the Government please clarify whether a subcontractor's size status on Exhibit 4 NAICS impacts an offeror's compliance or future access to task orders, particularly if a subcontractor is small under only one NAICS code?	A subcontractor's NAICS code will not affect access to task orders unless the Issuing Agency includes such requirements in their RFQ.
7397	The solicitation requires each REP to address a single technical area, which creates unnecessary constraints for Offerors. Will the Government consider revising the requirement that each REP address only one technical area, to allow Offerors to demonstrate capabilities and experience in multiple technical areas within a single REP?	REPs are used to meet the minimum requirement of one technical Area per REP. There is no benefit for the Offeror to exceed the minimum requirement as the Government will only review the REPs to ensure those minimum requirements are met. Any additional information that exceed the minimum will not be reviewed.
7398	Amendment 8 introduced substantial changes to Mission Suitability requirements, shifting focus from sample technical areas to mission objectives. This change disregarded the significant effort already invested by Offerors and lacked sufficient explanation or justification. This requirement does not seem to align with the intent of showcasing comprehensive mission suitability to perform under the category scope. Will the Government reconsider the abrupt changes to Mission Suitability requirements and provide Offerors with more stable and clear instructions for proposal preparation?	The current RFP instructions will remain as stated.
7400	The ongoing amendments, contradictory guidance, and unclear requirements have resulted in significant wasted effort and costs for many Offerors. The current solicitation process fails to respect the time and resources invested by the industry. Will the Government provide an updated and stable version of the solicitation, along with an extended timeline?	An amendment is planned as the final requirement to be proposed against.
7401	Based on the Amendment 10 RFP instructions on pages 94-95 and the previous Q&A responses, we understand that the submission zip file for Category B must contain 3 combined PDFs for the proposal volumes, plus Exhibits 4 and 5 provided as MS Excel files. Please clarify: what other files are required to be included in the zip file?	The assumption is incorrect. Per Amendment 10, each document must be a separate file within the associated Volume folder. For example, Volume II will have a PDF file for the Technical Approach, a PDF file for the Management Approach; etc. The zip file should then have three folders where each folders contain the separate PDF and excel files.
7406	Block 10 of the SF1449 is pre-filled by the Government with "See Section A.1.34". Please confirm that offerors should NOT delete the Government's note there?	Confirmed

7410	<p>Amendment 10, Page 112 A.3.7.3 MISSION SUITABILITY VOLUME (a) TECHNICAL APPROACH (SUBFACTOR A)</p> <p>For All Categories</p> <p>For points 1 and 2 of this section the Offeror must provide a summary description of their overall technical offerings and general capabilities in accordance with the proposed Category scope (see Attachment A-SEWP Scope, Section A.2. SCOPE). Additionally, the Offeror must address how their technical offerings support the first three of the Four Acquisition Objectives as provided in Attachment A-SEWP Scope, Section A.1. ACQUISITION OBJECTIVES. Offerors Technical Approach shall also include information in the following areas:</p> <p>1. The offeror shall describe the technical scalability and extensibility of the offeror's products, solutions and/or services that demonstrates their ability to fulfill a range of ITC/AV Solutions and/or Services requirements centered on the Offeror's core technical capabilities within the breadth of the given Category scope.</p> <p>Question: Does an offeror need to respond to all Technical Areas for a given Category or just the Technical Areas relevant to their Core Technical Capabilities?</p>	No. Amendment 8 updated the instructions for the Technical Approach to clarify it is based on the offeror's general technical capabilities with regard to the SEWP scope and Acquisition Objectives and not on the sample Technical Areas.
7414	Since it's been several months since PPQs have been submitted project values have changed for ongoing projects. The information (total contract value, minimum average annual value, current contract expenditures) listed in the PPQs submitted in June won't match the information offerors need to provide in the Past Performance Volume. Please clarify how the government would like offerors to reconcile the differences between the PPQs that were submitted to the government back in June/July and the information that is to provided in the Past Performance Volume under items 3, 4 and possibly 5 (pg 108).	The Offeror will need to review the current requirements and ensure their previous submissions meet those requirements or require new submissions to be made.
7416	In reference to Volume III, Subfactor B, Exhibit 5 - Amendment 8 removed the language "Please note that an Offeror that provides a response of "no" to any of the items in Exhibit 5 disqualifies their organization from receiving a SEWP VI Contract award." This language seems to be added back in for Amendment 10. Please confirm if a response is no to any question that an award will not be granted for SEWP.	Confirmed. Note that other allowable responses beyond Y(es) and N(o) were added.
7417	For the Reps and Certs in Section V. it states that c-v do not need to be filled in if they are already in sam.gov. Do the rest of the provisions need to be completed even if they are in sam.gov?	As stated in the current RFP: 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 .
7418	If a reseller already wrote to each technical area in Category A as the original RFP had requested, will it be looked down on if they keep those responses with each technical area to answer how we can fulfil the technical capabilities? The same with the original SCRM and ESG original RFP language. If they were written prior to the amendments, do we need to update to ONLY include what is in the last amendment? Or will we be pinged for providing what was originally requested?	The Offeror needs to ensure their response meets the instructions of the current RFP. Responses based on previous versions of the RFPs will not necessarily be adequate unless they meet the current RFP.
7419	Is there a way for vendors to confirm that the government has received the 3 PPQ's as these were sent out months prior and we want to ensure it does not affect our submission.	No. Offerors will not be negatively affected if the customer failed to provide a questionnaire as long as the Offeror has ensured that the references are notified and have verified that the questionnaire is completed and submitted,.
7420	Can a distributor provide documentation regarding a credit line that we have with them to show that we have financial capabilities?	Any information that demonstrates the Offeror's financial capability to perform the contract is acceptable.
7422	We are an 8A Small Business, competing in the small business category. To be clear, we can compete in the Small Business Category, not 8A subgroup, as long as we meet the minimum threshold?	Yes.
7423	<p>A.1.2 GSFC 52.211-91 SCOPE OF WORK (FEB 2016), Page 25, RFP Statement: "The Categories are self-contained, and requirements will be provided for quoting and fulfillment at the order level in one category. The Contractor shall provide the personnel, materials, and facilities, necessary to perform the work and to furnish the items specified in Attachment D Contract Data Requirements Deliverable of this contract in accordance with the Statement of Work: SEWP Contract Scope (Attachment A); and task orders issued hereunder. The contracts will be awarded by Category and classified by Group as follows..."</p> <p>Question: Considering that contracts will be awarded by Category and not content representative areas, can the Government please confirm that offerors showcasing more than four content representative areas in their REPs and past performance references will not be rated more favorably than offerors showcasing only four content representative areas?</p>	Confirmed.

7424	<p>A.3.7.1 Offer Volume (c) Mandatory Experience/Offerings, Page 103, RFP Statement: "Each REP must be from a different project and must each address a different technical area per the given category."</p> <p>Question: Can the Government please confirm REPs may address multiple technical areas per the given category?</p>	No. REPs should only address one Technical Area.
7425	<p>A.3.7.2 PAST PERFORMANCE VOLUME, Page 106, RFP Statement: "The offeror must provide past performance submissions as it relates to the SEWP VI in scope NAICS code being used for competition at the master contract level, as noted on the SF1449." However, the NAICS code listed on the SF1449 for Category B and C states "See Section A.1.34"</p> <p>Question: Can the Government please confirm that offeror-submitted past performance references may align to any of the NAICS listed in A.1.34 applicable to the category the offeror is bidding?</p>	No. As stated in the current RFP, Past performance references must align to the NAICS code being used for competition.
7427	<p>A.3.7.2 PAST PERFORMANCE VOLUME, Page 109, RFP Statement: "10. Past Performance History-. The Offeror shall provide, at a minimum, the following information as part of its Past Performance Volume to demonstrate the relevance of its recent past performance, and to facilitate the evaluation of Past Performance as a whole and as related to the SEWP VI Contract Requirements."</p> <p>Question: Can the Government please confirm this requirement is only applicable "for the references submitted with the Offeror's proposal," similar to the preceding question (9)?</p>	Yes.
7428	<p>Exhibit_1_-_REP_Template_Amendment_08.pdf, RFP Statement: "Exhibit 1 asks for each REP's "Project Value."</p> <p>Question: Can the Government please confirm that offerors should provide Total Contract Value inclusive of obligated value and unexecuted options?</p>	"total contract value" refers to the total contract value, including all options, not just the size of the project based on dollars obligated to date.
7429	<p>Will the Government confirm whether a small business proposing under Category C "IT Services" is required to address all ten content areas within the category (listed below) in their response, or only those content areas aligned with their core capabilities as it relates to responding to describing the technical scalability and extensibility of the offeror's products, solutions and/or services that demonstrates their ability to fulfill a range of ITC/AV Solutions and/or Services requirements centered on the Offeror's core technical capabilities within the breadth of the given Category scope AND describing their over-all ITC/AV-based solutions and/or services and how the Offeror's solutions and/or service-oriented capabilities provide technological leadership in supporting the current and next generation of Government technical requirements in terms in terms of solutions and/or services. Specifically, does the Offeror need to:</p> <p>Address all ten content areas or only their core capabilities within the ten content areas to demonstrate the technical scalability and extensibility of their products, solutions, and/or services, showing their ability to fulfill a range of ITC/AV solutions and/or service requirements within the category's scope?</p> <p>Provide an overarching description of their ITC/AV-based solutions and/or service-oriented capabilities, emphasizing how these offer technological leadership in supporting both current and future Government technical requirements?</p> <p>The ten content areas are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Innovation Services Information and Data Analytics Services (IDAs) Application Services/Software Development Cybersecurity Services Cloud Services Digital Multimedia and Technical Communications Services IT Operations and Maintenance / Help Desk/Call Center Support 	The instructions to the Technical Approach do not require that any of the sample Technical Areas be referenced. Amendment 8 updated the instructions for the Technical Approach to clarify it is based on the offeror's general technical capabilities with regard to the SEWP scope and Acquisition Objectives and not on the sample Technical Areas.
7431	<p>Exhibit_1_-_REP_Template_Amendment_08.pdf, RFP Statement: PART III: "PROJECT DESCRIPTION Provide a clear and concise description of the IT service as it relates to the Mandatory Experience Technical Area. Use a font, no smaller than 10 point. The completed REP description may not exceed a total of three (3) pages and should be attached to this Exhibit cover page. Any text exceeding three pages will not be considered"</p> <p>Question: Can the Government please confirm that each Exhibit 1: Relevant Experience Project Cover Page is limited to a total of three pages, inclusive of Parts I, II, and III?</p>	The Relevant Experience Cover Page is Exhibit 1 and is one page. As stated in the referenced instructions, a description should be provided in a maximum of 3 pages attached to the cover page; i.e. a total of up to 4 pages.
7432	<p>Exhibit_1_-_REP_Template_Amendment_08.pdf, RFP Statement: "PART III PROJECT DESCRIPTION Use a font, no smaller than 10 point."</p> <p>Question/Comment: Part III of Exhibit 1: Relevant Experience Project Cover Page allows for font "no smaller than 10 point". To maintain consistency with the font requirements of the RFP, can the Government only allow 12 point Times New Roman font for Part III of Exhibit 1?</p>	The exhibit will remain as stated.

7433	<p>Q&A 1702 states, "The Technical and Management Approach should be submitted in a single file." The RFP, Amendment 10, section A.3.6(A) states, "Offerors shall submit proposals in three volumes as specified" in the table. But section A.3.6(A)(3) instructs Offerors to create volume folders within a zip file. The instructions provide the naming convention for each required document within the volume folder, to include the Technical Approach (GetITDone_Category#-Technical Approach) and the Management Approach (GetITDone_Category#_Management Approach), indicating the Technical and Management Approach are not to be submitted in a "single file." Section A.3.6(A)(3) further states, Unless specifically authorized by the solicitation instructions, alternate proposal submissions shall not be submitted" and "Each document shall be submitted in a single searchable Adobe Portable Document Format (PDF) file..." Will the Government please clarify the correct submission instructions for the Technical Approach and Management Approach and update the RFP amendment, as required?</p>	The current RFP correctly states that each file is a separate PDF file (or excel, as appropriate) within the associated Volume folder.
7434	<p>A.3.7.1 OFFER VOLUME (a) General Instructions, Page 98, RFP Statement: "The Offeror shall complete SF1449 Blocks 12 (if applicable), 17, and 30..."</p> <p>Question/Comment: The Solicitation did not indicate the placement of SF 30 forms. Can the Government please confirm that offerors should include signed SF 30 forms in the SF 1449 section of Volume I?</p>	All forms such as SF30s should be provided as a separate PDF file within the Volume I folder.
7435	<p>A.3.6 Proposal Preparation - General Instructions (b) Proposal Content and Page Limitations, Page 95, RFP Statement: "No mention of Volume I Cover Page in Proposal Format Table"</p> <p>Question/Comment: The Solicitation Table does not include a Volume I Cover Page. Can the Government please confirm that offerors may include a Cover Page for Volume I?</p>	Yes. Amendment 8 updated the instructions for the Technical Approach to clarify it is based on the offeror's general technical capabilities with regard to the SEWP scope and Acquisition Objectives and not on the sample Technical Areas.
7440	<p>Can the government confirm that the scope of Category B is limited to the 10 Technical Areas listed in A.3.6 page 104? Prior Q&A only confirmed 11b is not included in REP scope (#4778). Page 26, section A.1.2 GSFC 52.211-91 SCOPE OF WORK (FEB 2016) includes Technical Area 11b: PROGRAM MANAGEMENT/ANCILLARY SERVICES AND SUPPLIES, however there are only 10 listed on page 104 for the Category B- Mandatory Experience Technical Areas. It is unclear if offerors under Category B need to address 11b and where?</p>	No the listed Technical areas are examples. As stated in the current RFP: "The sample list of representative service areas is not meant to be all-inclusive, but are indications of types of in-scope services-based solutions. Other services which adhere to the definition of ITC/AV services and encapsulate an enterprise-wide solution, are within scope." There is no requirement for the Offeror to address Technical Area 11b in their proposal.
7442	<p>A.3.6 Proposal Preparation - General Instructions (b) Proposal Content and Page Limitations, Page 95, RFP Statement: "(c) Category B and C Mandatory Experience Exhibit 1 Cover Page"</p> <p>Question: The Proposal Format Table instructs offerors to provide an Exhibit 1 Cover Page. Can the Government please confirm that this is to be provided for each REP in addition to the three page project description for a total of 4 pages per REP?</p>	Yes. The provided Exhibit 1 file is the referenced Exhibit 1 Cover Page. As noted in Exhibit 1: "The completed REP description may not exceed a total of three (3) pages and should be attached to this Exhibit cover page."
7444	<p>A.3.7.2 Past Performance Volume (a) Information From The Offeror, Page 110, "Offerors identified as an Other Than Small Businesses in Category B shall provide past performance references showcasing relevant work in at least four (4) content representative areas for content to be rated relevant."</p> <p>Question: Can the Government please confirm that the collection of Past Performance references showcases at least four content representative areas collectively?</p>	Yes.

7447	<p>Question: Will the Government confirm the past performance history requirement for HUBZone, SDB, VOSB, SDVOSB, WOSB, EDWOSB, 8a offerors in Category B and/or C is to showcase relevant work in two content representative areas? As opposed to having to showcase past performance references for all 10 content representative areas?</p> <p>Reference: pg. 109 Section A.3.7.2(a)10.Past Performance History.</p> <p>10. Past Performance History- The Offeror shall provide, at a minimum, the following information as part of its Past Performance Volume to demonstrate the relevance of its recent past performance, and to facilitate the evaluation of Past Performance as a whole and as related to the SEWP VI Contract Requirements.</p> <p>The Offeror shall provide a description of its relevant past performance history in meeting the technical and management requirements identified below (This list shall not be construed as indicating any priority ranking or order of importance):</p> <p style="text-align: center;">CATEGORY C Content Representative Areas</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Innovation Services 2. Information and Data Analytics Services (IDAs) 3. Application Services/Software Development 4. Cybersecurity Services 5. Cloud Services 6. Digital Multimedia and Technical Communications Services. 7. IT Operations and Maintenance / Help Desk/Call Center Support 8. Network Services 9. Database Services 10. In-Scope Training <p>Offerors identified as HUBZone, SDB, VOSB, SDVOSB, WOSB, EDWOSB, 8a in Category B</p>	<p>Confirmed: the past performance history requirement for HUBZone, SDB, VOSB, SDVOSB, WOSB, EDWOSB, 8a offerors in Category B and/or C is to showcase relevant work in two content representative areas</p>
7450	<p>A.3.7.2 Past Performance Volume (a) Information From The Offeror, Page 109, RFP Statement: 10. Past Performance History-. The Offeror shall provide, at a minimum, the following information as part of its Past Performance Volume to demonstrate the relevance of its recent past performance, and to facilitate the evaluation of Past Performance as a whole and as related to the SEWP VI Contract Requirements.</p> <p>The Offeror shall provide a description of its relevant past performance history in meeting the technical and management requirements identified below (This list shall not be construed as indicating any priority ranking or order of importance)"</p> <p>Question: Can the Government please confirm that offerors may satisfactorily address question 10 (Past Performance History) by providing a table listing all submitted Past Performance Reference contract information and including a description of relevant past performance history in meeting the technical and management requirement for each Past Performance Reference submitted?</p>	<p>The question is unclear. The Offeror should follow the instructions provided in the RFP.</p>
7451	<p>Under section (a) GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS, point number 6 reads: "To determine if an Offeror is responsible in accordance with FAR 9.104-1(a), Offeror is instructed to submit information which demonstrates its financial capability to perform the contract. Acceptable information includes: letters from certified United States banks indicating the available amount of credit for the business and the company's annual report."</p> <p>Question: Could NASA please confirm that submitting only a letter from a certified United States banks indicating the available amount of credit for the business is sufficient information?</p>	<p>Any information that demonstrates the Offeror's financial capability to perform the contract is acceptable.</p>
7452	<p>A.3.6 Proposal Preparation - General Instructions (A) Proposal Format And Organization, Page 96, RFP Statement: "Mission Suitability Volume III</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Technical Approach III-A</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Cover Page & Indices Excluded</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Category A- IT Solutions 15 Pages</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Category B- IT Enterprise-Wide Solutions 15 Pages</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Category C- IT Services 15 Pages</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Management Approach III-B 15 Pages</p> <p>(a) Cover Page, Indices, Exhibit 5 (Proposal C- SCRM Attestation Form) Excluded"</p> <p>Question/Comment: The Proposal Format Table indicates separate Cover Pages and Indices for the Technical Approach and Management approach. Can the Government please confirm that within Volume III there should be a Volume Cover Page, A Cover Page for Subfactor III-A, an Index for Volume III-A, a cover Page for Volume III-B, and an Index for Volume III-B?</p>	<p>The listed cover pages and indices can be included in the Technical Approach file and the Management Approach file. Cover pages and indices are allowed but not required.</p>

7453	<p>A.3.6 Proposal Preparation-General Instructions (A) Proposal Format And Organization, Page 94, RFP Statement: "Examples of how the respective documents within the folder are to be labeled are shown below:</p> <p>GetItDone_Category#-EXHIBIT # GetItDone_Category#-LOA # GetItDone_Category#-PP # GetItDone_Category#-Management Approach GetItDone_Category#-T technical Approach"</p> <p>Question/Comment: The solicitation still indicates naming conventions such as: GetItDone_Category#-LOA # GetItDone_Category#-PP # GetItDone_Category#-Management Approach, which do not seem to be necessary. Question # 5659 in Batch 5 indicated that only Volumes I, II, and III, and any excel exhibits need to be provided with separate naming conventions. Can the Government please re-confirm that this is the case?</p>	<p>The current RFP prevails over old comments and responses. As stated in the current RFP there is no longer a requirement to merge the documents into a single PDF, Each document shall be submitted in a single (i.e. separate) searchable Adobe Portable Document Format (PDF) or Excel file. Each document should be placed in the appropriate folder (Volume I, II or III) following a similar naming convention throughout.</p>
7455	<p>A.4.3 Phase Two-Past Performance, Page 117, RFP Statement: "All past performance references must meet the "recent" and minimum average annual cost/fee expenditures criteria as specified in Section A.3.7.2 to be evaluated."</p> <p>Question: Can the Government please confirm that Past Performance References do not have to be Cost/Fee type contracts?</p>	Confirmed.
7456	<p>A.3.7.3 Mission Suitability Volume (a) Technical Approach (Subfactor A) , Page 112, RFP Statement: "(a) TECHNICAL APPROACH (SUBFACTOR A) For All Categories For points 1 and 2 of this section the Offeror must provide a summary description of their overall technical offerings and general capabilities in accordance with the proposed Category scope (see Attachment A-SEWP Scope, Section A.2. SCOPE). "</p> <p>Question: Can the Government please confirm the number of Technical Areas that need to be addressed in Volume III for each Category and offeror type/size?</p>	Amendment 8 updated the instructions for the Technical Approach to clarify it is based on the offeror's general technical capabilities with regard to the SEWP scope as defined in Attachment A-SEWP Statement of Work Section A.2. SCOPE and Acquisition Objectives and not on the sample Technical Areas.
7457	<p>A.3.7.1 OFFER VOLUME (c) Mandatory Experience/Offerings, Page 101, RFP Statement: "Each REP must be from a separate and distinct contract, task order, or project. A REP must be based on a single specific contract, single award IDIQ contract or blanket purchase agreement, or task order, but may not be based on a multiple award IDIQ contract..."</p> <p>Question/Comment: Other Transaction Agreement (OTA) contracts are performance contracts. Can the Government please confirm that OTAs are acceptable as relevant experience and past performance?</p>	No.
7459	<p>A.3.7.1 OFFER VOLUME (c) Mandatory Experience/Offerings, Page 101, RFP Statement: "Each REP must be from a separate and distinct contract, task order, or project. A REP must be based on a single specific contract, single award IDIQ contract or blanket purchase agreement, or task order, but may not be based on a multiple award IDIQ contract..."</p> <p>Question/Comment: Can the Government please confirm that non-FAR based contracts are acceptable as an REP?</p>	Yes.
7460	<p>If a prime contractor's corporate policy prohibits the completion of Past Performance Questionnaires (PPQs) for subcontractors but instead provides subcontractors with a "Supplier Past Performance Rating" evaluation based on the performance rating criteria outlined in FAR 42.1503 (including Technical [quality of product or service], Cost Control, Schedule/Timeliness, Management or Business Relations, and Other), would the Government accept the Prime Contractor's "Supplier Past Performance Rating" evaluation as a substitute for the SEWP VI-requested PPQ form?</p> <p>If the Government accepts this alternative, please clarify how the document should be submitted to comply with the requirements of the SEWP VI RFP.</p> <p>Reference: Amendment 10, page 111, Section A.3.7.2(b) Prior Customer Evaluations (Past Performance Questionnaires) The offeror shall provide the questionnaire provided as Exhibit 2 to this RFP for each of the above references to establish a record of past performance.</p>	<p>No. The statement "The offeror shall provide the questionnaire provided as Exhibit 2 to this RFP for each of the above references to establish a record of past performance." refers to the Offeror providing Exhibit 2 to their references, not as part of their proposal submission.</p>
7463	<p>A.3.7.2 Past Performance Volume (a) Information From The Offeror, Page 98, RFP Statement: "The Offeror shall complete SF1449 Blocks 12 (if applicable), 17, and 30.."</p> <p>Question/Comment: SF1449 is prefilled with the "Small Business" block checked. Can the Government please confirm that offerors are able to change the checked box to "Unrestricted" if applicable?</p>	No.

7464	<p>A.3.7.2 Past Performance Volume (a) Information From The Offeror, Page 98, RFP Statement: "The Offeror shall complete SF1449 Blocks 12 (if applicable), 17, and 30.."</p> <p>Question/Comment: SF1449 is prefilled with the "Small Business" block checked. Can the Government please confirm that offerors are able to change the checked box to "Unrestricted" if applicable?</p>	No.
7468	A.3.7.1 - Category A - Letter of Authorization - Are offerors who are designated providers and also meet the minimum number of CLINs per technical area, required to provide additional designated providers?	The question is unclear as there are designated providers and additional providers but no additional designated providers. If the offeror is themselves the designated provider for one or more of the four designated technical areas, then different designated providers are needed for the remaining technical areas. The Offeror must also propose an additional provider for each of the four designated areas.
7469	We have an overarching contract with the County under which individual purchase orders are issued. This is not a multiple award IDIQ. Can these purchase orders be treated as separate contracts for past performance (PP) and relevant experience projects (REPs)?	If the purchase orders are separate orders and otherwise meet the past performance requirements, they can be used.
7470	A.3.7.1 - Category A - Letter of Authorization - Are offerors who are designated providers and also meet the minimum number of CLINs per technical area, required to provide Letters of Authorization for other additional designated providers?	The question is unclear as there are designated providers and additional providers. If the offeror is themselves the designated provider for one or more of the four designated technical areas, then an LOA is only needed for the remaining technical areas for which they have a designated provider other than themselves. An LOA is not required for additional providers.
7472	<p>The description for Technical Area 9a states: "These services shall also be included in the other appropriate Technology Areas, (e.g., Server warranty and installation is an integral part of any Server offering in Technical Area 1 above)."</p> <p>When completing exhibit 3a, should ancillary services be listed both under Area 9a and the relevant other technical area (i.e. duplicated) or should they only be listed once under Technical Area 9a?</p>	Only two CLINs should be listed in 9a. Other services can be placed in the designated Technical Area as appropriate.
7473	<p>"A.3.7.2 - (a) INFORMATION FROM THE OFFEROR...For all Offerors - The requirement to provide information on terminated contracts was moved in Amendment 10 to come after the past performance matrix which describes the past performances being submitted. In the Government's response to Q/A question 2320, the government states that ""terminated contracts are intended to be specific to past performance examples being submitted. They should appear in their own separate, dedicated sections within the Past Performance Volume.""</p> <p>Is that the Government's intent? Or must offerors list every contract within the last 3 years that has been terminated for convenience or default or in which the scope has changed as described in the Government's response to Q/A questions 5304 and 2909? "</p>	A stated in the RFP: "In addition to the above, Offerors shall provide the following information for all Offerors contracts in the past three years"
7474	A.1.34 - NORTH AMERICAN INDUSTRY CLASSIFICATION SYSTEM (NAICS) & NAICS CODES WITHIN SCOPE - Can a Government Agency award an order under SEWP VI to a small business who bids products from a large OEM provider in response to a NAICS 541519e small business set aside RFP when such small business is providing less than 15% value added services?	There is no longer a non manufacturer rule waiver in place for NAICS 541519e.
7476	Post award, when task orders are sent to contract holders, will the RFQ indicate which specific parts on the order could be provided by an AbilityOne contractor? If not, what entity will be responsible for ascertaining if individual parts could be supplied by an AbilityOne contractor?	No. The Contract Holder is responsible.
7477	<p>A.3.7.1 - Exhibit 3a - Category A Solutions Spreadsheet - The instructions for the Information Tab states that ""A brief description is to be provided in Column ""D"" for each Technical Area.""</p> <p>Should descriptions be provided for only those Technical Areas that are being proposed by the Offeror?</p>	Yes.
7480	Are AbilityOne commitment letters required from both SourceAmerica and NIB, or only one of these two organizations?	One.
7481	A.3.7.1 - Category A - Letter of Authorization - Are offerors who are designated providers and also meet the minimum number of CLINs per technical area, required to propose one or more additional providers?	Yes.
7482	<p>Regarding Section A.3.6(B)(7), could the Government clarify its methodology for evaluating duplicate content versus similar content? Specifically:</p> <p>When multiple offerors propose solutions using the same OEM products, certain approaches in their proposals could be similar because of the OEM descriptions, specifications, common OEM solutions, and other industry approaches.</p> <p>How will the Government differentiate between legitimately similar content stemming from shared OEM relationships and actual duplicate content that could trigger disqualification?</p>	The duplication statement does not apply to product offerings and their descriptions.
7488	Will the government confirm that Summary Subcontract Reports are not due at the time of proposal submission?	Confirmed.
7489	Will the government confirm that they will be providing a conformed final solicitation package?	No.

7490	Regarding Section A.3.7.1(a)(6), could the Government clarify what is meant by 'the company's annual report'? Since only public companies are typically mandated to publish formal annual reports, would balance sheets, profit/loss statements, and credit letters be acceptable alternatives for privately held companies to demonstrate financial capability?	The references to "letters from certified United States banks" and "annual reports" are example documents that could be used to demonstrate financial capability. Any information that demonstrates the Offeror's financial capability to perform the contract is acceptable.
7491	<p>Question and Answer #1925 describes the process of submitting the technical and management volumes as a single PDF document. However, in those instructions, it still says that Technical and Management should be in their own folders, and then combined. "See text below:</p> <p>"Yes, the documents associated with the Technical Approach should be placed in one folder and the documents associated with the Management Approach should be placed in a separate folder. Each subfactor should have its own unique cover pages, table of contents, list of figures, and list of tables. The two folders should then be combined into a single Volume III PDF File with the exception of Exhibit 5 which must be provided in MS Office Excel format with working cell formulas The Volume III pdf and Exhibit 5 Excel file should then be included in the Proposal zip file."</p> <p>We believe the government intended to say "two volumes" should then be combined into a single PDF file. Will the government confirm that it did not intend to say "two folders should then be combined" and instead meant to say "two volumes should then be combined?"</p>	As stated in the current RFP there is no longer a requirement to merge the documents into a single PDF, Each document shall be submitted in a single (i.e. separate) searchable Adobe Portable Document Format (PDF) or Excel file. Each document should be placed in the appropriate folder (Volume I, II or III).
7492	Will the government provide how long after initial contract award the offeror will have in order to set up and publish the required web portal?	As stated in Attachment A: "The Contractor shall provide these SEWP-specific Web capabilities within one month of contract award."
7494	Comment ID 2594 states that a list of recipients of past performance questionnaires is not included in the page count for Volume II. Offerors should include this information at the beginning of Volume II Past Performance. Follow-On Question: Can the list of recipients be on a separate page after the page limited information so that the 10-page limit of the references is not affected?	Yes, or it can be submitted as a separate PDF.
7495	<p>Comment ID 4676 states, Copies of the Past Performance Questionnaires (PPQs) can be appended to the Past Performance Volume proposal document.</p> <p>Comment ID 4840 question states Do an offeror need to submit the three things together, i.e. narrative on past performances, past performance questionnaires and CPARS for the past performances being submitted? The Government Response states, Yes, the offeror needs to submit the narrative on past performances, past performance questionnaires, and CPARS for the past performances being submitted.</p> <p>Follow-On Question: As these two (2) responses conflict, please confirm that the copies of the submitted PPQs can be included after the page limited information in the Past Performance Volume.</p>	Copies of the submitted PPQs should not be submitted by the Offeror.
7496	Assuming the evaluations for Past Performance, REPs, and ISO certifications are satisfied, if an offeror bidding exclusively for Category C demonstrates experience and capabilities in at least 6 of the 10 required areas or exceeds 25% of the NAICS areas, will they be considered to meet the technical threshold for evaluation under the Mission Suitability Volume?	There is no such formula in the RFP. For the Mission Suitability Volume, the Offeror must respond to all points in the Technical Approach and Management Approach as stated in A.3.7.3 and the responses must provide the Government with satisfactory confidence that the Offeror understands the requirements and demonstrates an ability to be successful in performing the contract with little or no Government intervention.
7497	Comment ID 5199 states, Yes, the past performance section should correlate to the products offered in the CLINs for which OEM LOAs are provided. Further, Comment 3700 states, Past performance needs to match the Mandatory Experience primary and secondary Technical Areas. Follow-On Question: As this is not detailed in the Past Performance requirements of the RFP as of Amendment 10, please provide exact requirements if all 4 LOAs provided need to be represented in the Past Performances provided? For example, if only one past performance is provided that covers the required 3 Technical Areas for small businesses with products/solutions from those areas, do the LOAs provided need to be for the specific OEMs specified in the past performance citation in those Technical Areas? OR, can the OEMs for which we provide LOAs be different from the OEMs in our past performance citations as long as the same Technical Areas are covered? Please detail the requirements of what is and what is not acceptable.	The referenced question and response is no longer valid. The current RFP does not reference LOAs within the Past Performance section.
7498	<p>Regarding Category A CLIN requirements in Section A.3.7.1(c), which specifies minimum CLIN counts (1,000 CLINs for primary Technical Area, 100 CLINs for non-primary Technical Areas, and 50 CLINs from secondary providers):</p> <p>Can an offeror submit more than these minimum required CLINs in their proposal? If additional CLINs beyond these minimums are submitted, will the Government evaluate them as part of the technical evaluation?</p>	Offerors should only submit the minimum required Technical Areas and offerings. As stated in the current RFP: "The information in Exhibit 3a will only be utilized to verify that the requirements above are met for the proposed Technical Areas and for administration purposes to establish the initial Contract Database of Record upon Contract Award. The government will not review or evaluate the pricing, nor the technical capabilities of the offerings beyond validating the requirements in this section."

7500	<p>Comment ID 2487 states.... Yes, if you include a reference to the management section in the Mission Suitability section, those referenced paragraphs will count against the Mission Suitability page count limitation. The document specifies that regardless of where it appears in the proposal, information construed as belonging in a page-limited section of the proposal will be counted against that section's page limit.</p> <p>Follow-On Question 1: Can the offeror reference a section from their Technical Approach in their Management Approach so as to not repeat information in the proposal? For example, reference a Table in the Tech Approach that is applicable to a section in the Management Approach as that information is contained in the same volume.</p> <p>Follow-On Question 2: Will the page space for the Table in the Tech Approach section be counted in the Management Approach, i.e. a 1 page table in Tech Approach referenced in Management approach will also count as 1 page of Management Approach?</p>	Offerors should provide a self-contained Technical Approach and a self-contained Management Approach and should not reference form on to the other. If a reference is made, the page count from the referenced section will be added. Therefore, the answer to Question 2 is yes, it will count as 1 page in both files.
7501	<p>Comment ID 3006 states, Yes, landscape pages count as 2 pages.</p> <p>Follow-On Question: Please confirm that one (1) page portrait or one (1) page landscape counts as only one (1) page as is commonplace. The dimensions are the same.</p>	Confirmed.
7502	In Q&A entry 3962, the government states "We require that Offerors submit with Volume II all formal customer evaluation documents for each of the 3 past performance references the offeror provides." However, a dozen other Q&A responses clearly state that CPARS should not be included in the proposal and PPQs will be sent directly from the customer to SEWP. Please confirm only past performance references should be included in Volume II.	Confirmed.
7503	<p>In Q&A entry 4823, an offeror asked, "Exhibit 1- Relevant Experience Project Table Part II... will NASA allow alternative points of contact to sign/approve Exhibit 1 forms in the event that the CO is no longer available?" The government responded ""Yes.</p> <p>Alternative points of contact can sign/approve Exhibit 1 forms in the event that the original CO is no longer available." There is no place for customer POCs to sign the REP form. Please confirm the customer only needs to type their name to represent their signature.</p>	Confirmed.
7504	In Q&A entries 4238 and 6334, the government says that "Volume III should be delivered as two separate files (III-A and III-B)." But entry 3981 and various other entries state that all PDFs within each volume should be combined into a single PDF. Please confirm the PDFs comprising Vol III should be delivered as separate files while the PDFs for the other volumes should be combined into a single PDF.	The current RFP prevails over old comments and responses. As stated in the current RFP there is no longer a requirement to merge the documents into a single PDF, Each document shall be submitted in a single (i.e. separate) searchable Adobe Portable Document Format (PDF) or Excel file. Each document should be placed in the appropriate folder (Volume I, II or III).
7505	For the AbilityOne Commitment Letter, please confirm that the requirement is met when offerors request the letter from primecontractor@abilityone.org and then execute/sign the provided letter with either SourceAmerica or NIB.	Yes.
7507	Amendment 10 states, "Please note the due date of the solicitation is extended to 1pm EST on February 17th, 2025." However, February 17, 2025 is a Federal holiday-- Washington's Birthday (Presidents' Day). Can the Government move the due date for the solicitation to February 18, 2025?	Updates to the due date will be announced in sam.gov.
7508	<p>The RFP language in Section A.3.7.1(c) only specifies that 'Offerors shall only submit the total number of REPs as required for the proposed category and business size standard' but does not mention socioeconomic status.</p> <p>For an 8(a) contractor planning to compete under small business category and task orders, should the REP/Past Performance submission requirements follow those specified for general small business, without consideration of socioeconomic status (e.g., 8(a)) or should we just satisfy 8(a) requirements only?</p>	8(a) requirements only.
7509	The timing of the question period does not seem to allow potential SEWP vendors much time to digest the latest amendment and Q&A batches published just days before the question period opened, and the sudden announcement so shortly before the Christmas holidays no doubt meant that many companies did not have their full proposal staff in place to respond due to holiday time off. We humbly request an additional Q&A period to be held sometime in early January.	No further Q and A time slots are anticipated. Over 1000 questions were submitted and the final RFP amendment will be updated, as needed.
7510	It is acceptable for Column E in Exhibit 3a to indicate if a product is TAA compliant with "TAA:Yes" if this is already part of the product description?	There is no need to identify TAA compliance in Exhibit 3.
7511	In the Mission Suitability Volume, Technical Approach section, is there a recommended format to respond to the question about meeting Acquisition Objectives requirements?	No.
7512	Please confirm that Arial Narrow is allowed, as it is neither an Expanded nor Condensed font.	Any font is allowed as long as the resulting text size is not smaller than 12 (or 10 as appropriate)-point type Times New Roman font.

7513	<p>Section A.3.6(B)(7) page 97 Only one proposal per scope category will be accepted per offeror. An Offeror can propose as the prime contractor one time per category and can propose one additional time as a member of a joint venture (JV) or Contractor Team Arrangement (CTA) in that same category. A firm cannot propose as a member of a JV or CTA for a category and also simultaneously propose for the same category as a member of a different JV or CTA.</p> <p>By the definition of FAR 9.601, a CTA can be a Prime/Subcontractor relationship. Is there a limit to the number of proposals a subcontractor can participate on?</p> <p>If not a Prime Offeror, is there a limit on the number of proposals a subcontractor can support?</p>	<p>A Prime Offeror can also be a subcontractor for one Past Performance and/or REP reference, assuming all requirements are met as stated in the RFP, in a Category. They can also be a subcontractor to as many other Offerors as long as they are not used as a Past Performance or REP reference.</p>
7518	<p>A.3.7.1(a)(6) Page 100</p> <p>Offeror is instructed to submit information which demonstrates its financial capability to perform the contract</p> <p>Acceptable information includes:</p> <p>Letters from certified United States banks indicating the available amount of credit for the business and the company's annual report.</p> <p>If a teaming arrangement, joint venture, or other business combination is contemplated, disclose each participant's responsibility for the financial management of the venture, funding requirements, limitation of liabilities, and any other information which describes the financial arrangement</p> <p>Annual reports are typically only for publicly traded companies - what are the small businesses and private companies to submit?</p> <p>With respect to teaming partners, will the Government permit them to submit financial information confidentially - independently of the Prime Offeror's proposal submission?</p> <p>Will the Government allow password protected annual or other type of financial information?</p>	<p>The references to "letters from certified United States banks" and "annual reports" are example documents that could be used to demonstrate financial capability. Any information that demonstrates the Offeror's financial capability to perform the contract is acceptable. Teaming partners are not required to submit financial information beyond disclosing information concerning the financial arrangement. The Government is not able to accept password protected files.</p>
7520	<p>A.4.4(b) Page 121</p> <p>The Government will evaluate the Offeror's understanding and demonstration of their ability to successfully perform the management requirements as specified in Section A.3.7.3(b)(1)(iii-v), A.3.7.3(b)(2), A.3.7.3(b)(3), and A.3.7.3(b)(4)(i-vii).</p> <p>Please clarify evaluation</p> <p>Section A.3.7.3(b)(4)(i-vii) has been changed to A.3.7.3(b)(3)(i-iii)</p> <p>Remove referenced to Section A.3.7.3(b)(4) entirely</p>	<p>The reference has been corrected in Amendment 10.</p>
7522	<p>Multiple Q&A Responses referred to the need to submit a MRCL in support of a Prime/Sub FAR 9.601(2) Teaming Arrangement</p> <p>This is inconsistent with A.3.5 page 92, Request the Government confirm that Prime/Subcontractors can share resources without a MRCL</p> <p>Please clarify if Prime Offeror's using a Subcontractor for Mandatory Experience or Past Performance needs to submit a MRCL</p>	<p>The circumstances in which an MRCL letter is required is described in A.3.7.1(a)(4). If the relationship does not meet the requirements stated in the current RFP, an MRCL is not needed.</p>
7524	<p>Will task orders be limited to the NAICS code within each Category, not the entire Category? E.g., within Category C, will task orders be limited to certain NAICS codes? Or, will all Category C awardees get to receive/respond/compete on all task orders?</p>	<p>The question is unclear. However, note that all Contract holders within that RFQ's category that meet the NAICS code and set-aside (or unrestricted) status and any other requirements of an Issuing Agency will be eligible to see the Issuing Agency's RFQ.</p>
7526	<p>Are we allowed to delete worksheets for category A and B, while submitting Exhibit 4 for category C?</p>	<p>No.</p>
7527	<p>Exhibit 4, are we allowed to select NAICS codes that are not on our SAM.com record?</p>	<p>No.</p>
7528	<p>The response to question 3242 on December 15, 2024, states that the 2% goal is not a mandatory minimum requirement but a target goal. What is the difference between being mandatory and a target goal?</p>	<p>A target goal is a goal the Offeror should strive to reach and document in their AbilityOne reports the steps being taken to do so.</p>
7529	<p>Q&A indicates that Volume 1 should be single PDF searchable document. We plan to import signed SF forms, AbilityOne commitment letter as JPEG files into the pdf version of Volume 1. Is this allowed?</p>	<p>The current RFP prevails over old comments and responses. As stated in the current RFP there is no longer a requirement to merge the documents into a single PDF. Each document shall be submitted in a single searchable Adobe Portable Document Format (PDF) file. Each document should be placed in the appropriate folder (Volume I, II or III).</p>
7530	<p>Batch 6, question 2760. JPEG image of pdf files will not be searchable. Please confirm this is accepted?</p>	<p>The PDF should be provided in a searchable format. If an element in the PDF is inherently not itself searchable, such as a JPEG image file, than it cannot be made searchable and is still valid to submit within the searchable file.</p>
7531	<p>For Exhibit 2 Past Performance our State and Local contract does not include NAICS code in the award document. Are we allowed to use this as a Past Performance?</p>	<p>Amendment 8 clarified that if a NAICS code of a referenced contract or award, does not exist or match the NAICS code being used for competition then the Offeror should describe how the work relates to the NAICS code being used for competition.</p>

7532	A.1.35 states, "Contract holders shall allocate a target goal of at least 2% of the overall contract value to AbilityOne subcontractors. If Ability One subcontractor is unable to perform the work, the contractor may utilize their own subcontractors or perform the work as the prime." What are the standards or guidelines (reasons) that determine an AbilityOne subcontractor is unable to perform the work, thus allowing the prime to self perform? (i.e., pricing, inability to provide labor services).	The determination is made by the Contract Holder. The Contract holder should strive to reach and document in their AbilityOne reports the steps being taken reach the AbilityOne goal.
7534	Solicitation 80TECH24R0001, Section I includes a detailed "order of precedence," so potential awardees may understand the terms and conditions of the contract. Will the Government provide a similar order of precedence for the complete solicitation and the batches of Q&A, since there are conflicting responses within individual batches of Q&A, across batches of Q&A, and between Q&A batches and the latest amended Solicitation? For example, does a answer posted in Batch 7 Q&A that has a later time stamp than another Batch 7 response with an earlier time stamp take precedence? Similarly, if an answer is different than the solicitation, does the solicitation take precedence?	The final RFP and exhibits will constitute the definitive document Offerors should respond to.
7536	In Block 10 of the SF1449, can the Government clarify if the inclusion of pre-existing information – "Small business and 50% set-aside" – was intentional for Category B?	Yes.
7537	Do all NAICS claimed in Exhibit 4 have to match our SAM profile since NAICS are assigned at the task order level?	Yes.
7538	Comment: Among the thousands of questions answered there are multiple instances where answers contradict each other, and answers are not clearly reflected in the current version of the RFP. Question: Will the government please provide an updated conformed copy of the RFP that accurately addresses all inconsistencies in the QA so that offerors have a clear single version and understanding of the governments' requirements upon which to base a compliant proposal?	The final RFP and exhibits will constitute the definitive document Offerors should respond to.
7539	Can the Government clarify if it is their intention for vendors to take all Exhibits that are in excel form and PDF them before submission? If so, can the Government advise on the purpose of certain Exhibits that were previously PDFs (e.g., Exhibit 5) being converted to in excel format in the latest amendments?	No. Offerors should follow the proposal format instructions in the current RFP which clearly states: "Exhibits: 3a, 4, and 5 must be provided in MS Office Excel format".
7543	With regard to the AbilityOne formal agreement, after signing the agreement with SourceAmerica or NIB, SEWP offerors are given a further opportunity by SourceAmerica/NIB to sign partnering agreements with specific, individual SourceAmerica/NIB vendor companies. Please confirm that the letter agreement with SourceAmerica or NIB is sufficient for the proposal and that further agreements with individual SourceAmerica or NIB vendor companies are not required.	Confirmed
7544	The response to Comment ID 3340 was not consistent with other responses. The question asked for a confirmation as to whether a separate zip folder be submitted for each volume. The response was in the affirmative - a separate zip folder is required for each volume of a single response. However responses to other questions state that the volumes should be in a single zip file. Can NASA please clarify the submission requirements?	The current RFP prevails over old comments and responses. Offerors should follow the directions provided in the RFP Amendment 10. The only zip file requirement is "Electronic files of Volumes I, II, and III, shall be in separate folders in 1 zip file."
7550	Amendment 10, RFP, Section A.3.7.1(c) Category B and C, pages 103 to 105, details the minimum values a company must meet for Mandatory Experience Offerings, while page 107 outlines the minimum values required for Past Performance. The Mandatory Experience Offerings require companies to meet a total value size of a single order or contract, while Past Performance requires an average annual cost/fee incurred. It is unclear why these minimum values differ between the two sections. Question: Would the Government consider updating the solicitation to standardize the minimum values for both experience and past performance, ensuring consistency in categories, types of values requested, and thresholds across both sections?	No.
7551	A.3.7.1 OFFER VOLUME, (a),6,In reference to, "To determine if an Offeror is responsible in accordance with FAR 9.104-1(a), Offeror is instructed to submit information which demonstrates its financial capability to perform the contract. Acceptable information includes: letters from certified United States banks indicating the available amount of credit for the business and the company's annual report." Is there a minimum credit amount required from the bank to the business to be compliant?	No.
7552	Please provide the date or timeframe for when the Government will post a complete conformed RFP with all correct and updated attachments.	A final amendment will be posted shortly.
7554	Amendment 10, RFP, Section A.3.7.1(a).6, page 100, requests offerors to provide information to determine if the Offeror is responsible in accordance with FAR 9.104-1(a), including a certified letter and annual report. However, annual reports are typically filed only by publicly traded companies. Question: Would the Government consider revising the requirement to state, "...annual report, if a publicly traded company"?	The references to "letters from certified United States banks" and "annual reports" are example documents that could be used to demonstrate financial capability. Any information that demonstrates the Offeror's financial capability to perform the contract is acceptable.

7556	The solicitation states, "it is acceptable to provide proof that the certification approval is in process by providing the Point of Contact information including the name of appraisal body and name, phone number, and email of a representative from whom the Offeror is obtaining the verification." With respect to the "appraisal body", there is some question as to what is acceptable in the case of the ISO-9001. The International Organization for Standardization (ISO) develops and publishes the ISO 9001 standard but does not participate in audits or certifications. Certification Bodies (CBs), also called ISO Registrars, are accredited entities that audit a company's Quality Management System (QMS) and issue ISO 9001 certifications. Accreditation Bodies (ABs) evaluate and accredit Certification Bodies to ensure their competence and compliance with international standards. The International Accreditation Forum (IAF) oversees and ensures global consistency among Accreditation Bodies, fostering mutual recognition of certifications. ISO Consultancy or Preparation Companies are entities that assist organizations in implementing ISO 9001 requirements, providing guidance, training, and mock audits to prepare for certification. Please confirm that name, phone number, and email address a Point of Contact in the ISO Consultancy or Preparation Companies which the offeror engaged with to go through the ISO certification and audit process will be sufficient for the proposal.	Confirmed.
7557	A.3.7.2 states "an Offeror that has relevant past performance but fails to provide the minimum requirements of the past performance volume will result in the contractor being excluded from competition." Does recency apply or only relevance?	Both.
7562	The solicitation does not explain why an offeror must select a primary NAICS code. Specifically, it is unclear how the primary NAICS impacts access to task orders under other NAICS codes within the same category, as well as determining the subcontractor size status for compliance. Question: Could the Government clarify the purpose of selecting a primary NAICS code, its impact on accessing task orders under other NAICS codes in the same category, and whether the primary NAICS determines a subcontractor's size status?	The selection of a primary NAICS code is used for the REP and Past Performance requirements of the proposal and will be the Contract level NAICS code. It does not impact accessing task orders under other NAICS codes in the same category. It does determine the subcontractor's business size if the subcontractor is used to meet the REP or Past Performance requirements.
7563	Referencing Section A.3.7.3, the Letter of Authorization (LOA) requirements, and the answers related to LOA submission. The answers to question 511 and 857 state that, "While the exact wording and format of the LOA can vary, the Point of Contact (POC) signing the LOA must include the name of the offeror; a reference to SEWP VI and the POC's position in the company." For most experienced Category A Offerors, with existing relationships with OEMs, their LOAs do not include specific customer identification but represent blanket authorization to sell the OEM's products. The SEWP 6 Solicitation's requirement that submitted letters specifically include a reference to the SEWP VI contract will require offerors to request revised LOAs specifically for this contract. This places an undue burden on small businesses, requiring them to request revised LOAs from each of the OEMs they represent when existing LOAs authorize offerors to sell the OEMs products to any and all customers. We ask that the government remove the "a reference to SEWP VI" language from the solicitation.	The RFP will remain as stated and only applies to the four primary providers.
7564	The solicitation does not explain whether a subcontractor can contribute a REP or past performance for the proposal if they are classified as small under the primary NAICS code but large in several other NAICS listed for the Category they are bidding in Exhibit 4+NAICS+Size+Standard++Crosswalk+Amendment+9+11.21.24. Question: Can the Government clarify if a subcontractor's size status on Exhibit 4 NAICS affects an offeror's compliance or future access to task orders, particularly if the subcontractor is small under only one NAICS code?	Subcontractor's size status should not be included in Exhibit 4.
7565	Each REP must address a single technical area according to the solicitation instructions, which imposes unnecessary constraints on Offerors. Question: Would the Government consider revising the requirement allowing Offerors to demonstrate capabilities and experience in multiple technical areas within a single REP?	The minimum requirement is met by addressing a single technical area within an REP. Referencing other technical areas beyond the minimum serves no purpose since the minimum will have been met.
7566	Due to the extended time frame for the SEWP VI solicitation and in recognition that many offerors sent Past Performance Questionnaires to their customers more than 6 months ago, will the government please provide an accounting of the number of PPQs they have received for each offeror?	No.
7567	Page 108 of the RFP states, "The offeror shall structure the Mission Suitability Proposal with multiple sections distinguishing the subfactors." The subfactors are A: TECHNICAL APPROACH and B: MANAGEMENT APPROACH. This instruction indicates one volume, with multiple sections. However, in Q&A Batch 2, page 75, answer to comment ID 2793 states, "the Technical and Management Approach sections are required to have their own file within the Offeror's category#_VolumeIII zip file." These two instructions contradict each other. Can NASA please clarify: Should the Mission Suitability Proposal be a single, 30 page submission file? Or should it be two, 15 page submission files, broken into factor A: Technical Approach and factor B: Management Approach?	There should be two files - a 15 page file for the Technical Approach and a 15 page file for the Management Approach.

7568	<p>We have seen many Q&A line items regarding PPQs vs CPARS. Based on the review of all the Q&As we thought the issue of submitting CPARS instead of the PPQ was addressed through your Q&A posted on 10/28/24 (Batch 2) line item 2466 and 11/07/24 (Batch 3) line items 1761, 3067, & 4283, but with the recent 12/16/24 Q&A release we find ourselves in a quandary. The contract we are using for Past Performance meets all the requirements on SEWP VI, the client has declined to provide the PPQ since the COR went on a medical leave and shortly there after retired and is not available. The office is indicating that, since a CPARS have already been completed and issued and given the fact that the retired COR is the only person who has knowledge of the work that we performed, that COR is the only one could fill and sign the PPQ but other individuals are not knowledgeable nor qualified to complete the PPQ. As noted there are many questions that have been submitted but in this instance where a COR is no longer a federal employee and others in the office do not have knowledge of our performance other than what has been stated in the CPARS, we would like to request that under this circumstance and exception be made.</p>	No exception will be made.
7569	<p>In the Proposal Submission Table on page 94 for Volume II (b), the Cover Page, Indices, Customer Evaluations, Exhibits, and Termination/Descope Information are excluded from the page counts. Additionally, Volume III-A and Volume III-B in the same table excludes the Cover Page and Indices. However, the Government addresses pages not counted in the page count as the Table of Contents, Table of Figures, and/or Table of Tables (no reference to 'indices') in the narrative in A.3.6(A)(2) on page 93 of the RFP. Table of Contents is also addressed in A.3.6(A)(4) on page 94. This inconsistency of the terms in the Proposal Submission Table and the narrative is confusing, and we are not sure if we are supposed to add a Table of Contents and Indices for each Volume or just a Table of Contents, Table of Figures, and/or Table of Tables. Question: Does the Government require Table of Contents, Table of Figures/Table of Tables in the Proposal Submission Table on page, rather than 'Indices'? Question: Could the Government confirm 'indices' is not a requirement for Volumes II and III based on the answer for question 5617, Batch 4?</p>	The Offeror is not required to provide any of the tables or indices noted in this comment. If and when they are included is up to the Offeror.
7571	<p>Question: The instructions continue to address providing completed and signed SF 1449's, but do we also have to add signed SF 30's to Volume I? If so, where do we put the SF30's within Volume I?</p>	Each document being submitted should be placed in a separate PDF in the appropriate Volume folder.
7573	<p>Can the government please clarify and confirm that copies of Teaming Agreements are only required to be included with the proposal if the Prime is using subcontractor past performance or REPs to qualify?</p>	Yes.
7574	<p>Batch 4, Q&A 2350 states, "For example the three past performance references for a small business must include relevancy to at least two different content areas. (revised response)." and Q&A 3296 also references small business must showcase 2 different content representative areas. Additionally, Q&A 3425 addresses covering at least four (4) content representative areas without identifying for small or other than small business. Finally, Q&A 3859 states, "For example, if proposing in Small Business in Category A, the references collectively should present at least 3 content areas." Finally, Amendment 10 RFQ, A.3.7.2 (a) (10), Past Performance History, however, the RFQ states, "Offerors identified as a Small Business in Category A shall provide past performance references, showcasing technology solutions for at least three (3) content representative areas for content to be rated relevant." Batch 4 of the Question and Answers seems to have conflicting answers for the number of content areas covered for small businesses. Question: Could the Government confirm the Government requires Small Businesses in Category A must collectively technology solutions for at least three (3) content representative areas as Amendment 8 requires?</p>	Confirmed.
7576	<p>Q&A 6062 in Batch 4 states, "The Offeror should use all three past performance references to cover the required four content areas." Also, Q&A 6163 in Batch 4 states, "The requirement is to show relevance in the content areas in total of all the past performance projects included in the response." Question: Could the Government confirm that the three past performance references combined have to cover at least three content areas for a small business. In other words, the Government does not require each past performance reference to cover at least three content areas, correct?</p>	Correct.
7577	<p>Do copies of Teaming Agreements need to be provided if the Prime references subcontractor past performance in it's technical approach but is not using subcontractor past performance in Volumes 1 or 2?</p>	No.
7579	<p>The answer for question 6396 in Batch 2 states, "If any certification, such as the OTTPS Certification, is included in the Management Approach Volume, it will be counted within the 15 page count." Question: Would Exhibit 5, C-SCRM Attestation Form, which is three-pages in length, count against the 15-page count for the Management Approach?</p>	No. That exhibit should be submitted as a separate file. If the OTTP-S certificate is being provided as an alternative to Exhibit 5, it should be submitted as a separate PDF file. It will only be counted in the page count if is included in the Management Approach file.

7581	<p>We have seen many Q&A line items regarding PPQs vs CPARS. Based on the review of all the Q&As we thought the issue of submitting CPARS instead of the PPQ was addressed through your Q&A posted on 10/28/24 (Batch 2) line item 2466 and 11/07/24 (Batch 3) line items 1761, 3067, & 4283, but with the recent 12/16/24 Q&A release we find ourselves in a quandary. The contract we are using for Past Performance meets all the requirements on SEWP VI, the client has declined to provide the PPQ since the COR went on a medical leave and shortly there after retired and is not available. The office is indicating that, since a CPARS have already been completed and issued and given the fact that the retired COR is the only person who has knowledge of the work that we performed, that COR is the only one could fill and sign the PPQ but other individuals are not knowledgeable nor qualified to complete the PPQ. As noted there are many questions that have been submitted but in this instance where a COR is no longer a federal employee and others in the office do not have knowledge of our performance other than what has been stated in the CPARS, we would like to request that under this circumstance and exception be made.</p>	No exception will be made.
7582	<p>The answer to question 2195 in Batch 2 states, "As specified in Section A.3.6(A)(3)-Spreadsheets shall also be converted to PDF, in the most readable manner practicable, and submitted as part of a single PDF file." Additionally, the answer to question 2540 in Batch 2 states, "No. Offerors should not adjust the font type or size on Exhibit 4. Offerors should utilize the government-provided templates." In order to display tabs/fields correctly in a PDF of a spreadsheet, we may have to expand columns or other changes. Questions: Is it permissible for offerors to expand columns or make changes to Excel spreadsheet (e.g., Exhibit 3a and Exhibit 4) to create a PDF of the spreadsheet that is readable? Do we still have to submit a PDF version of the Excel spreadsheet or just provide the Excel spreadsheet for Exhibits 3a and 4?</p>	The referenced comment is out of date. The current RFP states " Exhibits: 3a, 4, and 5 must be provided in MS Office Excel format with working cell formulas."
7583	<p>When will the Government reissue a consolidated solicitation that contains the full RFP, all relevant documents, and revised forms so that offerors can be sure they are providing the Government with the proper submission materials?</p>	A final amendment will be released as soon as possible,
7584	<p>The answer to question 5646 in Batch 2 states, "Offerors must provide AbilityOne subcontractors with first preference for all task orders, even smaller task orders that do not require subcontractor support and could be performed 100% in-house by the prime. The prime may only perform the work themselves if the AbilityOne subcontractor is unable to perform the work." Question: Under Category A, would a small business awardee have to use AbilityOne for transaction that do not require services?.</p>	The use of AbilityOne contractors is based on the identified NAICS codes in section A.1.34.
7585	<p>Question: Is there a general overall requirement to use AbilityOne for 2% of all TOs awarded to a contractor under this contract, or is the requirement to use AbilityOne as a subcontractor with a work share of 2% only on Task Orders with NAICS Codes listed in A.1.34 with asterisks (i.e., NAICS 334112, 518210, and 541519) for Category A?</p>	The goal is related to Task Orders with NAICS Codes listed in A.1.34 with asterisks.
7586	<p>The answer to question 6413 in Batch 4 states, "The RFP requires the completion of the full Representations and Certifications as part of the proposal submission. This includes all necessary fill-ins and acknowledgements as specified in the solicitation." Question: If a bidder has updated representations and certifications in SAM.gov, does the bidder still have to complete and provide the full Representations and Certifications (not the 1440s or SF 30s) in Volume I or could we just add a statement saying our Representations and Certifications in SAM.gov are all up to date? If we have to submit the full Representations and Certifications, do we have to continue filling out and acknowledge anything past Part B?</p>	Offerors should follow the current RFP instructions as stated in Section V.
7588	<p>The Government introduced a drastic change of direction in Amendment 8 for Mission Suitability requirements. This shifted the focus from sample technical areas to mission objectives, driving significant changes in offerors approach to the outline of information and details for the Mission Suitability section. This change disregarded the significant effort already invested by Offerors and lacked sufficient explanation or justification. This requirement does not appear to align with the intent of demonstrating comprehensive mission suitability to perform under the category scope. Question: Would the Government reconsider the changes to Mission Suitability requirements and provide Offerors with more specific instructions, identifying exactly what should be provided for the Mission Suitability section for ease of proposal preparation?</p>	The current RFP will remain as stated.
7589	<p>The ongoing amendments, contradictory guidance, and unclear requirements have led to significant wasted effort and costs for many Offerors. The current solicitation process does not respect the time and resources invested by the industry. Question: Would the Government provide a completely updated version of the solicitation incorporating all Q&A, rectifying all contradictions within the answers and clear guidance on how to prepare the final submission files, along with an extended timeline, to accommodate the numerous clarifications and revisions?</p>	A final amendment will be released as soon as possible.

7590	<p>REPLACEMENT FOR ORIGINAL QUESTION #7556: The solicitation states, "it is acceptable to provide proof that the certification approval is in process by providing the Point of Contact information including the name of appraisal body and name, phone number, and email of a representative from whom the Offeror is obtaining the verification."</p> <p>With respect to the "appraisal body", there is some question as to what is acceptable in the case of the ISO 9001. The International Organization for Standardization (ISO) develops and publishes the ISO 9001 standard but does not participate in audits or certifications. Certification Bodies (CBs), also called ISO Registrars, are accredited entities that audit a company's Quality Management System (QMS) and issue ISO 9001 certifications. Accreditation Bodies (ABs) evaluate and accredit CBs to ensure their competence and compliance with international standards. The International Accreditation Forum (IAF) oversees and ensures global consistency among Accreditation Bodies, fostering mutual recognition of certifications. ISO Consultancy or Preparation companies are entities that assist organizations, such as the SEWP offerors, in implementing ISO 9001 requirements, providing guidance, training, and mock audits to prepare for certification. Please confirm that a name, phone number, and email address of a Point of Contact in the ISO Consultancy or Preparation Company which the offeror engaged with to go through the ISO certification and audit process, will be sufficient for the proposal. If this is not the case, then please clarify "appraisal body" in the solicitation using the official ISO terminology above.</p>	Yes.
7591	<p>The solicitation states, "it is acceptable to provide proof that the certification approval is in process by providing the Point of Contact information including the name of appraisal body and name, phone number, and email of a representative from whom the Offeror is obtaining the verification." With respect to the "appraisal body", there is some question as to what is acceptable in the case of the CMMI. The CMMI Institute, now part of ISACA, develops and governs the CMMI models and accredits organizations and individuals to conduct appraisals. CMMI Partner Organizations are officially accredited entities that employ Certified CMMI Lead Appraisers, who lead and conduct formal appraisals to evaluate a company's processes against CMMI Level 2 standards. ISO or Process Consultancy/Preparation companies assist organizations in implementing CMMI-compliant processes, conducting gap analyses, and preparing for the appraisal through mock assessments and process training. Please confirm that a name, phone number, and email address of a Point of Contact in the ISO or Process Consultancy/Preparation company which the offeror engaged with to go through the CMMI appraisal process, will be sufficient for the proposal. If this is not the case, then please clarify "appraisal body" in the solicitation using the official CMMI terminology above.</p>	Yes.
7595	<p>The solicitation states, "it is acceptable to provide proof that the certification approval is in process by providing the Point of Contact information including the name of appraisal body and name, phone number, and email of a representative from whom the Offeror is obtaining the verification." With respect to the name, phone number, and email of a representative, please confirm that not only is a copy of a letter from such a representative not being sought by the Government in addition to this contact information, but if offerors do include a copy of such a letter in their proposals, it will be considered within the page limitations and non-compliant.</p>	There is no requirement for a letter. The only requirement is for the stated POC information. That information should be provided in a PDF file clearly identified as the POC information for the certification.
7597	<p>Amendment 9 stated that Exhibit 3b included in Amendment 8 would no longer be required. Can NASA provide an estimated timeline with calendar dates for when pricing will be required during the Technology Refreshment phase of NASA SEWP VI?</p>	The timeline is up to the Contract Holder. Line Items, including pricing and all other relevant information, will need to be added via the Technology Refreshment process prior to submitting a quote in response to a customer requirement. The Technology Refreshment process is on-going beginning with the Contract start date.
7598	<p>If a offeror is awarded a contract in certain setaside categories but not others, please confirm that they can compete in additional setaside categories after award of SEWP if later the SBA certifies them for those additional categories. For example, if a company that is not a HUBZone company is awarded a SEWP master contract, and then after the award of the SEWP master contracts, that company becomes SBA-certified as a HUBZone company, then please confirm that company can notify the SEWP program office and be added to the list of companies that can compete for HUBZone setasides under SEWP.</p>	Yes, a process will be provided post-award to update the Offeror's NAICs code and business size.
7599	<p>In some of the batches of previously released questions and answers, particularly batches 2 - 4, there are multiple questions that were answered with answers that contradicted each other and/or did not match what is in the RFP. Can the government please confirm that the final amended RFP takes precedence over any answered Q&As? Meaning, if something is not stated as being required in the RFP, but there is an answer on the Q&A that states it is required, or vice versa, are we to disregard the Q&A answer and use the final RFP as our guide for what is required and not required?</p>	Yes. The final amended RFP takes precedence over any answered Q&As.
7601	<p>Would the Government consider GSA for 527 acceptable to demonstrate the Offeror's financial capacity?</p>	Any information that demonstrates the Offeror's financial capability to perform the contract is acceptable.

7602	The Solicitation and the panelists at the virtual industry day in November 2024 emphasize that content representative areas are ONLY examples. Generally, Amendments 8 and 10 include significantly reduced requirements and evaluation thresholds to underscore this. The solicitation now references "core" capabilities related to the Category scope. Program / project management and product based services continue to be excluded from the list. If there is some expectation that a Protege demonstrate capabilities / experience because they will be required to perform a specified percentage of the work and manage the program contract, why do "content representative areas" and mandatory experience areas exclude capabilities and experience in management, especially since Volume III-B is dedicated to this and represents 1/2 of 1/3 of the proposal?	The Government has determined that task areas 9a, 11b and 11c are not appropriate for meeting the REP and past Performance requirements.
7603	Would be can a vendor bid both as a prime and a sub? Or can multiple vendors participate on multiple teams either as a prime or subcontractor?	Yes as long as they are not utilized to meet REPs or past performance requirements.
7604	Can the government clarify how many past performances (REPs and PPQs) are required from Other than Small Business Prime offerors? Page 106 requires three projects while page 110 requires four projects.	One to Three projects are required covering 4 content representative areas.
7606	Do we need to consider the technical sub-areas - 1a-9a, 1b-10b, and 1c-10c - mentioned in each category while writing the technical response in volume III? As the language mentioned in the technical response requirements wants us to write to the scope given in Attachment A only and not to the sub-areas mentioned in "A.1.2 GSFC 52.211-91 SCOPE OF WORK (FEB 2016)", is that true or not? Please clarify.	Amendment 8 updated the instructions for the Technical Approach to clarify it is based on the offeror's general technical capabilities with regard to the SEWP scope and Acquisition Objectives and not on the sample Technical Areas.
7607	Please confirm that MRCLs are only required when resources/certs/projects are being shared between parent companies/affiliates/divisions/subsidiaries and they are NOT required in an instance where a SB prime is utilizing subcontractor past performance in its proposal. Previous amendments removed the requirement that MRCLs be provided for subcontractors but some answers in the Q&As have made this unclear, for example question 6524 says that MRCLs are still required in the scenario where a subcontractor provides its past performance to a SB prime for qualification purposes.	The current RFP takes precedence over past comments. In the current RFP MRCLs are not required in an instance where a SB prime is utilizing subcontractor past performance in its proposal.
7608	Can the Government please update the criteria for Subfactor B Management approach, specifically requirements specified in section A.3.7.3 (b) (1)(iii-vi), A.3.7.3 (b)(2), A.3.3.(b)(3)(i-iii)	The comment is unclear. A.4.4. in the RFP correctly references the requirements in A.3.7.3.
7609	The Government has published several amendments and various batches of clarifications to bidder's questions since the original release of the solicitation. Once the Government completes all updates to the solicitation, will you please issue a "final and conformed" solicitation packet that incorporates all updates and responses to questions?	A final RFP and associated exhibits and attachments will be provided.
7611	NAICs code 513210 - Software publishers, includes a reference to "Footnote - 15", however, we do not see a "Footnote - 15" in the RFP, only a footnote - 18. Can the government please clarify what is meant by "Footnote - 15" here? Where can we find that footnote?	The reference is to the SBA non manufacturer rule waiver under NAICs 513210 footnote 15.
7612	Please distinguish between (1) the Section A.1.2 GSFC 52.211-91 SCOPE OF WORK (FEB 2016) in the SEWP RFP (pp. 24-38) and (2) Attachment A SEWP Statement of Work. Which of these should the Technical Approach Subfactor A be written for?	As stated in the current RFP: "in accordance with the proposed Category scope (see Attachment A-SEWP Statement of Work Section A.2. SCOPE)."
7615	A.3.7.1 OFFER VOLUME, (a),6,In reference to, "To determine if an Offeror is responsible in accordance with FAR 9.104-1(a), Offeror is instructed to submit information which demonstrates its financial capability to perform the contract. Acceptable information includes: letters from certified United States banks indicating the available amount of credit for the business and the company's annual report." Will the cash balance verification letter from the US bank suffice the requirement in lieu of line of credit letter?	The references to "letters from certified United States banks" and "annual reports" are example documents that could be used to demonstrate financial capability. Any information that demonstrates the Offeror's financial capability to perform the contract is acceptable.
7616	The solicitation states, "The offeror shall describe the technical scalability and extensibility of the offeror's products, solutions and/or services that demonstrates their ability to fulfill a range of ITC/AV Solutions and/or Services requirements centered on the Offeror's core technical capabilities within the breadth of the given Category scope." In the context of the offeror's description of technical scalability and extensibility, does the Government mean to include all technical areas within each category that the offerors must speak to? (i.e., Technical areas 1a - 9a, 1b - 11b, and 1c - 11c)	Amendment 8 updated the instructions for the Technical Approach to clarify it is based on the offeror's general technical capabilities with regard to the SEWP scope and Acquisition Objectives and not on the sample Technical Areas.
7617	REPLACEMENT OF QUESTION #7616: Original Question #7616 - (Dec 20,24 02:05 PM EST) - The solicitation states, "The offeror shall describe the technical scalability and extensibility of the offeror's products, solutions and/or services that demonstrates their ability to fulfill a range of ITC/AV Solutions and/or Services requirements centered on the Offeror's core technical capabilities within the breadth of the given Category scope." In the context of the offeror's description of technical scalability and extensibility, does the Government mean to include all the technical areas that fall within a given category that the offerors must speak to in their proposal for that given category? (i.e., Technical areas 1a - 9a, 1b - 11b, and 1c - 11c)	Amendment 8 updated the instructions for the Technical Approach to clarify it is based on the offeror's general technical capabilities with regard to the SEWP scope and Acquisition Objectives and not on the sample Technical Areas.
7618	Many of the responses to the thousands of questions provided to date are in direct conflict, either with one another or with the RFP instructions. This introduces risk of offeror non-compliance as an offeror may incorrectly interpret the instructions. To remove this risk, please confirm that the Government will be evaluating proposals for compliance solely against the instructions provided within the RFP and not against instructions provided within the Q&A.	Confirmed.

7619	The solicitation states, "The principal support office under the contract shall be named and described." What does the Government mean by principal support office in the context of this question?	The Offeror's principal office associated with the Offeror's Program Office for support of the SEWP VI contract.
7620	Will the government confirm that opportunities released as a Small Business Set Aside in groups A and B only be accessible to awardees in that group? For example, would a business in Group B1 be able to access opportunities released to Group B2 and vice versa?	The comment is incorrect. All Contract holders within that RFQ's category that meet the NAICs code and set-aside (or unrestricted) status and any other requirements of an Issuing Agency will be eligible to see the Issuing Agency's RFQ.
7623	<p>A.3.6(A) states that "Each document shall be submitted in a single searchable Adobe Portable Document Format (PDF) file (compatible with ADOBE Reader version DC or 2017), with appropriate bookmarks to at least the section header. All files, with the exception of Exhibits:3a, 4, and 5 should be converted to PDF. Exhibits: 3a, 4, and 5 must be provided in MS Office Excel format with working cell formulas."</p> <p>This requirement implies that all files be merged into one, single PDF for each volume, except for Exhibits 3a and Exhibit 4 for Volume I and Exhibit 5 for Volume III, which are to be provided in their native Excel format. However, many Q&A conflict with this requirement. For example, Q&A #2195 regarding Exhibit 3a states that "Spreadsheets shall also be converted to PDF, in the most readable manner practicable, and submitted as part of a single PDF file" while Q&A #2512 states that "The solicitation was updated to clarify exhibits in excel format should not be converted to PDF ". Additionally, Q&A #4394 states that " Each proposal volume should be submitted in a single searchable PDF file. However, specific exhibits or attachments required for a volume should be submitted as their own individual PDFs as indicated in the solicitation" and Q&A #2311 states that "offerors should include ISO 9001:2015 evidence in Volume I of the offer as a separate PDF document." These are only several of the Q&A that introduce confusion as to what should or should not be included in the "one single searchable PDF" or what should be provided separately from the single PDF.</p> <p>Please confirm that all required documents should be included (i.e., merged) in one single searchable PDF and that the only files that should be included separately in their native format are the Government-provided Exhibits requested in Excel (e.g., 3a, 4, and 5).</p>	Each document should be in a searchable PDF or, as appropriate, Excel file. There is no mention of combining each document into a single PDF. The offeror should include three (3) folders - one folder for each volume - and then within each volume folder, include the associated files each as either a separate PDF or excel file within that volume folder. Amendment 10 removed the reference to a single combined PDF file.
7625	RFP A.3.6(A)(3) Proposal Format and Organization provides document naming examples "GetItDone_Category#-Management Approach" and "GetItDone_Category#-Technical Approach", but Q&A 6334 (and 3953) states "The Mission Suitability Volume should be broken down into two separate documents: Technical Approach Volume III-A and Management Approach Volume III-B." The RFP provides examples, whereas the Q&A appears to be providing instruction. To avoid discrepancies or compliance issues, please confirm the correct file naming for Volume III files and update the RFP as needed.	The RFP provides example file naming conventions and takes precedence over previously answered comments.
7626	<p>Q&A 3953 states that "Technical and Management Approaches should be submitted as two separate documents within Volume III" whereas Q&A 3755 states that "The documents associated with the Technical Approach should be placed in one folder and the documents associated with the Management Approach should be placed in a separate folder. Each subfactor should have its own unique cover pages, table of contents, list of figures, and list of tables. The two folders should then be combined into a single Volume III PDF File with the exception of Exhibit 5 which must be provided in MS Office Excel format with working cell formulas The Volume III PDF and Exhibit 5 Excel file should then be included in the Proposal zip file. (Note: if an O-TTPS Certification is provided in place of Exhibit 5, include the certificate in Volume III and do not provide Exhibit 5).</p> <p>These Q&A conflict with one another regarding whether Volume III comprises three files (e.g., Technical Volume, Management Volume, and Exhibit 5) or if Volume III comprises two files (e.g., Volume III (that merges the Technical Volume and Management Volume PDFs) and Exhibit 5). Please confirm which approach the government wants offerors to follow.</p>	The current RFP prevails over old comments and responses. As stated in the current RFP there is no longer a requirement to merge the documents into a single PDF. Each document shall be submitted in a single searchable Adobe Portable Document Format (PDF) file. Each document should be placed in the appropriate folder (Volume I, II or III).
7627	Can we bid as Prime on Category B , and Category C. In this case can we reuse the past performances?	Yes.
7628	Suppose a company ABC bid as a Prime and Subcontractor on category B? Can Company ABC Bid as a subcontractor on another company XYZ that is bidding as prime on Category B? In that case can ABC reuse the Past performances and REPs?	No.
7629	RFP Section A.3.6(A)(3) and associated Q&A have introduced confusion as to the submission format. Within the overall category zip file, should the offeror include three (3) folders - one folder for each volume - and then within each volume folder, include the associated files, which should be one single combined PDF for each volume with the exception of Exhibits 3a (if applicable), Exhibit 4, and Exhibit 5, which should be provided separately in Excel format?	The offeror should include three (3) folders - one folder for each volume - and then within each volume folder, include the associated files each as either a separate PDF or excel file within that volume folder. Amendment 10 removed the reference to a single combined PDF file.

7630	<p>Q&A 6602 states that "Attachments like Exhibits, Past Performance Questionnaires, and Letters of Authorization should be submitted as separate files within the corresponding category folder. These should not be included as an appendix within a single PDF for their respective volume."</p> <p>Please confirm that Past Performance Questionnaires should NOT be included as files with the proposal and instead should have been returned directly to the Government, in accordance with RFP instructions.</p>	Confirmed.
7631	The solicitation states, "Information related to how the offeror is participating in SCRM and/or IT Security activities, or at a minimum provide details regarding how the Offeror is kept abreast of and is addressing key SCRM and/or IT Security practices." What does the government mean by "kept abreast of and is addressing" in the context of this question? Does the Government mean how an offeror is keeping up with the evolving changes in SCRM-related practices coming out of industry bodies such as ISO, IEC, and other groups?	It is up to the Offeror to respond to how they "kept abreast of and is addressing" SCRM and/or IT security practices.
7633	The solicitation states, "Information related to how the offeror is participating in SCRM and/or IT Security activities, or at a minimum provide details regarding how the Offeror is kept abreast of and is addressing key SCRM and/or IT Security practices." What does the government mean by "is addressing" in the context of this question? Does the Government desire offeror to describe their technical measures taken to enforce SCRUM and IT Security standards within their company?	It is up to the Offeror to respond to how they "kept abreast of and is addressing" SCRM and/or IT security practices.
7634	A.3.6, reference, "Any proposal found to be a duplication or replica of another offeror or have a section that is a duplication or replica of another offeror, that is not a part of a joint venture or contractor teaming arrangement, will lead to all identified offerors being ineligible for award and will not be evaluated by the Government. Information such as Provider Point of Contact Information, or proof of certifications will not be considered as duplication if submitted by multiple entities." Question: Since SDB is now an additional track, may a prime vendor submit the same proposals for Category B & C for both the SB track AND the SDB track?	Yes.
7635	Referring to : "The offeror must provide past performance submissions as it relates to the SEWP VI in scope NAICS code being used for competition at the master contract level, as noted on the SF1449. If the NAICS code for the past performance submission does not match the Offeror's NAICS code used on the SF1449 or for references that are not assigned a NAICS code (e.g., commercial contracts), the offeror shall include the description within the past performance volume that explains how the work performed relates to the NAICS code used to compete as noted on the SF1449." do we need to show any type of document for evaluation of the past Performance references"?	No.
7636	ATTACHMENT A - SEWP Statement of Work, Section A.5.2 - Program Office Support, Page 6: What specific performance metrics or Service Level Agreements (SLAs) does the government intend to monitor at the IDIQ level under Category A contracts? Is the contract performance going to be evaluated per the metrics shown on https://www.sewp.nasa.gov/sewp5public/chperformance ?	The SEWP Program Office will review performance information based on customer requirements and any metrics or SLAs at the task order. Please see Attachment B: Program Performance for information on contract performance.
7637	Could the Government please provide a consolidated Q&A to allow for deconfliction of answers provided over time?	No. If a conflict exists, the Offeror should use the current RFP as the definitive reference point
7638	We are bidding as Prime on Category C, Can we bring more than one subcontractor to support us on this category?	Yes, as long as the subcontractor(s) are not utilized for REPs and/or past performance.
7639	The solicitation states, "The Offeror shall describe their corporate processes and resources with regard to the supply of products to the Government and corporate risks associated with Supply Chain Risk Management (SCRM) and IT Security..." Please define what the Government means by "corporate risks" in the context of this question. Does the Government mean risks such as (1) an offeror suffering a data breach from hacking, or, as another example, (2) an offeror being unable to adhere to standards?	The offeror should respond to the instructions as provided. The Government will not expand upon definitions within those instructions beyond what is provided in the RFP.
7640	We are bidding as Prime on Category C, Can we bring more than one subcontractor to support us on this category even if those subcontractor companies are subcontractor to other primes?	Yes, as long as the subcontractor(s) are not utilized for REPs and/or past performance.
7641	The solicitation states, "At a minimum, the offeror shall address the extent to which their corporate policies and procedures encourage, promote and/or require sustainable practices such as recycling, carbon emission reduction, reduced energy usage, etc." Please confirm that in the context of meeting the "minimum" requirement, the word "etc." here does not mean that offerors must address how they encourage, promote and/or require additional sustainable practices than those expressly listed here (i.e., recycling, carbon emission reduction, and reduced energy usage).	etc. means the provided list are examples and does not limit to just those listed examples what the offeror may choose to reference in their documentation .
7642	Do we have any pricing factor or Pricing Sheet to fill if we are bidding on Category B and Category C?	No.
7643	What do we need to provide from pricing perspective as there is no Pricing attachment for category B or Category C?	Category B and C have no pricing requirement.
7644	Referring to : "Specialized Contract Line-Item Numbers", Do we need to provide any pricing for this?	No.

7645	<p>Q&A #2487 regarding the Offer Volume states that "Regarding the ISO 9001:2015 certificate, it is stated that the cited offeror documentation shall be included in the proposal and counts against the page count as defined in A.3.7 1. Therefore, including a reference to the ISO 9001:2015 certificate from Volume I would count against the page count of Volume III."</p> <p>The ISO 9001 Certifications are excluded from the Offer Volume page limitation per A.3.6(B). Please clarify how referencing an ISO certificate (or any corporate certification) that an offeror holds in Volume III to evidence their capabilities would impact the 15-page limit? For example, an offeror's management approach is at 15 pages and includes statements that reference various certifications as evidence of management capability (e.g., ISO certificates, CMMI appraisals, and other qualifications) - is the Government suggesting they will penalize the offer with additional "pages" for these references?</p>	The current RFP prevails over old comments and responses. As stated in the current RFP, the ISO 9001 certificate is not counted against the page count.
7646	Please confirm it is acceptable to submit two commitment letters with our proposal submission - one with SourceAmerica and one with NIB.	Yes, although it is not required.
7647	regarding Section A.3.6.B (3), Paragraph states "Proposal sections that do not have an associated page limit shall be strictly limited to the information described as part of that section. Regardless of where it appears in the proposal, information construed as belonging in a page-limited section of the proposal will be so construed and count against that section's page limit." Will the government provide examples, or guidance, for how such material will be determined?	No. The Government will evaluate in accordance with the RFP.
7648	Regarding A.3.7.1 (b), Please confirm that small business prime offerors are NOT required to submit evidence of CMMI certification, but only ISO 9001 certification.	As stated in the current RFP, all Offerors in Category B, regardless of business size must either submit a CMMi certificate or "provide proof that the certification approval is in process"
7649	RFP A.3.6(A)(3) Proposal Format and Organization provides document naming examples, to include the volume file name as well as "respective documents". Relative to Past Performance, the examples include "GetItDone_CategoryA_Volumell" as the file name for Volume II Past Performance as well as "GetItDone_Category#-PP #". It is unclear what the "GetItDone_Category#-PP #" file would include if an additional file to Volume II as well as what the "#" within the file name is to indicate. Please confirm that only one file is required for Volume II Past Performance (i.e., GetItDone_CategoryA_Volumell), consistent with the Proposal Submission Table in Section A.3.6(B), that include the required contents in a "single searchable Adobe Portable Document Format (PDF) file" and that the ""GetItDone_Category#-PP #" is not applicable. If this is not correct, please clarify the difference between the contents of the two files.	Each document should be submitted as a separate PDF file. For example, the Information from the Offeror can be placed in one file; the Termination/Descope information is a separate file, etc.
7650	regarding A.3.7.1 (d), Please provide clarification for completing the NAICS Crosswalk. Are offerors required to fill in (or N/A as appropriate) all NAICS on the list or just the single NAICS used to compete for a master SEWP VI contract award?	All NAICS codes should be entered as stated in the RFP: Each Offeror... for each NAICS code represented in Section A.1.34 NORTH AMERICAN INDUSTRY CLASSIFICATION SYSTEM (NAICS) & NAICS CODES WITHIN SCOPE must complete Exhibit 4 reflecting their Size Standard(s) for each NAICS within the category in which they are proposing"
7651	The solicitation states, "The offeror shall discuss its management chain of command, with reference to the contract management functions at each management level." By "contract management functions", is the Government only referring to functions involving the contract that would typically involve management? Or would the Government also including in "contract management functions" typical contract related functions/actions such as submitting a new delivery order (DO) offer to or signing a Standard Form (SF) for a DO?	The offeror should use their discretion to respond to instructions with the information that best describes their contract management functions.
7652	<p>A.3.7 states, "If any reference to documentation is made by the offeror such documentation shall be cited at the page, section, and paragraph level. The cited offeror documentation shall be included in the proposal and counts against the page count as defined in A.3.6(B)." Q&A 2486 states that "Responses should be self-contained and not utilize references to other documents or other sections of the document. A reference to a certification or other document that does not imply the need for the Government to refer to a separate document does not count against the page count." The RFP instructions and this Q&A are in conflict. Please 1) confirm what type of "other documentation" this section/Q&A refers to; 2) clarify what documentation would be counted against the page limit; and 3) clarify what document would NOT be counted against the page limit?</p> <p>For example, can an offeror simply reference having a non-mandatory certificate (e.g., a Category C offeror referencing CMMI or other certifications within the Management Volume to demonstrate management practices) without having to include the certificate and thus have it count towards the page limit?</p>	If a reference is made to the outside document, the document must either be included in the proposal within the page limit or the reference will not be considered.
7656	Regarding A.4.3, Please provide clarification of the term 'content relevancy' as an evaluation factor. Will the government provide details of how content relevancy, as an evaluation criteria, will be determined?	The Government will review the information provided to the customer and determine if the information demonstrates relevance to the content area.
7657	Could the Government clarify their answer to Comment ID 5529? Is the required past performance annual spend threshold cumulative across all references or specific per reference?	The minimum values required are per reach reference.

7658	A.3.7.1(a) states that the offeror shall complete "the indicated Offeror required fill-ins in the clauses, provisions/representations and certifications, and attachments." Please 1) confirm that "clauses, provisions/representations" references RFP Section V Reps and Certs and 2) clarify what "certifications" and "attachments" this requirement refers to and their associated fill-ins.	The reference is to all required fill-ins in the clauses, provisions/representations and certifications, and attachments listed in the subsequent A.3. sections.
7659	Please confirm that the List of Acronyms allowed in the Q&A are optional, not required.	Confirmed.
7660	Would the Government clarify the reference "to all projects" in Comment 4960?	The current RFP prevails over old comments and responses. Comment 4960 is no longer relevant.
7661	Would the Government clarify the reference to Technical Area 9a in Comment 4778? Category A does not require REPs.	The corrected version is: Technical Areas 9a, 11b and 11c are not considered a Past Performance Content Representative area and are excluded from the Mandatory Experience Areas for Past Performance areas.
7662	Regarding A.4.4, What metric or methodology does NASA propose to evaluate and quantify the 'Satisfactory level of confidence' in vendors' ability to meet the standards outlined in A.3.7.3? How should vendors demonstrate that they have satisfactorily addressed and understood all elements and sub-elements to ensure they avoid a 'level of no confidence' rating?	The Offeror should respond to the instructions provided in A.3.7.3. and will be evaluated as indicated in A.4.4.
7664	Could you please confirm if an offeror, whether a small or large business, can now provide proof of ISO certification in process at the time of proposal submission? Additionally, please confirm if it is no longer mandatory to submit the ISO certification along with the proposal?	Confirmed.
7665	Could the Government clarify their answer to Comment ID 5529? Is the required past performance annual spend threshold cumulative across all references or specific per reference?	The minimum values required are per each reference.
7666	Could the Government clarify whether Offerors are allowed to submit additional technical areas in Exhibit 3a so long as the number of LOAs is 4?	Offerors should only submit the minimum required Technical Areas and offerings.
7667	Would the Government rank a Category A Offeror who provided more than 4 technical areas (while abiding by the 4 LOA limit) more highly than an Offeror with only 4 technical area?	No.
7668	Please confirm if offerors should label zip files "OfferorName_80TECH24R0001_Category Submission" if they are only bidding on one category. In other words, should Category A, B, C be specified for all zip files or only for offerors submitting in more than one category?	The zip file name should indicate the Category the zip file is in reference to.
7670	The SF1449 for Category B indicates that this requirement is a Small Business Set-Aside. We request clarification from the government on whether offerors that are not small businesses should select the "Unrestricted" box.	No.
7671	Can the Government clarify the response to Comment 5137? We were under the assumption that there was a maximum of four (4) OEM POCs permitted. However, this response stated no maximum number of OEM POCs.	As stated in the current RFP, up to 4 primary providers and 4 additional providers must be proposed. There is no purpose to proposing more than the minimum requirement.
7672	Will an Offeror who proposes more providers be given a better rating?	No. The only rating associated with exhibit 3 is a pass/fail rating for meeting the minimum requirements.
7673	Can the Government clarify whether Exhibit 1 needs to be signed? The answers to comments 4824 and 4823 appear to be contradictory.	Exhibit 3 does not need to be signed.
7674	Can NASA please clarify what forms of documentation are acceptable for small businesses to submit to demonstrate financial capability to perform the contract (in lieu of annual reports)?	The references to "letters from certified United States banks" and "annual reports" are example documents that could be used to demonstrate financial capability. Any information that demonstrates the Offeror's financial capability to perform the contract is acceptable.
7680	Please clarify, A.3.7.1 (d) "An Offeror's size standard shall match the NAICS information reflected in SAM.gov entity information.". Must offerors be registered in SAM.gov for each NAICS Code at the time of submission to see Task Order RFQs under each NAICS Code? Also, will offerors be permitted to update their registered NAICS Codes post-award, to add access to Task Order RFQs?	Offerors must be registered in SAM.gov for each NAICS Code at the time of submission to see Task Order RFQs under each NAICS Code at the start of SEWP VI. A process for updating NAICS code information will be provided post award and any updates will then apply to subsequent task orders.
7681	Can the Government clarify the use of the word "work" in the sentence "the other columns of the matrix, indicate the work the Offeror has performed that is similar or related to each element of the current requirement as presented in the matrix?" Should this answer indicate the scope area? Scope area would be consistent with the example table.	"Work" refers to the work performed in one of the selected content areas. As stated in the current RFP, the only two entries to be placed on the matrix is P and S. A P is placed in the matrix cell corresponding to the content area and reference contract for which the work performed was as a Prime; and an S for work performed as a subcontractor.
7683	Please confirm the signed SF 1449 and amendments can be provided as separate files within the Volume I folder and do not have to be saved within a single Volume I response file.	Confirmed. Note that Amendment 10 removed the concept of a single Volume I response file.
7684	Please confirm Past Performance History (Subsection 10 of A.3.7.2) is to be provided only for the references submitted with the proposal.	Confirmed.
7685	Please confirm the AbilityOne Commitment Letters can be provided as separate files within the Volume I folder and do not have to be saved within a single Volume I response file.	Confirmed. Note that Amendment 10 removed the concept of a single Volume I response file.
7687	FAR 9.104-1 General standards. (a) Have adequate financial resources to perform the contract, or the ability to obtain them (see 9.104-3(a)); What amount of financial resources/credit will instill high confidence that a contractor will be able to successfully fulfil their prime responsibilities?	Any information that demonstrates the Offeror's financial capability to perform the contract is acceptable.

7688	Can NASA clarify the reference to Scope Categories in Attachment A? Attachment A is the Statement of Work.	The term Scope Categories was removed in Amendment 10.
7689	The instructions and examples for proposal organization contain contradictions. It is not clear if files for each Volume should be submitted individually or in one PDF, and if submitted individually how the Table of Contents and numbering should account for individual files. Will the government provide a submission example holistically covering all requirements, with file naming conventions for each Volume?	As updated in Amendment 10 the Offeror should provide each document as a separate PDF or Excel file within the appropriate Volume folder (Volume I, II or III). If the Offeror includes a Table of Content for a document, the table should be part of that file. Page numbering is only required for page limited files; e.g. Attachments to Exhibit 1; Past Performance Information from the Offeror; Technical Approach; etc. There is no required file naming convention. Example filenames are provided but the requirement is only to use identifiable filenames related to the content of each file.
7690	Will alternate lines of credit through distributors (Ingram, TD Synnex, Carahsoft) instill high confidence that a contractor will be able to successfully fulfil their prime responsibilities?	Any information that demonstrates the Offeror's financial capability to perform the contract is acceptable.
7692	Can NASA confirm that Offerors should not cite to the instructions but simply the evaluation factors when mirroring structure in the headers. For instance, A.4.4 and not A.3.7.3(a)	Offerors should cite the instructions; e.g. A.3.7.3(a)1 and A.3.7.3(a)2.
7693	The instructions and examples for proposal organization make determining submission structure at the Volume level difficult. Will the government consider responses submitted in three Volumes, with each Volume consisting of one PDF file (and only Exhibits 3a, 4, and 5 submitted as separate files in MS Office Excel), to be compliant?	The instructions have been clarified in the most recent RFP. Each document shall be a PDF or Excel spreadsheet file within the appropriate Volume folder. There is no need to merge files into one PDF per Volume and therefore the only structural requirement is to name files in a distinguishable manner per the examples provided in the RFP.
7694	If PPQs were sent out to customers in anticipation of the August proposal due date, do they need to be updated with the current expenditure numbers at the submission due date?	Yes.
7695	Can NASA clarify whether the Offerors should include references to requirements in their volume response? For example, can/should Offerors cite to A.3.7.3(a), which would be the requirement for Mission Suitability Volume - Technical Area, in addition to A.4.4?	Offerors should cite the instructions; e.g. A.3.7.3(a)1 and A.3.7.3(a)2.
7697	The solicitation states, "Identify any consultants, generative artificial intelligence, and/or sub-contractors used in writing this proposal (if any) and the extent to which their services will be available in the subsequent performance of this effort." Will there be any manner of penalties imposed on offerors who use consultants, generative artificial intelligence, and/or sub-contractors in the writing of their SEWP proposals?	No.
7698	Can NASA confirm that, per the Q&A, the SF-1449, Reps and Certs, AbilityOne letters, Meaningful Relationship Commitment Letter, and SF-30s should be included in the Offer volume?	Confirmed.
7699	The Technical Approach instructions provide confusing language around the two numbered requirements. Are these the "points 1 and 2" referenced in the first sentence, or additional requirements as implied by "shall also include information in the following areas"? Can the government provide more clear instructions for the technical approach?	Yes, these are the "points 1 and 2" referenced in the first sentence.
7701	Please clarify the reference to, "general capabilities in accordance with the proposed Category scope (see Attachment A-SEWP Scope, Section A.2. SCOPE)". How should offerors address the differences between the Attachment A Section A.2. SCOPE and the Content Representative Areas in RFP Section A.1.2 in their responses?	There is no requirement to reference section A.1.2. in the Technical Approach. As stated in the current RFP, the Offeror should respond with regard to proposed Category scope (see Attachment A-SEWP Statement of Work Section A.2. SCOPE).
7702	The Technical Approach instructions contain various overlapping requirements, without a clear organizational structure. How should offerors outline their responses to the Technical Approach?	The Technical Approach consists of two points. The Offeror should clearly distinguish between the provided information in response to point 1 vs, the provided information in response to point 2.
7704	Based on the instructions for the technical approach, for Category B will the government accept a proposal structured with an introduction addressing points 1 and 2 based on the Attachment A Scope, followed by Sections for each of the 11 Content Representative Areas detailed in RFP Section A.1.2?	Amendment 8 updated the instructions for the Technical Approach to clarify it is based on the offeror's general technical capabilities with regard to the SEWP scope and Acquisition Objectives and not on the sample Technical Areas.
7705	Can the Government confirm that the requirements in Section A.3.7.1(a) 1-3 should be answered in a cover letter?	Yes. The information should be included in the cover page (letter).
7706	Can the Government confirm that all financial statements provided in response to A.3.7.1(a)(6) should be combined into one PDF file?	They can be in separate files or combined into one file. The filename should clearly indicate the purpose of the file(s).
7710	Can the Government confirm that for Volume 1, Offer Volume Folder the following documents would be separate PDFs: SF-1449, Reps and Certs, Ability One Commitment Letter, Meaningful Relationship Commitment Letter, Financial Information, SF-30s, ISO/CMMI Certification, Letters of Authorization, Exhibit 3a?	Confirmed.
7711	Can the Government confirm that the certification POC for ISO/CMMI information can be combined with the ISO certification into one PDF?	Confirmed.

7714	RFP Section A.3.7.1(a)(6) requires Offerors to demonstrate their financial capability to perform the contract in accordance with FAR 9.104-1(a). Acceptable information includes letters from certified U.S. banks indicating the available amount of credit for the business and the company's annual report. Since many small businesses are not required to produce annual reports like large businesses, can the government confirm that small businesses can submit their income statement, balance sheet, and cash flow statement for the past two years (2022 and 2023) to demonstrate financial capability?	The references to "letters from certified United States banks" and "annual reports" are example documents that could be used to demonstrate financial capability. Any information that demonstrates the Offeror's financial capability to perform the contract is acceptable.
7716	RFP Section A.3.7.1(a)(6) requires Offerors to demonstrate their financial capability to perform the contract in accordance with FAR 9.104-1(a). Acceptable information includes letters from certified U.S. banks indicating the available amount of credit for the business and the company's annual report. Will the government consider providing a template for Offerors to use in requesting the company's available amount of credit from the bank?	No. The references to "letters from certified United States banks" and "annual reports" are example documents that could be used to demonstrate financial capability. Any information that demonstrates the Offeror's financial capability to perform the contract is acceptable.
7717	Can NASA confirm that no response is required to the Technical Areas in A.3 in Attachment A-SOW, including in our response to Section A.1.2 of the RFP?	Confirmed.
7719	Can Government please clarify the evaluation criteria for core technical capabilities? If the Offeror responds to some of the technical areas and not to all in the selected category, will that be weighted negatively as compared to another Offeror addressing all technical areas by leveraging several subcontractors/partners?	Amendment 8 updated the instructions for the Technical Approach to clarify it is based on the offeror's general technical capabilities with regard to the SEWP scope and Acquisition Objectives and not on the sample Technical Areas. As stated in A.4.4, the evaluation is based on either "Satisfactory Level of Confidence" or "Level of No Confidence" and not on weighting of proposals beyond the stated confidence rating.
7720	The Government's response to question number 6411 is: "A cover page is permitted for each Volume and should be placed in the volume(s) in which it is intended." The question was regarding a cover letter (vs. a cover page). Please clarify the Government's answer regarding a cover/transmittal letter by confirming a cover/transmittal letter is permitted and excluded from page limits, and indicate with which volume(s) it should be included.	The term cover page is used in the RFP. A cover letter would be an equivalent term.
7721	Can NASA clarify the potential discrepancy between questions 6430, 380, and 1865 with regards to what Reps and Certs need to be completed if the Offerors have updated Reps and Certs in SAM.gov?	The current RFP prevails over old comments and responses. Offerors should follow the instructions and information in the current RFP with regards to reps and certs.
7722	Will the Government be resending a final RFP that conforms to all amendments and changes? If so, when can industry expect the release of the final RFP?	The Government plans to release a final RFP as soon as possible.
7723	Given the requirement to organize the response consistent with the RFP and address all subfactors, can NASA clarify the paragraph in A.3.7.3(a)? It appears to be duplicative in its reference to points 1 and 2.	The Offeror should review the current RFP for specific guidance. There are two Technical Approach points to be responded to - points 1 and 2. The paragraph in A.3.7.3(a) provides instructions for responses to those two points and is not itself responded to.
7725	Could NASA clarify that the validation of the NAICS Crosswalk against NAICS in SAM.gov will be done at the time of proposal submission? Companies, or the SBA, may add/remove NAICS post-submission and prior to award.	Confirmed.
7728	Can NASA clarify the addition of "the etc." in the program management volumes Sections i and ii? We want to ensure that we address SEWP's requirements and intent with this addition.	etc. means the provided list are examples and does not limit to just those listed examples what the offeror may choose to reference in their documentation.
7730	The Government has provided "Enclosure 1 SEWP VI Major Providers," which includes a list of acceptable providers. However, it does not include a mapping of the eight Mandatory Technical Areas to these providers. As a result, it becomes the responsibility of SEWP offerors to specify which mandatory technical areas are covered by a given letter of authorization from an acceptable provider. The lack of such mapping creates a potential for discrepancies between the offeror's interpretation and the Government's understanding. For instance, Microsoft Corporation is listed in Enclosure 1 as an acceptable provider. Hypothetically, if an offeror holds a letter of authorization from Microsoft that does not explicitly state which mandatory technical areas it covers, the offeror might assert that their letter covers Technical Area 4: Security and Sensor Equipment. This assumption could be based on Microsoft offering products like the Azure Kinect DK, an imaging camera. However, if the Government disagrees and determines that Microsoft's products do not qualify under Technical Area 4, the letter of authorization may be deemed insufficient for that technical area. This could disqualify the offeror from meeting the requirement of covering four mandatory technical areas, potentially rendering them ineligible for award. To ensure clarity and avoid such potential misunderstandings, we respectfully request that the Government update Enclosure 1 to include a mapping of acceptable providers to the mandatory technical areas they are eligible to cover.	The comment appears to be based on a false assumption: there is no implication that LOAs be specifically notated for any one Technical Area. The only SEWP specific requirement for LOAs is that SEWP VI is mentioned within the allowed 3 pages.
7731	Regarding A.3.7.2(a) Item #9 (For the references submitted with the Offeror's proposal, Offeror shall provide recent customer evaluations of previous performance including Award Fee Evaluation results, Fee Determination Official letters, Annual Performance Evaluation Forms, or any other written performance feedback, if applicable.) Are offerors required to include this information if it is available, or can this be up to the discretion of the offeror?	Offerors are required to include this information if it is available.

7733	Is it necessary to have a GSA schedule to respond to SEWP VI or having a DUNS number is sufficient? Because it's mentioned on SAM.gov that Potential offerors should ensure its company is listed in the online database(s) for the following: Initial Solicitation Post- 5.23.24 Date Universal Numbering System (and the transition to the US Government's unique entity identifier (UEI)): https://www.gsa.gov/about-us/organization/federal-acquisition-service/office-of-systems-management/integrated-award-environment-iae/iae-information-kit/unique-entity-identifier-update	There is no requirement that Offerors have a GSA schedule.
7734	The Government stated that Offerors should not modify the NASA-provided exhibits or forms, however, Exhibit 5 is populating in Arial 12 and not Times New Roman. Should Offerors change the font consistent with A.3.6(B)(2), which states that excel files were provided in Times New Roman font size 9-12 or leave as is?	Offerors should leave exhibits as is.
7735	The instructions imply there should be one letter of authorization for each of the four mandatory technical areas which an offeror is covering in their proposals for category A. If one letter of authorization covers more than one mandatory technical area, please confirm that the offeror is not required to provide duplicate copies of that letter of authorization, one for each mandatory technical area being covered.	Confirmed.
7736	We are a WOSB firm and intend to submit proposals for Category B and C. Can the Government please confirm if by submitting a proposal just under WOSB pool and if awarded, do we get awarded under Small Business by default and can we bid for future task orders released under Small Business? Please clarify if should be submitting two proposals under each categories (B and C) OR four proposals (two under WOSB for categories B and C AND two under SB for categories B and C)?	Offerors can only submit one proposal per category as a Prime. Post-award all Contract holders within that RFQ's category that meet the NAICS code and set-aside (or unrestricted) status and any other requirements of an Issuing Agency will be eligible to see the Issuing Agency's RFQ.
7737	Annual reports are typically only for publicly traded companies. What are small and private companies expected to submit?	The references to "letters from certified United States banks" and "annual reports" are example documents that could be used to demonstrate financial capability. Any information that demonstrates the Offeror's financial capability to perform the contract is acceptable.
7739	The Government stated that offerors should not modify the NASA-provided exhibits or forms, however Exhibit 2a is populating in Arial and not Times New Roman. Should Offerors change the font or leave as is? This question is in the context of A.3.6(B)(2), which states that excel files were provided in Times New Roman font size 9-12.	Offerors should leave exhibits as is.
7740	Are "content representative areas" (referenced in this section) and "technical areas" (referenced in prior sections) used interchangeably?	Yes.
7741	Regarding the submission of financial statements/information, will the Government allow password protected files be submitted?	No.
7742	In Exhibit 4 (NAICS Crosswalk) the fonts beginning at Row 9 are formatted in Calibri and not Times New Roman, whereas the above rows are formatted in Times New Roman. Given the instruction not to modify the Government-provided exhibit, should Offerors leave as is? This question is in the context of A.3.6(B)(2), which states that excel files were provided in Times New Roman font size 9-12.	Offerors should leave exhibits as is.
7743	Are all the past performance questionnaires have to be related to the primary NAICS code selected, or the PPQs can be from multiple qualifying NAICS codes a company selects?	All past performance questionnaires have to be related to the primary NAICS code selected. As stated in the current RFP: "If a NAICS code of a referenced contract or award, does not exist or match the NAICS code being used for competition then the Offeror should describe how the work relates to the NAICS code being used for competition."
7744	Please confirm that for Category A, four mandatory technical areas must be covered. This does not mean four providers from Enclosure 1. So hypothetically speaking, an offeror with a letter of authorization from a single provider from Enclosure 1 whose products (and whose letter of authorization also) span 4 of the mandatory technical areas would be deemed by the Government to have fully met this requirement.	Yes, as stated in the RFP: "The same designated provider may be identified in more than one of the four (4) Technical Areas but the offerings from the provider must be distinct, relevant, and different in each Technical Area."
7745	Exhibit 3(a) is defaulting the responses in Calibri and not in Times New Roman. Given Government's instruction not to modify the Government-provided exhibit, should Offerors leave as is? This question is in the context of A.3.6(B)(2), which states that excel files were provided in Times New Roman font size 9-12.	Offerors should leave exhibits as is.
7746	Please confirm that offerors are not to submit more than 4 letters of authorization and that additional letters beyond the 4 allowed will be considered within page limitations and to be not compliant.	Confirmed.
7747	The instructions contained within the Exhibit 3(a) provided with Amendment 9 are inconsistent with the instructions in A.3.7.1(c). Can Government please update A.3.7.1 (c) to reflect the instructions in Exhibit 3(a)?	The comment is unclear. The Offeror should review the current RFP for specific guidance. Based on this document there is no inconsistency between the Exhibit and RFP.
7750	Per our understanding, the small businesses are only required to submit AbilityOne and SourceAmerica Commitment Letters, and are not required to submit a sub-contracting plan. Please confirm if that is correct?	Correct.
7751	Can the Government remove or clarify the phrase "minimum technical areas" in the instructions for Exhibit 3a (Tabs 2-10)? The RFP in Section A.3.7.1 (c) indicates that only four technical areas can be proposed.	There is a minimum of 4 technical areas to be proposed as stated. And submitting more than the minimum has no effect on the proposal process and therefore only the minimum should be submitted.

7752	The solicitation states, "For each of the four (4) proposed Technical Areas, a minimum of one (1) additional provider must be proposed with relevant offerings in each of the proposed four Technical Area. The additional providers do not need to be from the list provided in Enclosure 1 and the contact information is not needed." Please confirm that for additional providers, no letter of authorization is required.	Confirmed.
7753	As Batch 3 Q&A numbers 1920, 2320, 2446, 2820, and 4799 provide conflicting answers, can the Government please clarify whether past performance items 9-12 are to relate specifically to the 3 contracts submitted, or if they are general past performance information that are not specific to the 3 contracts submitted?	Points 1 through 10 (the list was updated in amendment 10) are to be responded to with respect to the 1-3 contracts submitted.
7754	As Batch 3 Q&A numbers 2232, 2335, and 2594 provide conflicting answers, can the Government please clarify whether the list to whom PPQs were sent is included or excluded from the 10-page limit?	The list is not included in the page count.
7755	Section A.3.7.1 Offer Volume, (a) General Instructions, #6 states, "To determine if an Offeror is responsible in accordance with FAR 9.104-1(a), Offeror is instructed to submit information which demonstrates its financial capability to perform the contract." Is it the Government's intent that all offerors (categories, A, B and C) provide documentation with its proposal submission that demonstrates financial capability to perform the contract?	Yes.
7756	Based on the addition of the word AND to the instructions, can the Government clarify whether the character counts for Exhibit 3a (the technical area description and description for each part), include or exclude spaces, particularly given the allowance for 500 words and restriction to 2,500 characters?	Inclusive of spaces.
7758	Please confirm as to what kind of services are expected to be listed under Exhibit 3a - Category A- Technical Area 9: Product-Based Services. Do we also have to list the prices and hourly rates at the time of responding?	Two line items are required. They could be a labor category or a warranty service or an installation or any product based service. The two line items provided must include pricing,
7759	Please confirm if the offeror selects NAICS 541512 at the master contract level (SF1449) then do all the submitted projects (relevant experience and past performance) are to be of same NAICS (541512) OR can these be of different NAICS (example 541330) as listed in Exhibit 4?	Amendment 8 removed the NAICS code wording with regard to REPs. Amendment 8 clarified that if a NAICS code of a referenced contract or award, does not exist or match the NAICS code being used for competition then the Offeror should describe how the work relates to the NAICS code being used for competition.
7763	Section A.3.7.1 Offer Volume, (a) General Instructions, #6 states, "To determine if an Offeror is responsible in accordance with FAR 9.104-1(a), Offeror is instructed to submit information which demonstrates its financial capability to perform the contract." Is it the Government's intent that all offerors (categories, A, B and C) provide documentation with its proposal submission that demonstrates financial capability to perform the contract?	Yes.
7764	The solicitation states, "An Offeror may submit a single award IDIQ/ BPA at the contract/ agreement level as a single past performance reference. However, Offerors are not permitted to submit a multiple award or GWAC as an individual past performance reference." Can offerors use a single task order from a multiple award or GWAC as an individual past performance reference?	Yes.
7765	Regarding the use of parent company/holding/affiliates/subsidiaries: The RFP states, "Offerors sharing resources from other entities by way of a Meaningful Relationship within a Corporate Structure (including its Parent Company/Holding Company or any one or more of its affiliates, subsidiaries, business units, joint ventures, or any other types of independent business structures) may only submit one Offer (e.g., proposal) from that Corporate Structure. More than one Offer, e.g., proposal, from a Corporate Structure may be submitted if an Offeror is NOT sharing proposal evaluation elements and/or committing resources from other entities by way of a Meaningful Relationship within a Corporate Structure. If an Offeror submits more than one proposal with any Meaningful Relationships sharing proposal evaluation elements, only the first proposal received will be considered for evaluation and all other proposals received will be rejected and not evaluated. " Q: If a parent company is a small business entity and wholly owns a small business subsidiary, would the limitations set forth in the RFP regarding proposal submissions (Section A.3.5) still apply, or would the Government make an exception to allow small business primes to use their relevant past performance experience when submitting a proposal as a subcontractor to its subsidiary?	No exception will be made.
7766	If the UNSPSC is not available for a Part Number, can we still include those lines in our submission?	UNSPSC codes exist for all items and services and must be provided for an item to be counted in meeting the minimum requirements.
7767	I read somewhere that the offerors don't have to quote prices in Exhibit 3a-Category A for the Technical Areas. Please confirm if that is correct.	That is not correct.
7768	May a past performance that qualifies in more than one Category be submitted for multiple categories? Or is it required that all past performances submitted in different categories be themselves different.	Yes, a past performance that qualifies in more than one Category can be submitted for multiple categories.

7769	Is there a maximum number of past performances and PPQs that can be submitted? It has to be at least three for each of them but there's no maximum number mentioned.	Three should be submitted. Any submissions beyond the required number will be ignored.
7770	If an Offeror meets the minimum number of required CLINs, but still had some lines without an UNSPSC, would the Offeror be eliminated from competition?	All CLINs must have a UNSPSC associated with them in order to be counted.
7772	Could we confirm that UNSPSC is not required for Technical Area 9 for Reseller Provided Services?	UNSPSC is required for all items including the services in Technical Area 9.
7774	If an Offeror has two lines in Exhibit 3a that have the same part number, but the description makes it clear the same part number is needed on a different custom configuration, is that acceptable? Is the preference to see only unique part numbers instead of full custom configurations?	Part numbers do not need to be unique as long as the description identifies them as different instances of the part number. Each instance must have a different and unique CLIN assigned to it.
7776	Could NASA confirm that two lines with the same OEM Part Number (but are true custom configurations) should have different CLIN numbers to represent the configuration?	Yes.
7777	A.3.7.2(a) Information from the Offeror states "Prime Offerors shall furnish the information requested below for a minimum of one but no more than three recent similar contracts." Please confirm Item 10, Past Performance History (page 109), shall align with the same "one but no more than three" references required in A.3.7.2(a) in general.	Confirmed.
7780	Can the Government clarify the naming convention for the Technical and Management Approach files within the Volume III Folder? Q&A indicate they should be named III-A and III-B, but the RFP states Getitdone_Category#-Management Approach; Getitdone_Category#-Technical Approach? Should Offerors add III-A and III-B into the file name?	The naming conventions are examples of how the files can be named. They are not required formats. Offerors should name the files such that it is easy to identify what part of the RFP the file is in reference to.
7785	Should an Offeror bidding on Category A reference the technical areas selected in Exhibit 3a in its mission suitability volume?	There is no requirement to do so.
7787	Amendment 10, Section A.3.7.1.c Category B and C, pages 103 to 105, provides minimum values for Mandatory Experience Offerings, while page 107 outlines minimum values for Past Performance. The requirements for Mandatory Experience Offerings necessitate meeting a total value size of a single order or contract, whereas Past Performance demands an average annual cost/fee incurred. It is not clear why these values differ between the two sections. Would the Government consider updating the solicitation to ensure the minimum values for both experience and past performance are consistent in terms of categories, types of values requested, and thresholds?	No.
7789	Should an Offeror bidding on Category A reference the technical areas selected in Exhibit 3a in the past performance volume?	There is no requirement to do so.
7790	Amendment 10, page 100, Section A.3.7.1(a).6, requests offerors to submit information to determine if the Offeror is responsible according to FAR 9.104-1(a), including a certified letter and annual report. However, annual reports are typically filed only by publicly traded companies. Would the Government consider amending the requirement to state, "...annual report, if a publicly traded company"?	The references to "letters from certified United States banks" and "annual reports" are example documents that could be used to demonstrate financial capability. Any information that demonstrates the Offeror's financial capability to perform the contract is acceptable.
7795	Paragraph 7 of this section remains unclear on the scope of what constitutes a "duplication or replica" and is extremely likely to result in protests by any offerors disqualified through this provision. Referring to a "section" is also unclear in scope as to whether this applies to an entire proposal "section" as listed under a single heading, or whether this will or will not apply to individual paragraphs, sentences, or phrases. The list of items that will not be considered a duplication remains a non-exhaustive list of examples, and it is unclear what items outside of this list may or may not be considered duplications. Would the government please provide an updated provision that clearly defines a "duplication or replica", clearly identifies what constitutes a "section" for the purposes of determining duplication, and provides an exhaustive list of exceptions to the provision?	The RFP will remain as stated.
7797	The solicitation lacks clarity on the purpose and implications of selecting a primary NAICS code. It is confusing on how this selection impacts access to task orders under other NAICS codes within the same category, and how it will affect the determination of subcontractor size status for compliance. Will the Government please provide an explanation of the purpose of selecting a primary NAICS code, how it impact access to task orders under other NAICS codes in the same category, and whether the primary NAICS determines a subcontractor's size status?	The selection has no impact on post award task orders. The purpose of selecting the primary NAICS code is for setting the proposal REPs and Past Performance requirements.
7799	The solicitation is not clear as to whether a subcontractor can contribute a REP or past performance to the proposal if they are considered small under their primary NAICS code, but large in multiple other NAICS listed in Exhibit 4+NAICS+Size+Standard++Crosswalk+Amendment+9+11.21.24. Does a subcontractor's size status on Exhibit 4 NAICS impact an offeror's compliance or future access to task orders, especially if the subcontractor is small under only one NAICS code?	The size for a subcontractor is based on the Proposal NAICS code for competition.

7800	The Government requires each REP to cover only ONE technical area, creating unnecessary constraints for Offerors. Can the Government revise the requirement to allow each REP to demonstrate an Offeror's capabilities and experience in MULTIPLE technical areas within a single REP?	The REPs are only evaluated to ensure the minimum number of technical areas are represented. No evaluation will be made of information beyond meeting the minimum requirements.
7801	Amendment 8 introduced substantial changes to Mission Suitability requirements, shifting the focus from sample technical areas to mission objectives. This change impacted the significant effort already invested by Offerors and lacked sufficient explanation or justification. This requirement does not appear to allow offerors to showcase their comprehensive mission suitability knowledge and ability to perform under the category scope. Will the Government reconsider the sudden changes to Mission Suitability requirements and provide Offerors with clear instructions for meeting the Mission Suitability requirements?	The RFP will remain as currently stated.
7803	Comment: The continuous amendments, conflicting guidance, and unclear requirements have caused significant wasted effort and costs for many Offerors. The current solicitation process does not respect the time and resources invested by the industry. Will the Government provide a fully updated version of the solicitation with clear instructions and evaluation criteria that links directly to the instructions, along with an extended timeline, to account for the numerous clarifications and revisions?	A final amendment is planned.
7805	Given the large volume of questions submitted in response to Amendments 8, 9, and 10, would the government please provide another question submission period after the release of amendments posted in response to these questions?	No.
7806	Given the large volume of questions submitted in response to Amendments 8, 9, and 10, and the likely scope of RFP changes required to address these questions, would the government please extend the proposal submission deadline to a minimum of 45 days after the release of any amendment posted in response to these questions?	Final proposal due date will be announced in sam.gov.
7808	When the current question period opened, it seems that all previous questions have been removed from the SEWP portal, including the excel download of all questions and answers. The PDF files provided on SAM do not permit processing the responses to questions in the same way as was possible with the excel file. Would the government please provide the excel file containing all questions and answers prior to December 17, 2024?	There was a short period of time when past Q and A was not available. That has been fixed.
7810	For Exhibit 1 narratives, given the 3-page limit, are there specific requirements for level of detail that will be evaluated?	As stated in the Exhibit 1 instructions: Provide a clear and concise description of the IT service as it relates to the Mandatory Experience Technical Area.
7811	How will past performance be rated if a customer does not return the past performance questionnaire? During the most recent industry day, it was indicated the government would reach out to the named reference, but there is no mention of this in the updated solicitation.	Offerors will not be negatively affected if the customer failed to provide a questionnaire as long as the Offeror has ensured that the references are notified and have verified that the questionnaire is completed and submitted.
7813	Management Approach instruction (b) 1 iv on page 113 requires C-SCRM attestation Exhibit 5, but the exhibit itself has been deleted from SAM.gov. Please confirm whether this is still required and/or provide the updated Exhibit 5.	The exhibit was replaced with a corrected version on sam.gov.
7814	Several Designated Providers have refused to provide LOAs in the name of JVs. Per their agreements, they can only provide LOAs to the JV members. Requiring LOAs to be in the JV's name in the base contract may also cause operational issues during the course of the contract. Will the government consider updating the LOA requirement for JVs to reflect this challenge?	The requirement will remain as stated.
7815	In reference to the Exhibit 3a spreadsheet tab labeled, "Technical Area 9." Is the government requiring a minimum of 2 Service CLINs in total? Or is the requirement to provide 2 Service CLINs for each of the four (4) Technical Areas provided as a part of the proposal submission?	2 service CLINs in total are required.
7816	It is possible that a NASA SEWP VI Prime Contract's NAICS applicable NAICS codes will change over the life of the contract. It is also likely that the government's requirement evolves over the life of the contract. Regarding the completed Offeror NAICS Size Standard Crosswalk (Exhibit 4), will the government add new or different NAICS codes over the life of the contract? Additionally, how will the government ask that a Prime Contractor update their NAICS codes for the NASA SEWP VI portal, to ensure they will receive all task orders that they are eligible to submit proposals under?	The mechanism is still under development. Post award, Contract Holders will be provided instructions as to the methodology for updating Exhibit 4 information.
7817	a. Is there a place for an introduction to Cat. B Vol. I REPs and index to Exhibit 1 documents? b. If yes, are there general instructions and evaluation criteria?	Introductory remarks and indices can be included in the Volume Cover page. The cover page is not evaluated.
7819	What specific details or level of detail does the government require in the description that explains how the work performed relates to the NAICS code used to compete, as noted on the SF1449?	The Offeror should provide a description that relates the work performed with the NAICS code used for competition.
7820	For Offerors submitting a proposal under NASA SEWP VI Category A, their past performance data could include tens or hundreds of contracts that have been terminated for convenience. For example, due to changing customer requirements or due to lack of government funding. Is it acceptable to list only contracts that have been terminated for default (partial or complete)?	No.
7821	Please confirm Exhibit 2 Past Performance Questionnaires previously submitted will be accepted.	Yes.

7824	<p>Would an example of the logical organization of an offeror's Technical Approach proposal response look as follows?</p> <p>Technical Approach:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Point 1 <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. summary description of their overall technical offerings and general capabilities b. scalability and extensibility 2. Point 2 <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. summary description of their overall technical offerings and general capabilities b. technological leadership 3. Acquisition Objectives <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Objective #1 b. Objective #2 c. Objective #3 	<p>There is no requirement for a detailed outlined structure. The Offeror should separately address points 1 and 2 based on the RFP instructions.</p>
7825	<p>The ITC/AV Solutions, listed in Attachment A, A.2 SCOPE lists solutions such as hardware and software products, including cloud-based solutions, installation, integration, testing, training, maintenance, and other product-based services. The RFP states that the Category A Mandatory Technical Areas as 1. IT Computer Systems / Compute Facilities, 2. IT Storage Systems, 3. Networking and Communication Equipment, 4. Imaging Equipment and Supporting Technology, 5. IT Power and Cabling Equipment, 6. Audio / Video Equipment, 7. Security and Sensor Equipment, 8. Software and Cloud Technology.</p> <p>When responding to the requirements of A.3.7.3 MISSION SUITABILITY VOLUME, (a) TECHNICAL APPROACH, should the offeror respond based on the solutions listed in A.2 SCOPE or the RFP Category A - Mandatory Technical Areas?</p>	<p>As stated in the current RFP: overall technical offerings and general capabilities capabilities in accordance with the proposed Category scope (see Attachment A-SEWP Statement of Work Section A.2. SCOPE). Additionally, the Offeror must address how their technical offerings support the first three of the Four Acquisition Objectives as provided in Attachment A-SEWP Statement of Work Section A.1. ACQUISITION OBJECTIVES.</p>
7827	<p>The proposal requirement states, "Additionally, the Offeror must address how their technical offerings support the first three of the Four Acquisition Objectives as provided in Attachment A-SEWP Scope, Section A.1. ACQUISITION OBJECTIVES." Objective 1 applies to Categories A, B, and C, as it references "hardware and software solutions and services." Objective 2 references "a suite of ITC/AV services..." which aligns with Categories B and C. Objective 3 references "a wide range of ITC/AV hardware, communications, audio-visual and related hardware, software..." which aligns with Category A. In an effort to more clearly align the acquisition objectives with offeror's unique capabilities, will the government update the requirement to Category A offerors are to respond to Objectives 1 and 3 and Category B and C Offerors are to respond to Objectives 1 and 2?</p>	<p>No. Offerors are to address all three Acquisition Objectives regardless of the proposed category. Services, products and solutions are referenced in all 3 objectives.</p>
7828	<p>Offeror NAICS Size Standard Crosswalk (Exhibit 4)</p> <p>QA # 1751 - "Include all designations within the associated cell in Column C; e.g. WOSB, VOSB."</p> <p>Question: Can this form be reissued, with Column C separated into one column per designation, for consistency for the gov't and responses</p>	<p>The exhibit will remain as stated. If there are multiple business size designations, they should be separated by commas.</p>
7830	<p>Regarding QA #2518, "The submission requirement is to combine all documentation into a single PDF file within each Volume.</p> <p>Each proposal volume shall be submitted in a single searchable Adobe Portable Document Format (PDF) file with appropriate bookmarks to at least the section header. All files, with the exception of Exhibit 3, should be converted to PDF for inclusion in the single PDF file for each proposal volume."</p> <p>This answer contradicts itself. Please clarify.</p>	<p>The current RFP prevails over old comments and responses. As stated in the current RFP there is no longer a requirement to merge the documents into a single PDF, Each document shall be submitted in a single (i.e. separate) searchable Adobe Portable Document Format (PDF) or Excel file. Each document should be placed in the appropriate folder (Volume I, II or III).</p>
7834	<p>The Past Performance examples we provide must have the same NAICS as the NAICS we choose for our primary SEWP NAICS.</p> <p>What if the work that was done is a different NAICS than the NAICS on the award docs / FPDS-NG? Or what about SubK or Commercial contracts? Can we submit something that justifies the NAICS for the work is different from the Award NAICS?</p>	<p>Yes, as stated in the current RFP: "if a NAICS code of a referenced contract or award, does not exist or match the NAICS code being used for competition then the Offeror should describe how the work relates to the NAICS code being used for competition."</p>
7835	<p>In the Past Performance Matrix, should the offeror reference all the technical areas a given contract may cover even though they only describe two or three technical areas in the past performance description since no additional technical areas are required for a given socio-economic category?</p>	<p>The Offeror should reference the representative content areas only.</p>
7836	<p>Section A.3.6(A) provides instructions for how documents should be organized and labeled, including references such as "GetItDone_Category#-EXHIBIT #" and "GetItDone_Category#-LOA #." Could you please clarify exactly which documents are expected to be included within the single PDF file for Volume I, and which documents should be separate files in accordance with these instructions?</p>	<p>There is no single PDF file. Each document should be placed in its own searchable PDF or Excel file as noted in the RFP.</p>

7839	<p>Regarding the Financial Responsibility documentation, could you provide further guidance on the following:</p> <p>A. Is there a specific minimum amount of credit or assets that must be demonstrated in the bank letter to meet the financial responsibility criteria?</p> <p>B. If a company operates without a line of credit due to significant liquidity, would a letter from the bank substantiating the liquidity satisfy the financial responsibility criteria or is a line of credit of a certain amount necessary?</p> <p>C. If an offeror is a small business and does not produce an annual report—unlike publicly traded companies—what alternative documentation would be acceptable to fulfill the financial responsibility requirements?</p>	The references to "letters from certified United States banks" and "annual reports" are example documents that could be used to demonstrate financial capability. Any information that demonstrates the Offeror's financial capability to perform the contract is acceptable.
7840	<p>Question 1925 states that the Technical Approach documents should be placed in one folder and the Management Approach documents in a separate folder, with each subfactor having its own cover pages, table of contents, list of figures, and list of tables. These two folders are then to be combined into a single Volume III PDF file (with the exception of Exhibit 5 in Excel format).</p> <p>Could you clarify how exactly the Subfactor-specific PDF files are placed in separate folders and then the Subfactor-specific PDF files should be merged into the final single Volume III PDF file?</p>	As noted the RFP states that each file should be submitted as a single PDF; therefore the Technical Approach file should be submitted as a PDF and the Management Approach file should be submitted as another PDF. Both files should be placed in the Volume III folder.
7842	<p>Per Section A.3.7(c) Proposal Volume, General Instructions, Mandatory Experience/Offerings on Page 101: All Categories: Offerors must provide separate and different experiences for their Relevant experience projects to address more than one technical area.</p> <p>Is it the Government that the Contractors Relevant Experience and past Performance be the same?</p>	No.
7843	<p>For Exhibit 3a, what process with the Government take in validating information? We are trying to determine how to organize the CLIN offerings within each Technical Area tab if we are proposing more than the minimum number of CLINS for any one provider. For example, if we provide 150 CLINs for our preferred provider, and 100 CLINS for our second provider, will this impact the Government's validation of this information that could potentially make us non-compliant?</p>	The Government will count the number of CLINs in the associated Technical Area Tab for the designated provider listed in the POC Info tab to ensure the required minimum number of CLINs are included. The Government will not review any additional offerings beyond the minimum requirement.
7844	<p>Per Section A.3.7.1 Offer Volume, (a) General Instructions, point 6. Pg 100.</p> <p>As privately owned small businesses do not typically produce annual reports, will the Government allow alternative documents such as financial statements to fulfill the financial responsibility requirement?</p>	The references to "letters from certified United States banks" and "annual reports" are example documents that could be used to demonstrate financial capability. Any information that demonstrates the Offeror's financial capability to perform the contract is acceptable.
7848	Will the Government please confirm by updating the solicitation on pages 103-105, that Offerors can reuse the same REP contract in Category B as in Category C?	Confirmed (note that this has always been a true statement).
7849	1. If a client changed the PPQ file name and already submitted it to the government within the original due date parameters (July 2024), will the government accept the PPQs, or does the offeror need to have the client resubmit the PPQ with the original file name?	The Government will accept previously submitted PPQs that meet the criteria in the final amended RFP.
7850	Will the Government please confirm, by updating the solicitation on pages 103-105, that Offerors can reuse the same Past Performance Reference (that will be used in the PPQs) contract in Category B as in Category C?	Confirmed (note that this has always been a true statement)
7851	1. Our PPQs were finished in July and our customers submitted them directly to the SEWP VI POC listed in the RFP. One of our clients marked n/r in section 5 and did not comment on the n/r rating. Is it acceptable for us to explain the n/r rating in our proposal submission, or do we need our customer to redo the PPQ? Per question #2831, Nov 02, 2024 04:44 PM.	The Offeror should request the POC to submit an updated PPQ.
7852	Would the Government consider re-issuing the RFP and or SOW separately per Category (just like the Attachments) as there is overlapping information/content between categories that may cause confusion and cause industry to protest?	The RFP clearly states when a section is for all Categories or for specific categories.
7856	1. The Final RFP in the Amendment 10, pg. 103 states: "Offerors proposing to category B and/ or C shall complete Exhibit 3b- Category B Solutions Spreadsheet and Exhibit 3c- Category C Solutions Spreadsheet..." However, exhibit 3, Amendment 8 states that "Exhibit 3(b) and 3(c) have been removed from the solicitation and should not be included in the Offeror's proposal submission." Please confirm that exhibits 3(b) and 3(c) are excluded from the proposal submission.	The referenced line was removed in amendment 10.

7857	<p>"The third category, Category C, will be focused on ITC/AV mission-based services that provide a full range of technology services inclusive of custom computer programming services, telecommunication services including network operations, ITC/AV based engineering and design services, data processing and analysis services, hosting, and related services, ITC/AV and network operation and computer facilities, ITC/AV management services, ITC/AV consulting and educational services, digital government services, and cybersecurity and security systems services."</p> <p>15 pages is not enough space to demonstrate our understanding of 10 task areas in addition to the other Mission Suitability compliance requirements. Will the Government please double the page count for Technical Approach (Subfactor A) part of the Mission Suitability volume?</p>	The RFP will remain as stated.
7859	To avoid confusion regarding NASA's definition of "related to," we respectfully request that NASA permit the use of Past Performance citations that are assigned any NAICS code listed in Exhibit 4, provided at least one of those codes matches the NAICS used for competition. Additionally, we ask that NASA remove the requirement to explain how a Past Performance citation is "related to" the NAICS used for competition. This change would greatly enhance opportunities for small business participation, as many small businesses may not have multiple contracts with the same or closely related NAICS codes.	The RFP will remain as stated.
7860	1. According to the final RFP, pg. 110: "The offeror shall provide the questionnaire provided as Exhibit 2 to this RFP for each of the above references to establish a record of past performance. The Offeror shall instruct each of its references to return the questionnaire no later than proposal submission date directly to the Government Contracting Officer via email PastPerformance@sewp.nasa.gov." However, the government responded to the question #4733 that "Exhibit 2 must be separately submitted with each Offeror's proposal." Please clarify whether offerors need to submit signed copies of exhibit 2 with the proposal, volume II. Since our PPQs (exhibit 2) were submitted directly to the government, we do not have copies.	Offerors should not submit copies of Exhibit 2.
7861	<p>A.3.7.1-6 Financial Responsibility</p> <p>RFP Amendment 10 states "Acceptable information includes: letters from certified United States banks indicating the available amount of credit for the business and the company's annual report." Please clarify if the prior quoted statement was meant as examples. Also please define "company's annual report" and if it means a company's year end financial statements are required. The latter is highly sensitive information and most companies will need a secure method of providing it.</p>	The references to "letters from certified United States banks" and "annual reports" are example documents that could be used to demonstrate financial capability. Any information that demonstrates the Offeror's financial capability to perform the contract is acceptable.
7863	RFP Section A.3.7.1 (a)(6) "Offeror is instructed to submit information which demonstrates its financial capability to perform the contract. Acceptable information includes: letters from certified United States banks indicating the available amount of credit for the business and the company's annual report." Question: To determine offeror responsibility in accordance with FAR 9.104-1(a), please confirm acceptable information includes at least one of the items listed in the RFP (e.g., letters from certified United States banks indicating the available amount of credit for the business, the company's annual report) and not all.	The references to "letters from certified United States banks" and "annual reports" are example documents that could be used to demonstrate financial capability. Any information that demonstrates the Offeror's financial capability to perform the contract is acceptable.
7864	<p>A.1.32 SMALL BUSINESS SUBCONTRACTING PLAN AND REPORTS - APPLICABLE TO OTHER THAN SMALL BUSINESS: SEWP VI does not have recommended Subcontracting Goals but in accordance with Federal Acquisition Regulation 19.704 will require prime contract holders that are other than small businesses to submit subcontracting plans at the summary level only for agencies.</p> <p>Does the Government intend that ONLY "Other than Small Businesses" provide/submit Small Business Subcontracting Plans?</p>	Yes.
7865	RFP Section IV.A.4.1. Will the Government please confirm offerors must only respond to FAR 9.104-1(a) [i.e., the Offeror is not required to provide a response to FAR 9.104-1(b)-(g) and/or FAR 9.104-2 through 9.104-7]?	Confirmed.
7867	6. # 3953, Nov 27, 2024 12:30 PM: "Technical and Management Approaches should be submitted as two separate documents within Volume III. The Proposal Submission Table specifies that the Technical Approach should be labeled as Volume III-A and the Management Approach should be labeled as Volume III-B." However, pg. 95 of the RFP states: "Each proposal volume shall be submitted in a single searchable adobe portable document format (PDF) file..." Please clarify how we are to submit two separate documents for volume III in one PDF.	As noted the RFP states that each file should be submitted as a single PDF; therefore the Technical Approach file should be submitted as a PDF and the Management Approach file should be submitted as another PDF.
7868	Regarding Categories B and C, if a company does \$50M in VAR business and \$15M in services business, the NAICS codes for services will categorize this \$65M company as a large services business. We all know this company isn't a large services business. This is why including NAICS 541519 with footnote 18 for "Other Computer Related Resources" under Categories B and C would be beneficial for small businesses successfully providing services. It allows for the VAR exception. This is how small VAR companies are able to participate in SEWP V for services business today. Please include 541519 with footnote 18 to be used in Categories B and C.	NAICS 541519 with footnote 18 is not in the scope of Category B and C.
7869	Please confirm that Meaningful Relationship Commitment Letters are NOT required between the Prime Offeror and First Tier Subcontractors within a traditional prime/subcontractor relationship (CTA).	Confirmed.

7870	If it is the government intention that Only "Other than Small Businesses" submit a Small Business Subcontracting Plan, can the Government Revise the RFP to state that clearly as it does not read the same across the RFP document.	The RFP clearly states that only "Other than Small Businesses" submit a Small Business Subcontracting Plan. See A.1.32 SMALL BUSINESS SUBCONTRACTING PLAN AND REPORTS. - APPLICABLE TO OTHER THAN SMALL BUSINESS among all other references within the RFP
7871	RFQ, A.3.7.1, General Instructions, 5. If we mention subcontractors within Volume III, any category, must we include a subcontractor management plan?	No.
7873	RFQ, A.3.7.1, General InstructionsIf we use an REP from a first-tier subcontractor, must we include a Teaming Agreement?	The Offeror should contact their Point of Contact and ask them to resubmit the questionnaire under Category B.
7874	Potential Question to Gov RFQ, A.3.7.1, General InstructionsWhen an offeror submits the proposal, should we include copies of items such as ISO Certs as images within our main proposal document, or include them within the file only?	Each document should be submitted as a separate PDF file.
7875	Recommend adding Teledyne, to include FLIR Systems etc. as a Designated Provider. In SEWP-V, Teledyne/FLIR has 49 contract holders and 955 products. It is clearly a major provider and should be a Designated Provider.	The list will remain as provided. Companies not in Enclosure 1 can be added as secondary providers or they can be added post award using the Technology Refreshment process.
7876	Potential Question to Gov RFQ, A.3.7.1, General InstructionsIf we are submitting a Relevant Experience Project (REP) from a first-tier subcontractor, can the project they provide be work they performed as a subcontractor?	Yes, per the RFP: "If the work was done as a subcontractor, then the size and work described as a sub-contractor must be only that work specifically defined in the subcontract."
7878	Potential Question to Gov RFQ, A.3.7.1, General Instructions, 6. The Financial Capability requirement references providing the company's annual report. Typically, an annual report is associated with publicly traded companies. For privately held government contractors, would NASA accept alternative financial documentation, such as audited financial statements or a letter of financial stability from a certified accounting firm, to meet this requirement?	Yes. The references to "letters from certified United States banks" and "annual reports" are example documents that could be used to demonstrate financial capability. Any information that demonstrates the Offeror's financial capability to perform the contract is acceptable.
7879	Potential Question to Gov RFQ, A.3.7.1, General Instructions, If we use an REP from a first-tier subcontractor, must we include a subcontractor management plan?	No.
7880	Will a hubzone and 8a business be allowed to bid on SB is we are awarded	Yes. All Contract Holders within that RFQ's category that meet the NAICs code and set-aside (or unrestricted) status and any other requirements of an Issuing Agency will be eligible to see the Issuing Agency's RFQ.
7881	GPO Display should be a Designated Provider. In SEWP-V it has 50 contract holder and over 1000 products.	The list will remain as provided. Companies not in Enclosure 1 can be added as secondary providers or they can be added post award using the Technology Refreshment process.
7882	Regarding The Past Performance Information Matrix, should offerors indicate all relevant areas covered within a category for each contract reference, or only those that the offeror is writing to? For example, if one project is relevant in all areas of CAT B, but the offeror is a small business and is only writing to two technical areas under CAT B for that one project, should only the two technical areas in the narrative be indicated in the summary table?	Yes.