

OASIS+ MAC
QUESTION AND RESPONSE DOCUMENT #1

Thank you for your interest in OASIS+.

In addressing questions, it is the Government's opinion that if the solicitation's position is self-evident, the response to a question may simply be that the solicitation already addresses the matter in the manner the Government intended for the subject of the question to be addressed. While the Government may include one or more specific solicitation passages in a response to a question, interested parties are reminded that section L.3 of the solicitation states, *"Offerors are instructed to read the entire solicitation document, including all attachments in Section J, prior to submitting questions and/or preparing an offer. Omission of any information from the proposal submission requirements may result in rejection of the offer."*

Questions were not extensively edited for grammar, punctuation or spelling. Not every question is shown. Due to the significant interest in OASIS+, many duplicate or similar questions were submitted. Only those questions, or portions of questions, that were frequently asked and/or those that were deemed to benefit the procurement process are shown.

Questions and responses are organized into topic areas shown below. Interested parties stand to benefit from reviewing all statements, questions, and responses.

- General
- Qualifying Project Experience
- Systems, Rates, and Clearances
- Past Performance
- Cost/Price
- Responsibility
- Section G
- Attachments
- Section K
- Section L.1 through L.4
- Section M.1 through M.4
- Symphony

This is the first Question and Response Document. Additional Question and Response Documents will be posted to SAM.gov as appropriate. It is the responsibility of the Offerors to periodically check the solicitation on SAM.gov for more information.

Q&R#	Question	Response
General		
1	Can GSA confirm the RFP is final and not a draft?	The final RFPs for all six OASIS+ solicitations were published on June 15, 2023 and are available for download on SAM.gov. The cover page for the RFPs will be amended to remove the word "Draft".
2	Is the OASIS+ portal the same as the current OASIS portal in Symphony? It appears to be.	Yes, it is accessed through the same link.
3	The government states that, "...To the maximum extent practicable, all proposal documents should be in Adobe (pdf) format, with the exception of Attachment J.P-9." Can the government confirm what, if any, individual or aggregate file size restrictions exist within Symphony for OASIS+ submissions?	The maximum file size is 20 MB, and compressed files are not allowed. If a file is too large, it may be broken up into smaller files and properly identified.
4	Within the "Projects / Past Performance" proposal asset section of Symphony, there is a field for "What is the Total Value of Other Direct and Indirect Costs", is this a required field? There is no discussion of what the validation requirements are for this data or how Offeror's responses to this item would impact credits scoring. Please clarify.	This is an optional field. This is being clarified with a forthcoming update to the OSP.
5	Attachment A, Industry FAQ states that a Pre-Award Survey (SF1408) completed by Government Officials would be acceptable supporting documentation to demonstrate an acceptable accounting system. It is a concern to find a government official who is both willing to complete the form in a timely manner and one who has the knowledge in order to accurately access our accounting system. Would the government consider a certified 3rd party to complete the form in lieu of a government official? If it must be a government official and since contractors are unable to request audits, please provide guidance on how to meet the requirement for it to be a government official.	The SF1408 is typically completed by another contracting officer/surveying activity in association with an earlier procurement. GSA will not sponsor a Pre-Award Survey of Prospective Contractor Accounting System or an adequacy determination on behalf of any Offerors for evaluation purposes. In addition, third party audits will not be accepted.
6	Does Amendment 1 include the Small Business Set Aside Competition Type? Do the updated attachments, J.P-1 OASIS Plus Domain Qualifications Matrix and Scorecards (Amd 0001) and J.P-3 Project Verification Form (Amd 0001) apply to Small Business Set-Aside?	Yes, an amendment was issued for each RFP at Amendment 0001, which included revisions to Attachment J.P-1 and Attachment J.P-3.
7	If an offeror submits their proposal prior to the September 13 final deadline and there is an amendment after our submittal date, please confirm that our proposal only needs to reflect information provided up to our submittal date, not September 13. This is supported by the OASIS Plus Final RFP Cover Letter, which states on page 3 that as of July 15, offers can be submitted.	Offerors are allowed to make changes to their offer, even after submission, until the due date for proposals. All amendments issued under this RFP must be acknowledged by the offeror, even if the Offeror has already submitted their proposal.
8	Can the Government please identify what Offeror's should put in the "CODE" and "FACILITY" boxes in 15a? The "CODE" box does not allow for the number of characters in a UEID.	In box 15a of the SF33 the "CODE" is referring to the Offeror's Cage Code. The "FACILITY" code is not required.
9	In Section L.5.8 Responsibility, the guidance for unpopulated Joint Ventures is that Section 5.7 submissions must be submitted for each member of the Joint Venture. Please confirm that this should say all Section 5.8 submissions must be submitted for each member of the Joint Venture.	Correct, this has been corrected to reference Section L.5.8. For populated joint ventures, all Section L.5.8 submissions must be submitted for the joint venture itself. For unpopulated joint ventures, all Section L.5.8 submissions must be submitted for each member of the joint venture.
10	RFP states: If the cognizant CO's signature is unattainable, the Government will accept the signature of the COR or other Government Employee with cognizance over the submitted QP. The Project Verification Form must include both cognizant CO's and verifying Government employee's direct telephone numbers and email addresses. Question: The J.P-3 form has spaces for only one government signatory. If two are required, where should we put the second one?	Thank you for pointing this out. This language will be updated in the RFP, and Attachment J.P-3 will be corrected and issued with Amendment 2.
11	If the cognizant contracting officer has retired from the government, may the government task manager or contracting officer's representative sign a completed Project Verification Form? What information should we provide under the Contracting Officer's contact information if they are no longer working for the government?	If the cognizant CO's signature is unattainable, the Government will accept the signature of the COR or other Government employee with cognizance over the submitted project. However, the project verification form must include both cognizant CO's and verifying government employee's direct telephone numbers and email addresses. Attachment J.P-3 will be updated in Amendment 2 with the appropriate format.

12	In the 8(a) and UR RFPs, Section L.5.1.3.1, in the bullet on Section L.5.8 - Responsibility, the RFP states, "For populated joint ventures, all Section L.5.8 submissions must be submitted for the joint venture itself. For unpopulated joint ventures, all Section L.5.7 submissions must be submitted for each member of the joint venture." Please confirm that the second sentence should state, "For unpopulated joint ventures, all Section L.5.8 submissions must be submitted for each member of the joint venture."	Thank you for your feedback, Unrestricted and 8(a) RFP Section L.5.1.3.1 Joint Venture ,#5 bulleted Section L.5.8 _ Responsibility, incorrectly references section L.5.7 instead of Section L.5.8. This will be updated in a future amendment to read: "Section L.5.8 - Responsibility : For populated joint ventures, all Section L.5.8 submissions must be submitted for the joint venture itself. For unpopulated joint ventures, all Section L.5.8 submissions must be submitted for each member of the joint venture."
Qualifying Project Experience		
13	L.5.2.3.4 states, "If the contract documentation does not unequivocally demonstrate surge capability, offerors may, in addition to the aforementioned contract documentation, leverage customer verification through the use of completed Project Verification Form (either from the OSP or Attachment J.P-3) signed by a CO with cognizance over the submitted project verifying surge capability." Please confirm that if the Offeror performed as a subcontractor on a federal project, then in lieu of the CO's signature, the completed Project Verification Form may be signed by a Corporate Officer/Official of the prime contractor with cognizance over the submitted project.	If the Offeror is submitting a QP for which they were the Subcontractor, then the Prime Contractor for that Federal contract would be the customer, and would therefore sign as the Corporate Officer/Official of the commercial entity with cognizance over the submitted project. Reference Section L.5.1.7.2.
14	Qualifying Project Experience FTE Calculation: Juneteenth was added as the 11th Federal holiday in June of 2021 and the maximum number of hours for FTEs was immediately reduced from 1920 to 1912. Contracts awarded since then have been at 1912 hours per FTE. QUESTION: Will the Government allow vendors to use 1912 for FTE calculations since that's the maximum number of working hours in a year now that there are 11 Federal holidays (if not for all projects, then at least for those with work done in 2021-2023)?	With the addition of Juneteenth as a Federal Holiday in June 2021, for estimating purposes under the OASIS+ RFP, 1 FTE will be considered 1,912 annual hours.
15	The RFP states "Ongoing projects with a period of performance of less than one year will not be annualized." Can the Government confirm that projects with a period of performance of under one year should use the non-annualized TCv for the Annual Value scoring element?	Correct, the Government will evaluate the total contract value for that project since ongoing projects less than 12 months will not be annualized.
16	For the "Managing first-tier subcontractors/teaming partners" scoring element, please confirm that the offeror can provide only the pages of the subcontractor/consultant agreement with the company names, contract number, and signatures, and does not need to include all the subsequent pages with contract clauses, etc.	Yes, this would be acceptable as long as it provides the information required to meet the qualification.
17	Qualifying Project Experience FTE Calculation: Juneteenth was added as the 11th Federal holiday in June of 2021 and the maximum number of hours for FTEs was immediately reduced from 1920 to 1912. Contracts awarded since then have been at 1912 hours per FTE. QUESTION: Will the Government allow vendors to use 1912 for FTE calculations since that's the maximum number of working hours in a year now that there are 11 Federal holidays (if not for all projects, then at least for those with work done in 2021-2023)?	Thank you for your feedback. The OASIS+ Acquisition Team conducted extensive research from industry surveys and customer focus groups to prepare the solicitation requirements. With the addition of Juneteenth as a Federal Holiday in June 2021, for estimating purposes under the OASIS+ RFP, 1 FTE will be considered 1,912 annual hours.
Systems, Rates, and Clearances		
18	Please confirm that third party auditor signatures certifying the adequacy of an Offeror's Cost Accounting System will be accepted. Other recent, similar solicitations (e.g., NIH CIO-SP4, GSA Polaris) expanded the current list (DCAA, DCMA and CFA) so that offerors with significant investments in their accounting systems including third party verifications are also able to claim credit for this element.	OASIS+ intends to provide highly qualified, mission-ready vendors with systems and certifications that are applicable to task order requirements. A majority of Ordering Contracting Officers will not accept third party audits. Therefore, third party audits will not be considered for evaluation credit under the Systems, Rates, and Clearances criteria.
19	1. If a company does not have a DCAA approved accounting system, will they be eliminated from consideration? 2. If a company does not have a DCAA approved accounting system, will you dispatch DCAA to audit their accounting system?	1. No, an offeror will not be eliminated from consideration, but they will not receive evaluation credit under the Systems, Rates, and Clearances capability. 2. GSA's PSHC Program Office will not sponsor a "Pre-Award Survey of Prospective Contractor Accounting System" or an adequacy determination on behalf of any Offerors for evaluation purposes. Please refer to section L.5.4.1 of the RFP.
20	The copy of our approved billing rate agreement from DCAA is marked as CUI. How do we submit items marked as CUI in the Symphony system?	Symphony (OSP) allows upload of documents marked as CUI.
21	If a vendor's accounting system is not DCAA, DCMA or CFA audited during the time of submission; however, it is audited through an independent CPA review and determined to be adequate for accumulating costs applicable to each contract or order in accordance with FAR 53.209-1(f) and Standard Form 1408 (SF 1408), would the government accept a letter of verification and signature on SF1408 from a 3rd party/independent CPA?	Third-party approved accounting systems will not be considered for credit under the Systems, Rates, and Clearances criteria.

22	<p>Would the government approve the 3rd party/independent CPA letter and completion of SF1408 without signature that can be valid at the time of submission?</p> <p>Once the finalists are notified of the award, would it be satisfactory for the winners to then complete the Pre-Award Survey of Prospective Contractor Accounting System (SF 1408) and signed by a government official prior to starting work?</p>	<p>Third-party approved accounting systems will not be considered for credit under the Systems, Rates, and Clearances criteria. Additionally, GSA's PSHC Program Office will not sponsor a "Pre-Award Survey of Prospective Contractor Accounting System" or an adequacy determination on behalf of any Offerors for evaluation purposes. Please refer to section L.5.4.1 of the RFP.</p>
Past Performance		
23	<p>Can a new SDVOSB bid on the OASIS+ contract with no past performance?</p>	<p>Yes, as long as the Offeror meets the qualification threshold and other requirements for award. Please review RFP Section M.6.6.1 Evaluation Ratings for Past Performance Submissions; 3. A "Neutral" rating will be given for a project without an associated record of relevant past performance or for which information on past performance is not available.</p>
24	<p>For the Past Performance scoring (L.5.6) - if you have multiple CPARs on a qualifying project how are they evaluated/scored? For example, if you have a CPAR for the qualifying project's base period and option period 1 would each period's scores be combined and evaluated or would only the most recent CPAR period count?</p>	<p>Please review RFP Section L.5.6.1 Past Performance (when CPARS information exists). For the purposes of this solicitation, the final CPARS rating will be used for evaluation of Qualifying Projects (QPs). If a final CPARS rating is not available, the most current CPARS rating will be used.</p>
25	<p>If one of our selected projects had a duration of 5 years (Base Year Award + 4 Option Years) but the government only gave us a CPARS for the Award and 2 option years, can we use that latest CPARS to prove a positive rating or must we fill out a J.P-6 if the last or final year CPARS did not exist?</p>	<p>Please review RFP Section L.5.6.1 Past Performance (when CPARS information exists); If the Government has interim or final ratings in CPARS for the QPs being utilized, the Offeror shall provide a copy of this rating(s) report with its proposal. For the purposes of this solicitation, the final CPARS rating will be used for evaluation of QPs. If a final CPARS rating is not available, the most current (interim) finalized CPARS rating will be used. Offerors are responsible for verifying whether finalized past performance ratings exist in the CPARS database prior to using the Past Performance Rating Form.</p>
26	<p>For the Past Performance scoring (L.5.6) - do you have to submit the most recent CPAR on a qualifying project or can you submit a CPAR for a previous period on the qualifying project? For example, if a CPAR was issued for the qualifying project's base period and Option Period 1 - can you submit the CPAR for only the Base Period?</p>	<p>Please review RFP Section L.5.6.1 Past Performance (when CPARS information exists); If the Government has finalized (interim or final) ratings in CPARS for the QPs being utilized, the Offeror shall provide a copy of this rating(s) report with its proposal. For the purposes of this solicitation, the final CPARS rating will be used for evaluation of QPs. If a final CPARS rating is not available, the most current (interim) finalized CPARS rating will be used.</p>
27	<p>If you are using a collection of task orders as a qualifying project, how will this be assessed for Past Performance (L.5.6)? For example, if Project A within the collection of task orders has a CPAR and/or completed a Past Performance Rating Form - is that sufficient to get credit for L.5.6 or do all projects within the collection need to have a CPAR and/or a completed Past Performance Rating form?</p>	<p>Changes have been made to Section L & M with Amendment 0002 regarding Collections of Task Orders.</p> <p>Please review RFP Section M.6.6.1 Evaluation Ratings for Past Performance Submissions. To calculate the Past Performance rating of a "Collection of Task Orders," the past performance ratings of each project within the collection are averaged into a single project. If using a CPARS Report from the IDIQ/BPA/BOA level or a consolidated past performance assessment using Attachment J.P-6 for a collection of task orders IAW Section L.5.6.2, the past performance rating will be calculated based on Examples 1 and 2 in Section L.6.6.1, with only the single report factored into the calculated score for the collection.</p>
28	<p>We intend to use three task orders (from one IDIQ task order contract) as our three relevant Qualifying Projects. The IDIQ contract provides only one CPAR that applies to ALL task orders under the IDIQ contract. Do we submit the same CPAR three times to claim credits for Past Performance?</p> <p>Or does the Government want a completed J.P-6, Past Performance Rating Form, for EACH task order?</p>	<p>Please review the RFP Amendment 0002; specifically Section L.5.6.1 Past Performance (when CPARS information exists), which has been revised to state Offerors may use IDIQ/BPA/BOA level CPARS that covers the individual task order(s) in the report. Offerors shall provide Past Performance documentation with each Qualifying Project submission.</p>

29	<p>Offeror was validating that our intended Qualification Projects (QP) associated CPARS were present in the CPARS Data Base (DB). In one case, our Contracting Director was unable to access it, and submitted a trouble ticket to the CPARS DB Help Desk. We received a response that "Help Desk is unable to unarchive at the request of a contractor".</p> <p>Question: Will the Government confirm it will be able to unarchive a CPAR in the CPARS BO; or should offeror obtain a J.P-6?</p>	<p>Please review the RFP Section L.5.6 Past Performance; Only in the event CPARS information is not available for a submitted project will an Offeror be allowed to submit the Past Performance Rating Form as a substitute for the Past Performance Assessment. If CPARS information is available for any selected past performance qualifying project, it must be used/submitted in support of the Past Performance evaluation.</p> <p>The CPARS Help Desk can be contacted and asked to unarchive older CPARS. Send the contract number(s) (multiple can be requested in one email) to webpmsmh@navy.mil. The process to receive the reports from the CPARS team will take anywhere from one hour to three days. If further assistance is needed, contact the CPARS help desk for assistance at (207) 438-1690.</p> <p>If CPARS Help Desk is still unable to unarchive the CPARS Report, recommend completing the J.P-6 Form for the contract/task orders with the archive issue (CPARS information is not available) and providing the copy of the CPARS Data Base Help Desk email that states "Help Desk is unable to unarchive at the request of a contractor" with the contract/task order information that was attempted to be unarchived.</p>
30	<p>Where applicable, can an offeror use Intelligence Community Contract Review Information (IC CRI) evaluations in place of CPARS? *As background, many of our intelligence community contracts have IC CRIs in place of CPARS and are considered a CPAR equivalent per the contracts. These evaluations are not captured in the CPARS database, however they are not classified and can be used as part of a proposal submission such as this. The IC CRIs utilize the same grading scale as CPARS making them applicable for the evaluation factor. Please confirm this is acceptable where applicable for Project Experience references.</p>	<p>IC CRI evaluations will not be considered in place of CPARS. Please review the RFP Section L.5.6.2 Past Performance (when CPARS information does not exist);if the Government has not finalized (either interim or final) past performance ratings in the CPARS database; or, if the project(s) is non-federal, the Offeror shall submit a Past Performance Survey using the template in Attachment J.P-6, Past Performance Rating Form.</p> <p>No other format or additional proposal documentation will be considered.</p>
31	<p>Based on the fact that our customers consider a "Satisfactory" rating to be a positive rating in CPARS, would the Government consider allowing CPARS reports with a "satisfactory" or higher rating to earn Past Performance points?</p>	<p>No changes to the past performance evaluation rating/criteria are anticipated at this time. The goal of the evaluation criteria is to encourage and provide additional weight to above "satisfactory" levels of past performance. Projects that are rated "Satisfactory" IAW Section M.6.6 are still eligible to receive credits as qualifying projects and all credits within that section (L.5.2).</p>
32	<p>If an offeror submits a Collection of Task Orders as one QP, would the government accept a CPAR issued against the IDIQ contract number, and not specifically one of the task order numbers included in the collection?</p>	<p>Please review RFP Amendment 0002; specifically Section L.5.6.1 Past Performance (when CPARS information exists) which clarifies instances where Master Contract (i.e. IDIQ/BPA/BOA) level CPARS may be used for task orders.</p> <p>See relevant excerpt below:</p> <p>If a task order under an IDIQ/BPA/BOA has an interim or final CPARS report at the IDIQ/BPA/BOA level that covers the individual task order(s) in the report, then CPARS at the IDIQ/BPA/BOA level may be used as the record of Past Performance. CPARS reports that do not cover the individual task order(s) and/or document any performance rating beyond subcontract reporting, will not be considered. In a scenario such as this or other scenarios where CPARS do not exist, see Section L.5.6.2 below and follow the instructions for obtaining and submitting Attachment J.P-6, Past Performance Rating Form.</p>
33	<p>It is very common for an agency to issue an annual CPAR against an IDIQ contract number, covering the performance of all applicable task orders for that year. This is especially common for base operating support (BOS) contracts where performance may be accomplished by hundreds of small task orders per year and issuing a CPAR for each task order is not feasible. L.5.2.1 does not allow IDIQ contracts to be used as QP. Only a task order under the IDIQ may be used as a QP. In this situation where an offeror uses a task order under an IDIQ as a QP, but the corresponding CPAR for that task order is issued against the IDIQ contract number (and not the task order number specifically), will the government accept this CPAR as documentation for claiming points under L.5.6?</p>	<p>Amendment 0002 revises Section L.5.6.1 and provides clarity in this type of situation. If the CPARS report at the IDIQ/BPA/BOA level covers the individual task order(s) in the report, then CPARS at the IDIQ/BPA/BOA level may be used as the record of Past Performance. See this section for more details.</p>
34	<p>Under L.5.6, why does the scoring matrix only allow a total of 3 points? If submitting 5 QPs with positive past performance, an applicant should be allowed to receive 5 points.</p>	<p>Please review RFP Section M.6.6.2 Credits Assigned to Past Performance Assessments; this section will explain how credits are assigned to QPs.</p>

35	If an Offeror is using a collection of task orders as one of its QPs, are we required to submit CPARS or Attachment J.P-6, Past Performance Rating Form for each task order?	Please review the RFP Section L.5.6 Past Performance; Acceptable forms of past performance assessments are detailed below in Sections L.5.6.1 and L.5.6.2. Only in the event CPARS information is not available for a submitted project will an Offeror be allowed to submit the Past Performance Rating Form, as a substitute for the Past Performance Assessment. If CPARS information is available for any selected past performance qualifying project, it must be used/submitted in support of the Past Performance evaluation. Please review RFP Amendment 0002 changes at Sections L.5.6.1, L.5.6.2, and M.6.6 which provide clarity on Task Order Contracts and Collections of Task Orders.
36	The solicitation states that "if CPARS information is available for any selected past performance qualifying project, it must be used/submitted in support of the Past Performance evaluation." Should Offerors submit CPARS evaluations that they have previously downloaded but are no longer available in the system?	Yes, there are no restrictions to offerors providing CPARS evaluations that were previously downloaded but are no longer available in the system. The CPARS must be final, and not labled incomplete.
37	Once an Offeror calculates the Past Performance rating of a "Collection of Task Orders" by averaging the performance ratings of each project within the collection, where will an Offeror document the final Past Performance rating?	The Past Performance Rating must be added by the Offeror in the core project details within the OSP/Symphony. My Company -> Projects/Past Performance -> Select the Project -> Edit Project -> Complete your Project Details -> On this screen, there is a location to input Past Performance Rating.
38	Can GSA clarify if the SB Utilization scoring should be rounded to the nearest whole number?	Please review RFP Section M.6.6.3 Credits Assigned to SB Utilization (SB Subcontracting) for Prime Contract Qualifying Projects; there is no requirement to round the SB Utilization scoring.
39	Can the government confirm that amended CPARS are to be submitted as fully satisfying the government's requirements without any pre-amended versions required?	There is no distinction between an amended CPARS, only that the CPARS must be in a finalized state (L.5.6.2 Past Performance (when CPARS information does not exist) If the Government has not finalized (either interim or final) past performance ratings in the CPARS database; or, if the project(s) is non-federal, the Offeror shall submit a Past Performance Survey using the template in Attachment J.P-6, Past Performance Rating Form. No other format or additional proposal documentation will be considered.)
40	We have a QP that is a collection of task orders, with a quantity of 64 task orders to date. There is one Contracting Officer that has been involved in all of these tasks. It is not reasonable for this individual to have to complete 64 past performance forms for each task order. Would it be possible to have the CO fill out one "Overall Past Performance Rating" for the tasks rather than have to fill out individual ratings for each of the 64 tasks?	Please review RFP Amendment 0002; specifically Section L.5.6.1 and L.5.6.2 which clarifies instances where Master Contract (i.e. IDIQ/BPA/BOA) level CPARS or Attachment J.P-6 may be used for task orders. See relevant excerpt below: If a task order under an IDIQ/BPA/BOA has an interim or final CPARS report at the IDIQ/BPA/BOA level that covers the individual task order(s) in the report, then CPARS at the IDIQ/BPA/BOA level may be used as the record of Past Performance. CPARS reports that do not cover the individual task order(s) and/or document any performance rating beyond subcontract reporting, will not be considered. In a scenario such as this or other scenarios where CPARS do not exist, see Section L.5.6.2 below and follow the instructions for obtaining and submitting Attachment J.P-6, Past Performance Rating Form. For Collections of Task Orders without records of past performance in CPARS (either at the IDIQ/BPA/BOA level or for each project), the Offeror may use Attachment J.P-6 to obtain a consolidated past performance assessment of all submitted task orders in the collection. If using this method, each task order within the submitted collection must be listed in Attachment J.P-6. Otherwise, the Offeror must complete and submit Attachment J.P-6 for each submitted task order within the collection, except for those with completed CPARS assessments. Task orders within a Collection of Task Orders without a record of past performance will not factor into the evaluation rating for past performance submissions at Section L.6.6.1.
41	Will the government access Past Performance Questionnaire forms for non-QP past performance?	Please review RFP Section L.5.6 Past Performance; Past performance will be evaluated for Relevant QPs submitted under Section L.5.2.2; non-Relevant QPs will not be considered for past performance evaluation under this section. Past performance assessments are not required or requested for any projects submitted under Section L.5.3 Federal Prime Contractor Experience.
42	Are the Past Performances exclusive for each domain?	Please review RFP Section L.5.6 Past Performance; Past performance will be evaluated for Relevant QPs submitted under Section L.5.2.2. Past Performance Rating Forms are not exclusive for each Domain.

43	For a federal subcontract, can a COR sign the Past Performance Rating Form?	Please review RFP Section L.5.6.2 Past Performance (when CPARS information does not exist); For a non-Federal project or Federal Subcontract, the Past Performance Rating Form must be completed and signed by a Corporate Officer/Official of the customer with cognizance over the submitted project.
44	The RFP states that "If CPARS information is available for any selected past performance qualifying project, it must be used/submitted in support of the Past Performance evaluation." Will the Government confirm if the most recent CPAR ratings are to be utilized?	Confirmed, as long as the CPARS Report is finalized (completed). This has been clarified with Amendment 0002. See Section L.5.6.1 Past Performance (when CPARS information exists); For the purposes of this solicitation, the finalized final CPARS rating will be used for evaluation of QPs. If a final CPARS rating is not available, the most current (interim) finalized CPARS rating will be used.
45	Please confirm that this statement in the RFP "If the Government has not finalized (either interim or final) past performance ratings in the CPARS database; or, if the project(s) is non-Federal, the Offeror shall submit a Past Performance Survey using the template in Attachment J.P-6, Past Performance Rating Form." only pertains to projects that are completed but do not have a final CPARS evaluation and does not pertain to ongoing projects where the Government has submitted an Interim CPARS?	Correct. RFP Section L.5.6.1 states: For the purposes of this solicitation, the finalized final CPARS rating will be used for evaluation of QPs. If a final CPARS rating is not available, the most current (interim) finalized CPARS rating will be used. The CPARS submitted must be finalized (completed) and not just identified as an interim or a final CPARS. This means that the CPARS must have the final signature from the cognizant Government official.
46	Section L.5.6.2 says "If the Government has not finalized (either interim or final) past performance ratings in the CPARS database, the Offeror shall submit a Past Performance Survey using the template in Attachment J.P-6, Past Performance Rating Form. The form must be completed and signed by either a CO, COR, COTR or other Government employee with cognizance over the submitted project." Page 157, says, "work performed as a "Subcontractor" means the Contractor does not have privily-of-contract with the Government, but has privily-of-contract with the Prime Contractor or another subcontractor." Given these two statements, can you please clarify what form should Offerors that have been subcontractors use to submit their past performance rating and who should sign it? Should it be the Past Performance Rating Form completed and signed by the Prime's representative (as it cannot be the CO, COTR or a government employee)?	Please review RFP Section L.5.6.2 Past Performance (when CPARS information does not exist) in entirety; For a non-Federal project or Federal Subcontract, the Past Performance Rating Form must be completed and signed by a Corporate Officer/Official of the customer with cognizance over the submitted project.
47	Can offerors submit the same qualifying projects for the OASIS+ WOSB and SB solicitations?	Yes, however, see project restrictions at Section L.4 which states: QPs and/or FEPs submitted under Sections L.5.2 and L.5.3, respectively, may not be used in more than one proposal within a single Domain and solicitation. However, Offerors may submit the same QP and/or FEP across OASIS+ solicitations (e.g., HUBZone and small business) and OASIS+ Domains (e.g., Technical and Engineering Domain and Intelligence Domain) without penalty. QPs and FEPs used in more than one proposal in a given Domain and OASIS+ solicitation will be removed from all proposals and will not be evaluated as part of any Offeror's proposal. It is the Offeror's sole responsibility to ensure that the projects submitted as part of its proposal are not submitted in any other proposals for the same Domain and solicitation. Exception: Prime contracts and subcontracts are considered unique projects, and both the prime and subcontractor may claim credit for their portion of performance under the submitted project. However, a Prime Contractor and subcontractor may not claim credit for their performance under the same project as two separate QPs and/or FEPs within the same proposal when submitting an offer as a CTA IAW Section L.5.1.3. In situations where a company submits a project they are not entitled to claim (e.g., Company A submits Company B's project), only the unauthorized company would be penalized by having the project removed from their proposal.
48	In order to claim the Past Performance rating points, do all five past performances need to be from the QPs?	Please review RFP Section M.6.6.2 Credits Assigned to Past Performance Assessments; The Offeror receives credit as follows: Three Relevant QPs with a "Positive" past performance rating receive one credit. Four Relevant QPs with a "Positive" past performance rating receive two credits. Five Relevant QPs with a "Positive" past performance rating receive three credits. A total of three credits are designated to this Past Performance evaluation factor. Offerors will only receive credit for qualifying projects with a "Positive" past performance rating.
49	This section states that past performance assessments are not required or requested for any projects submitted under Section L.5.3 Federal Prime Contractor Experience. However, this section also makes reference to CPARS, which would only exist for a Federal Prime contract. Please clarify.	Please review RFP Section L.5.6 Past Performance in entirety; Past performance will be evaluated for Relevant QPs submitted under Section L.5.2.2; non-Relevant QPs will not be considered for past performance evaluation under this section. Past performance assessments are not required or requested for any projects submitted under Section L.5.3 Federal Prime Contractor Experience. The RFP Section L.5.6 is stating the requirements for the relevant QPs submitted under Section L.5.2.2.

50	Many US Government organizations, including most US Intelligence Community agencies, do not use the CPAR System for assessing contractor past performance. However, they use Contractor Performance Evaluations (CPE), Past Performance Evaluations (PPE), and Performance Assessment Reports (PAR) that provide the same performance ratings and information. For QP's with USG agencies that do not use the CPAR System, please confirm that providing a copy of the government-issued CPE, PPE, or PAR form used by that Agency is an acceptable alternative for claiming Past Performance credit.	Please review the RFP Section L.5.6.2 Past Performance (when CPARS information does not exist); If the Government has not finalized (either interim or final) past performance ratings in the CPARS database; or, if the project(s) is non-federal, the Offeror shall submit a Past Performance Survey using the template in Attachment J.P-6, Past Performance Rating Form. No other format or additional proposal documentation will be considered.
51	Certain Federal agencies have their own past performance rating databases, such as the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation Contractor Performance Evaluation (CPE). Will the government accept these agency specific rating reports as well?	Please review the RFP Section L.5.6.2 Past Performance (when CPARS information does not exist); If the Government has not finalized (either interim or final) past performance ratings in the CPARS database; or, if the project(s) is non-federal, the Offeror shall submit a Past Performance Survey using the template in Attachment J.P-6, Past Performance Rating Form. No other format or additional proposal documentation will be considered.
52	For OASIS+ offerors performing classified work with Intelligence Community agencies, it is not uncommon for contractor past performance to be assessed through a Contractor Performance Evaluation (CPE), which is not transmitted through the "Contractor Performance Assessment Reporting System (CPARS)". This is due to the nature of this highly sensitive work. Would GSA allow offerors to use a government-issued CPE form as an alternative to a CPAR report as evidence of a past performance rating for relevant QPs (meeting the solicitation criteria under Section L.5.6)?	Please review the RFP Section L.5.6.2 Past Performance (when CPARS information does not exist); If the Government has not finalized (either interim or final) past performance ratings in the CPARS database; or, if the project(s) is non-federal, the Offeror shall submit a Past Performance Survey using the template in Attachment J.P-6, Past Performance Rating Form. No other format or additional proposal documentation will be considered.
53	Will the government please confirm that unsigned interim CPARS will not be used for scoring in accordance with Section M due to the fact that Offeror's may be contesting these scores and unable to come to a resolution before the proposal due date?	Correct, unsigned, incomplete CPARS will not be evaluated for scoring.
54	Can the government confirm that for a federal subcontract, that the subcontractor should have the prime's corporate official fill out and sign the past performance rating form?	Confirmed. Please review the RFP Section L.5.6.2 Past Performance (when CPARS information does not exist); For a non-Federal project or Federal Subcontract, the Past Performance Rating Form must be completed and signed by a Corporate Officer/Official of the customer with cognizance over the submitted project.
55	Will the government please confirm that on page 173 the phrase 'final CPARS' refers to those given upon contract completion?	Confirmed. The term "Final" in this context is a CPARS Report at the end of a Period of Performance for a requirement. See definition of Final Evaluation in the CPARS Guide: A final evaluation, in accordance with FAR 42.15, should be completed upon contract/order completion or delivery of the final major end item on the contract/order. For contracts/orders containing option periods where not all options will be exercised, a final report should be prepared following completion of performance under the last option period which was exercised.
56	For a relevant collection of task orders, will GSA please confirm that task orders with a "Satisfactory" rating will receive 3 points and task orders with a "Neutral" rating will receive 0 points in the average calculation of the task order collection past performance rating? For example, a collection of 5 task orders that includes 1 Exceptional, 2 Very Good, 1 Satisfactory, and 1 Neutral assessment would average to a 3.2 past performance rating. $(5+4+4+3+0 = 16 / 5 = 3.2)$, and therefore would be considered to have a Positive Past Performance Rating in claiming credits for L.5.6.	Please review the RFP Section M.6.6.1 Evaluation Ratings for Past Performance Submissions, specifically the example for Collection of Task Orders as neutral is not adjectival rating option (Exceptional, Very Good, Satisfactory, Marginal, Unsatisfactory), and in the example an order without an assessment would not be included in the calculation. If you are referring to a specific area within a CPARS or Past performance Rating Form that was not evaluated (i.e. SB Subcontracting) and given an "N/A", those also do not factor into the calculation. This has been clarified with Amendment 0002 in Section M.6.6.
57	Past Performance: Page 172 of 192 states, "Acceptable CPARS Period of Performance is driven by the period of performance of the QP that it corresponds to, and not when the CPARS was completed. Please confirm CPARS for the entire contract period of performance must be uploaded vs just the most recently completed CPAR (which is typically the norm).	Please review the RFP Section L.5.6.1 Past Performance (when CPARS information exists); For the purposes of this solicitation, the final CPARS rating will be used for evaluation of QPs. If a final CPARS rating is not available, the most current CPARS rating will be used.
58	If a project is being submitted as a QP as an OTA project that was awarded from a Consortium Management Group, is it possible to have the AOR sign the J.P-3 and also complete/sign the J.P-6 as the OTA project does not receive CPARS?	Please review the RFP Section L.5.6.2 Past Performance (when CPARS information does not exist); The Past Performance Rating Form must be completed and signed by either a CO, COR, COTR, or other Government employee with cognizance over the submitted project. For a non-federal project or Federal Subcontract, the Past Performance Rating Form must be completed and signed by a Corporate Officer/Official of the customer with cognizance over the submitted project.

59	Will CPARS with a "MODIFIED EVALUATION" header have any impact on the viability of Offeror's CPARS submission? If so, can the Government advise the appropriate action for Offeror's to take in order to submit appropriate Past Performance validated documentation?	There is no distinction between an amended/modified CPARS, only that the CPARS must be in a finalized state.
60	If the Offeror was a subcontractor in the relevant QP, do we have the prime contractor complete a JP-6 Past Performance Rating Form even if the prime has CPARS (which they will not share)?	Please review RFP Section L.5.6.2 Past Performance (when CPARS information does not exist); for a non-federal project or Federal Subcontract, the Past Performance Rating Form must be completed and signed by a Corporate Officer/Official of the customer with cognizance over the submitted project.
61	If a slightly older CPARS is submitted and then a new is CPARS is released prior to the proposal deadline, it has the potential to negatively impact scoring of the submission. Please establish that proposal submission is the cutoff date where we can assume GSA will use submitted CPARS even if a newer CPARS is subsequently released.	The Government Team acknowledges that a CPARS report could be filed after the proposal receipt and intends on using the proposal submission date as the cut off in determining whether the J.P-6 Form or finalized CPARS was available at proposal submission. If the J.P-6 was used to circumvent a CPARS, then the Government reserves the right to consider the CPARS information. COs can use any and all past performance that fits within the solicitation terms to evaluate past performance. (Reference FAR 15.305)
62	We have a QP with more than six months of completed performance, but the current completed CPARS in the database only covers four months of performance. Please confirm that this is an acceptable CPARS to use. (We believe this is the point of the last sentence on page 171 but would like confirmation.)	Confirmed, this is acceptable.
63	Will the Government please confirm that any Offeror's QP where the small business subcontracting criteria is rated as "not applicable" (in either the CPAR or J.P-6) does not factor into the overall average rating for L. 5.6, since the J.P-6 Rater will not rate the SB Goal performance because it is not applicable.	Please review RFP Section M.6.6.2 Credits Assigned to Past Performance Assessments; Per the visual examples, elements that are rated are averaged based on the rated elements, elements that are N/A or not applicable are not factored into the average.
64	Please advise that offerors may seek Past Performance Questionnaire reviews when only an interim CPARS exists for a completed project - due to the customer not completing a final CPARS? For example, if an offeror has an interim CPARS with a "Satisfactory" rating, will the Government accept a customer signed PPQ form in lieu of providing the interim CPARS, if the offeror can obtain a higher rating on a PPQ form than "Satisfactory", in the event that only an interim CPARS exists?	Please review RFP Section L.5.6.1 Past Performance (when CPARS information exists) ... "For the purposes of this solicitation, the final CPARS rating will be used for evaluation of QPs. If a final CPARS rating is not available, the most current CPARS rating will be used." ... With the example provided if a finalized Interim CPARS exists, then the finalized Interim CPARS would be submitted since the Final CPARS is incomplete. Only in the event the Government has not finalized (either interim or final) past performance ratings in the CPARS database; or, if the project(s) is non-federal, the Offeror shall submit a Past Performance Survey.
65	Will the Government please confirm that the term "not finalized" is referencing the state of the CPAR and is equivalent to the formal "INCOMPLETE" CPAR state, since a "FINAL" CPAR refers to the last CPAR after contract close out and can be in a "COMPLETED" or "INCOMPLETE" state?	Not finalized/Incomplete is referencing the status of the CPARS as in the CPARS System. A Final CPARS is the last CPARS at contract closeout-end of period of performance, while an Interim CPARS is any CPARS that is not the Final CPARS at contract closeout-end of period of performance; both an Interim CPARS and Final CPARS can have a complete/finalized or incomplete, but for the purpose of the RFP the most current, finalized/completed (interim or final) CPARS are requested in accordance with RFP Section L.5.6.1 otherwise RFP Section L.5.6.2 applies
66	The RFP states that "If CPARS information is available for any selected past performance qualifying project, it must be used/submitted in support of the Past Performance evaluation." Will the Government confirm if the most recent CPAR ratings are to be utilized?	Please review the RFP Section L.5.6.1 Past Performance (when CPARS information exists); For the purposes of this solicitation, the final CPARS rating will be used for evaluation of QPs. If a final CPARS rating is not available, the most current finalized CPARS rating will be used. In the instance of the CPARS not being finalized in system (Incomplete), the next current finalized interim CPARS would be submitted in accordance with RFP L.5.6.1.
67	For the past performance surveys - can we use past performance surveys collected from Polaris?	Please review the RFP Section L.5.6.2 Past Performance (when CPARS information does not exist); If the Government has not finalized (either interim or final) past performance ratings in the CPARS database; or, if the project(s) is non-federal, the Offeror shall submit a Past Performance Survey using the template in Attachment J.P-6, Past Performance Rating Form. No other format or additional proposal documentation will be considered.

68	<p>Does a company qualify for Past Performance credit as a subcontract with a Relevant Qualified Project?</p> <p>Example: Company A has a prime contract with the Government. Company A awards Company B a subcontract and PWS stating what work is to be accomplished by Company B in supporting Company's A work to the Government. The work Company B performs is consistent with the Technical and Engineering Domain and the work meets qualifications as a Relevant Qualified Project. Company A provides Company B with a completed J.P-6 with an average past performance evaluation greater than 3 (Positive Assessment). Company B as a prime offeror for an OASIS+ proposal is submitting this Relevant Qualified Project. Can the J.P-6 Past Performance for this project be considered as one of the required 3 Relevant Qualified Projects for the offeror (Company B) for past performance credit as shown in M.6.6.2 Credits Assigned to Past Performance Assessments?</p>	<p>This provided example directly aligns with the RFP and would be considered as a relevant qualifying project with a positive past performance assessment.</p>
69	<p>RFP Section M.6.6.1 Evaluation Ratings for Past Performance Submissions reads in part: "To calculate the Past Performance rating of a "Collection of Task Orders," the past performance ratings of each project within the collection are averaged into a single project..."</p> <p>Question: One of our QPs is a "Collection of Task Orders" on a single award IDIQ contract with a Federal Agency. We are planning to include approximately 20 individual Task Orders (TOs); however, only four of these TOs have a CPARS. May we provide the CPARS that are available, or must we ask the CO/COR to complete a J.P-6, Past Performance Rating Form for each of the 16 TOs that does not have a CPARS? If we are only required to provide the CPARS that are available, will we be given a Neutral rating for those TOs without CPARS or J.P-6 forms (which would lower the average score significantly)?</p>	<p>Several changes have been made to Section L.5.6 and M.6.6 regarding Collections of Task orders and acceptable past performance documentation.</p> <p>For Collections of Task Orders without records of past performance in CPARS (either at the IDIQ/BPA/BOA level or for each project), the Offeror may use Attachment J.P-6 to obtain a consolidated past performance assessment of all submitted task orders in the collection. If using this method, each task order within the submitted collection must be listed in Attachment J.P-6. Otherwise, the Offeror must complete and submit Attachment J.P-6 for each submitted task order within the collection, except for those with completed CPARS assessments. Task orders within a Collection of Task Orders without a record of past performance will not factor into the evaluation rating for past performance submissions at Section L.6.6.1.</p>
70	<p>There are multiple sections of the RFP that refer to submission of the "most recent" document, such as an FPDS or CPAR report. This definition of "most recent" appears to be open-ended, as of the moment the offeror hits "submit" on the Symphony Portal. This would require each offeror to continually monitor and refresh their documents during the proposal process. Would the Government please consider placing a limitation on "most recent", such as "most recent as of the date of the final RFP" to prevent this situation?</p>	<p>This has been clarified in Amendment 0002 to state: "...the most current, finalized CPARS rating will be used, as of the date/time of proposal submission."</p>
71	<p>This section indicates, "Acceptable CPARS Period of Performance is driven by the period of performance of the QP that it corresponds to, and not when the CPARS was completed." Our understanding of this statement means that if the Offeror had a QP with a period of performance from 2018 - 2023 and the only CPARS available is from 2019, this CPARS is acceptable. Please confirm.</p>	<p>Amendment 0002 updated language in this section.</p> <p>Please review RFP Section L.5.6.1 Past Performance (when CPARS information exists); If the Government has interim or final ratings in CPARS for the QPs being utilized, the Offeror shall provide a copy of this rating(s) report with its proposal. For the purposes of this solicitation, the final CPARS rating will be used for evaluation of QPs. If a final CPARS rating is not available, the most current, finalized CPARS rating will be used, as of the date/time of proposal submission. Offerors are responsible for verifying whether past performance ratings exist in the CPARS database prior to using the Past Performance Rating Form.</p> <p>Based on the example given, the CPARS may be acceptable if it was the most current finalized CPARS, however, the period of performance would be based on QP period of performance and not when the CPARS rating was finalized.</p>
72	<p>P. 155 states that one of the criteria for a Qualifying Project is that it "Cannot have an associated record of negative past performance (e.g. on a five point scale, average of scores <3.0)." However, page 189 states that "Zero credits will be earned for a 'Satisfactory' ... rating." Is it correct that a project with an overall Satisfactory rating meets the past performance criteria for a QP but does not contribute to points for Past Performance on the scorecard?</p>	<p>Correct. A "Satisfactory" Past Performance rating will be given to an assessment with an average rating of "Satisfactory" (e.g. =3.0 on a 5.0 point scale) across the applicable rating elements, however, will not receive evaluation credit as outlined in Section M.6.6.2.</p>

73	"For each Domain, the Offeror is limited to only five (5) QPs to achieve OP-based criteria." Since a company is allowed to submit in more than one solicitation, does this mean that the past performances have to be the same for all submissions under the same Domain? For example, a small business may decide to use 3 relevant QPs and two non-relevant ones to apply for the Unrestricted solicitation, as the value threshold is higher, but eliminate one of the non-relevant QPs in favor of a fourth relevant QP for its small business submission, which has a lower value threshold.	No, QPs submitted for past performance evaluation credit do not have to be the same across OASIS+ contract families (such as provided examples of Unrestricted and Small Business), however they must be relevant qualifying projects as outlined in Section L.5.6 Past Performance and its subsections. Relevant Qualifying Project means a QP relevant to the scope of the proposed Domain in accordance with the Domain structure in Section C.2. Only relevant QPs will be considered for evaluation credit under L.5.6., Past Performance.
Cost/Price		
74	The Government states, "The Contractor must include the GAF as a separate line item on all proposals and invoices to the Government, regardless of contract type." For responses to the OASIS+ UR solicitation, is the offeror required to add a separate line item to Attachment J.P-9 for GAF? Does this only apply at the Task Order level? Or will the Government provide an updated J.P-9 Cost template with the added line item for GAF?	GAF applies at the order level as a separate contract line item number. Attachment J.P-9 is a provisional attachment that is used to conduct fair and reasonable pricing at time of proposal for OASIS+.
75	The government provided J.P-9+Cost_Price+Template has built in formulas for yearly escalation in all year. The government even provided the escalation rate to be applied to for year 1. Can the government please confirm that intent is correct or adjust the formulas to not escalate Year 1?	Yes, this is intended. GSA is taking this approach to provide ample time for the OASIS+ acquisition team to complete offer evaluations. Once contract awards are made, Year 1 pricing will be effective.
76	Based on Section L.5.7.3.1, if the offer's direct labor rate is below the "high" dollar value provided in Attachment J.P.8, no additional information is needed to substantiate the direct labor rate. Please confirm that assumption.	That is correct.
77	Please confirm if the escalation of 4.15 percent shall apply to the first year of the contract, Year 1, in Column "H" of Attachment J.P-9 Cost/Price Template.	Yes, the first year was escalated to account for award of contracts and performance start planned in late FY2024 and FY2025.
78	Due to the length of the evaluation period, would the Government consider, for pricing purposes, a start date later than the date of submission as specified in Section L.5.7.1?	Offerors shall only propose their ceiling rates effective as of the date of proposal submission. However, the first year's loaded hourly labor rate is being escalated to account for performance start in late FY2024 or FY2025.
79	If the offeror's Indirect Cost Rates are held has Controlled Unclassified Information (CUI), does OSP accommodate of this type of information?	Yes, Symphony (OSP) allows upload of documents marked as CUI.
80	L.5.7.1.1 Context: "Offerors that propose direct labor rates higher than the "high" end of the direct labor rate range value provided in Attachment J.P-8 must submit rationale and/or documentation to support the proposed rates within their basis of estimate described in Section L.5.7.3.1." J.P-9 Context: "Sole Source T&M/LH ceiling rates for years 2 through 16 will automatically be calculated for each labor category by an escalation factor embedded in the spreadsheet. ..." Will offerors direct labor ceiling rate only be evaluated for the base year? Specifically, does the offeror need to ensure the direct labor rate's escalation in years 2-16 is under the high end of the rate range provided?	Only the direct labor rates from column C of the J.P-9 Cost/Price template and the proposed indirect cost rates will be evaluated for fair and reasonable price. The fully burdened ceiling rates will not be evaluated for contract award on the IDIQ, but will be disclosed upon award to any ordering contracting officer who holds a Delegation of Procurement Authority (DPA).
81	Is it accurate to conclude that the Direct Rates to be entered in Column C of Attachment J.P-9 - Cost/Price Template must fall within the ranges specified by Attachment J.P-8 - Direct Labor Rate Ranges? Or is an offeror allowed to propose direct rates below the bottom of the J.P-8 ranges?	The "low" end of the direct labor rate range in Attachment J.P-8 is provided for informational purposes only and will not be used in evaluation of the offeror's price proposal. An offeror only has to provide supporting rationale and/or documentation when the proposed labor rates are higher than the high end of the range. An offeror may propose rates below the bottom of the range.
82	Can the government please confirm that the Direct Labor Rates submitted on form J.P-9 will ONLY be used for sole source T&M/LH type task orders and will NOT be applicable ceiling rates for competitive task orders awarded under OASIS+ contracts?	Correct; the direct labor rates are used for evaluation of price for award on the OASIS+ IDIQ. After award, the fully burdened ceiling rates are established for T&M/LH type task orders/CLINs awarded on a sole-source or direct award (noncompetitive); therefore, the Offeror's ceiling rates do not apply to fixed-price, cost-reimbursement, or T&M/LH type task orders when adequate price competition is anticipated.
83	The instructions for preparing indirect cost rates does not indicate whether we are to assume performance at a government site or on the contractor's site. This affects whether or not we include facility overhead in our indirect rates. Please clarify whether our ceiling rates should assume government site or contractor site.	If an Offeror has multiple indirect rates for different sites/locations, then the highest rates should be used. Additional indirect rates may be added to Attachment J.P-9 as long as they are substantiated in the basis of estimate. (This will be clarified in Amendment 0002.)

84	Please confirm that if an offeror has more than one overhead rate (e.g. both corporate and client site overhead rates) that offerors may select any of the overhead rates in their cost structures as part of their proposal on Attachment J.P-9. Example an offeror has corporate, telework, and client site overhead indirect rate pools. An offeror may propose in Attachment J.P-9 using their corporate site indirect rate.	If an Offeror has multiple indirect rates for different sites/locations, then the highest rates should be used. This will be clarified in Amendment 0002.
85	Do we have to provide a Basis Of Estimate [L.5.7.3] if our rates do not exceed the High figures provided in J.P-8?	No; the Basis of Estimate for direct labor rates is only required if the Offeror is proposing direct labor rates higher than the "high" dollar value provided. Please note, however, that the Basis of Estimate for indirect cost rates is required for all proposals and must identify the methodology used in computing the organization's indirect cost rates.
86	For the pricing, please confirm that if the Offeror's proposed hourly direct labor rate (Column C in Attachment J.P-9) is anywhere between the associated direct labor rate range for the category within Attachment J.P.-8, that the offeror's price would be considered reasonable and no additional documentation needs to be provided by the Offeror. (It is understood that the Offeror must propose approved DCAA rates or rates generated from their accounting system).	Correct; the Basis of Estimate for direct labor rates is only required if the Offeror is proposing direct labor rates higher than the "high" dollar value provided. The Basis of Estimate for indirect cost rates is required for all proposals and must identify the methodology used in computing the organization's indirect cost rates.
87	Second paragraph of this section states the Basis of Estimate shall address the Offeror's basis of proposed direct labor rates and each indirect cost rate consistent with their organization's accounting system, estimating system and FPRA.FPRR/PTS or other rate agreements. Paragraph L.5.7.3.1 states offerors are only required to provide Direct Labor Rates Basis of Estimate if the Offeror is proposing direct labor rates higher than the "high" dollar value in Attachment J.P-8. These two statements seem to contradict each other. Can the Government please clarify?	The Basis of Estimate for direct labor rates is only required if the Offeror is proposing direct labor rates higher than the "high" dollar value provided in Attachment J.P-8. The Basis of Estimate for indirect cost rates is required for all proposals and must identify the methodology used in computing the organization's indirect cost rates (i.e., Fringe Benefits, Overhead, and G&A), applied to the proposed Direct Labor Rates and explain how the indirect costs were derived. The contradictory language has been corrected in Amendment 0002.
88	For the pricing, please confirm that the Offeror's proposed profit rate for Attachment J.P.-9, cannot exceed 7.5%.	This is not an accurate statement. The OASIS+ CO estimates profit under a sole-source T&M/LH-type Task Order to be 7.5 percent. However, this may be different for each Offeror. When determining profit rate, Offerors shall consider their own business factors, including the risk they would undertake under a sole-source T&M/LH type Task Order. In accordance with FAR 15.404-4(c)(5) and RFP Section L.5.7.3.2, Offerors are not required to submit breakouts or supporting rationale for their proposed profit, but the Government may consider this information if it is submitted voluntarily.
89	Are Offerors to assume direct labor rates developed and submitted utilizing Attachment J.P-9_Cost_Price_Template are for Government Sites or Contractor Site?	If an Offeror has multiple indirect rates for different sites/locations, then the highest rates should be used. Additional indirect rates may be added to the optional columns in Attachment J.P-9 (Amendment 0002 version) as long as they are substantiated in the basis of estimate.
90	If a contractor will only propose on commercial service task orders, is it still required that the J.P-9 Cost/Price Template be completed?	Yes, Attachment J.P-9, Cost/Price Template, is required for all offerors on OASIS+.
91	Section L.5.7.3 requires the Offeror to provide the basis of estimate for indirect cost rates. Where should this information be provided? Should Offerors include this information as a separate tab in attachment J.P-9 or as a separate narrative document?	This information was an oversight in the proposal format table. We will provide details for submission of the Basis of Estimate in an upcoming amendment.
92	Our company has many different business units and approved rate pools. Will it be acceptable to use different approved Forward Pricing Rates to comply with the requirements of sections L.5.4.2 and L.5.7.1.2? In other words, can the rates used to build the ceiling hourly rates in the Cost/Price Volume be different from those used to claim credit for having current verification from DCAA/DCMA under Section L.5.4.2?	Yes; however, an explanation in the Basis of Estimate to support the Indirect Cost Rates used in the cost/price template is required for all offerors and must be provided in accordance with RFP Section L.5.7.3.2.
93	Section L.5.7.3 describes the requirement to provide a Basis of Estimate (BOE), however, Section L.5.7.3.1 indicates that a BOE for Direct Labor is only required when the Offeror is proposing direct labor rates higher than the "high" dollar value provided in Attachment J.P-8. Section L.5.7.3.2 does not include that language for Indirect Costs. Can the government clarify when a BOE is required to be submitted with the proposal?	The Basis of Estimate for direct labor rates is only required if the Offeror is proposing direct labor rates higher than the "high" dollar value provided. The Basis of Estimate for indirect cost rates is required for all proposals and must identify the methodology used in computing the organization's indirect cost rates (i.e., Fringe Benefits, Overhead, and G&A), applied to the proposed Direct Labor Rates and explain how the indirect costs were derived. We will clarify details for submission of the Basis of Estimate in an upcoming amendment.

94	<p>L.5.7.3 states that the Basis of Estimate should "reflect a clear understanding of the work to be performed, the complexity of various disciplines, and professional job difficulty." It also states that the BOE should address the Offeror's basis of proposed direct labor rates, and the methodology for establishing Prime Contract direct labor rates for categories where ii does not currently have employees to fulfill the duties.</p> <p>L.5.7.3.1 , Basis of Estimate: Direct Labor Rates, states that "Offerors are only required to provide a Direct Labor Rates Basis of Estimate if the Offeror is proposing direct labor rates higher than the "high" dollar value provided in Attachment J.P-8."</p> <p>Please confirm that offerors must provide a BOE with information described in L.5.7.3 only for those categories where the direct labor rates exceed the "High" rates in Attachment J.P.8.</p>	<p>That is correct with regard to direct labor rates. The Basis of Estimate for direct labor rates is only required if the Offeror is proposing direct labor rates higher than the "high" dollar value provided. The Basis of Estimate for indirect cost rates is required for all proposals. This has been clarified in Amendment 0002.</p>
95	<p>The current solicitation states: ""If the Offeror does not have current approved rates, submit the rates generated from the Offeror's accounting system and the Basis of Estimate (BOE) will be used to evaluate reasonableness." Since most small business accounting systems do not generate indirect rates, can the Offeror submit a narrative of the rate calculations based on cost pools?</p>	<p>Yes, this may be acceptable as long as narrative identifies the methodology used in computing the organization's indirect cost rates (i.e., Fringe Benefits, Overhead, and G&A), and explain how the indirect costs were derived.</p>
96	<p>Section M.8 Cost/Price states: "If the Offeror does not have current approved FPRA, FPRR, or PBR, the Offeror's Basis of Estimate provided IAW Section L.5.7.3.2 will be used to evaluate the reasonableness of the proposed indirect rates." Please confirm that if the Offeror does have current approved FPRA, FPRR, or PBR, the Offeror does not need to provide the information requested in L.5.7.3.2, and needs only to provide supporting documentation (e.g., DCAA approval letter, etc.) showing the approved FPRA, FPRR, or PBR for their indirect rates.</p>	<p>Yes, that is correct.</p>
97	<p>Why is OASIS+ requesting indirect costs percentages, when indirect rate information is only applicable to cost-type contracts?</p>	<p>Cost-type contracts are not the only contract-type that indirect rates apply to, rather indirect rates are applicable to all types of contracts. The Government understands that cost build up is a common price development method that involves allocating all expenses (e.g., general, overhead, and fringe benefits expenses) as a means of developing a fully burdened rate to ensure that businesses are covering their direct expenses, and recovering indirect expenses that cannot be directly assigned to a particular project in totality, but are necessary to overall business operations. Pursuant to FAR 15.404-1(b)(1) contracting officers shall obtain data other than certified cost or pricing data from the offeror or contractor for all acquisitions (including commercial acquisitions), if that is the contracting officer's only means to determine the price to be fair and reasonable (emphasis added).</p> <p>Considering the particular features of the OASIS+ solicitations, the Government has determined that obtaining information other than certified cost and pricing data (e.g., indirect rates/cost build up data) to support offeror pricing submissions, is the only means by which to determine each offerors' submitted pricing is fair and reasonable. The OASIS+ solicitation requirements (e.g., requiring breakdown of indirect cost elements) are not unduly restrictive and have a rational relationship to GSA's minimum needs.</p>
98	<p>Requiring the submission of indirect costs is an administrative burden. This information is not maintained as part of the contractor's normal commercial operations. Why is it required?</p>	<p>OASIS+ is a multi-billion dollar (with no actual ceiling), complex services contract that is non-commercial (at the master contract level), allowing all contract types at the task orders level (including cost-reimbursement, Time-and-Materials (T&M), labor-hour (LH) and Firm Fixed Priced (FFP)), and includes a very broad scope spanning eight Domains. Due to this broad and complex scope, companies must be able to demonstrate adequate financial controls to manage and estimate costs in accordance with Federal Acquisition Regulation (FAR) requirements. Since, OASIS+ does not require an accounting system that is determined adequate at the contract level, ii is important that the cost/price evaluation is comprehensive enough to allow the Government to conclusively determine that pricing at the master contract level is fair and reasonable. OASIS+'s terms and conditions apply across the board to all offerors.</p>

99	It's not fair that you are making offerors submit indirect costs, because when compared to other contractors, requiring indirect cost information unfairly limits competition to some offerors who do not calculate indirect costs.	All contractors must submit the same cosUprice information in response to the OASIS+ solicitations. All offerors are on a level playing field. The OASIS+ team maintains that, based on our research and extensive experience with other multi-agency, multiple award contract vehicles including the original OASIS contracts, it is very common to request cost buildup information in support of GSA commercial or noncommercial, FFP, T&M, LH or cost-type contracts. Requesting indirect rates to perform price analysis is a practice consistent at the master contract level with the strategy utilized on the original OASIS contracts, and adequate competition was received in response to the OASIS solicitation, including adequate competition from small businesses who provided indirect cost information as required by the cosUprice submission requirements. To alleviate burden at the master contract level, OASIS+ does not require an accounting system review to be eligible for award; however, GSA still must have supporting information that demonstrates the offerors' accounting controls are adequate and a fair methodology to allow each company to demonstrate to the Government that their pricing is fair and reasonable when compared to the solicitation requirements.
100	Requiring indirect cost data is Inconsistent with Standard Commercial Practices and Requiring indirect cost data is not appropriate when the established IDIQ contemplates task orders for commercial services, so why are you requiring indirects on OASIS+?	OASIS+ master contracts are not commercial contract vehicles. A contractor may respond with, "My company only provides commercial services,"; however, the OASIS+ scope is not restricted to commercial services and offerors will not be held to differing standards at the master contract level. While commercial task orders are permitted under the OASIS+ contract vehicles, the issuance of a commercial task order is at the discretion of the ordering contracting officer. The requirements at the master level are consistent across the board and take into account the types of orders that may be placed under the contracts.
101	Why is OASIS+ requiring indirect cost data at the IDIQ level when it is unnecessary given that the contract type along with pricing will be determined at the task order level, it is not necessary to request indirect cost information at the IDIQ level?	Thank you for this perspective; however, GSA disagrees. The Government has determined that in order to ensure that all offerors are treated fairly, i.e., their pricing submission is compared to the requirements of the solicitation, so as not to prejudice any one company or compare them erroneously to another contractor who may define and price their labor category for (e.g., Business Operations Specialist) differently than another, the indirect rates are required at the master contract level to allow insight into cost drivers and fully burdened price development.
102	Requiring indirect cost data is not appropriate, where the agency envisions the "main" contract type to be Firm Fixed Price (FFP).	OASIS+ allows for all contract types - not just FFP - at the task order level. It is a complex services contract program that has a very broad scope, and offerors must demonstrate that they can perform any contract type that is within the scope of the OASIS+ master contracts. In addition, it is not inappropriate to require indirect cost data on an FFP contract type, or on any contract type. The contracting officer is empowered to make the best business decision regarding submission requirements and evaluation processes within the confines of the law after consideration of the specific acquisition strategy terms. In the case of requiring indirect cost build up data from offerors, the Government determined that the indirect cost data is necessary to make an informed and adequate price reasonableness determination at the master contract level for OASIS+.
Responsibility		
103	What defines a Professional Employee for the Professional Employee Compensation Plan.	Per FAR 22.1102 Definition: Professional employee, as used in this subpart, means any person meeting the definition of "employee employed in a bona fide ... professional capacity" given in 29 CFR541. The term embraces members of those professions having a recognized status based upon acquiring professional knowledge through prolonged study. Examples of these professions include accountancy, actuarial computation, architecture, dentistry, engineering, law, medicine, nursing, pharmacy, the sciences (such as biology, chemistry, and physics, and teaching). To be a professional employee, a person must not only be a professional but must be involved essentially in discharging professional duties.
104	In regard to the RFP Section L.5.8.3 Financial Resources: Our company is privately held and its financial statements are non-public. Can offerors submit the required Financial Resources documentation through an offeror's secure FTP site or DoD SAFE instead of the OASIS+ Submission Portal (OSP)?	Once offers are submitted via OSP, the system will create a secure private portal which all documents and corresponding communications submitted will be solely viewed by GSA staff assigned to your offer (CS/CO). Therefore, all documents pertaining to financials or proprietary information submitted will remain private. The OSP is built to handle Controlled Unclassified Information (CUI) and is a safe repository for this sensitive information.

105	Will the government please state the ideal time frame offerors should provide the three years worth of annual financial statements? Should offerors provide statements three years prior to the proposal due date of September 2023 or some other date?	Offerors must submit annual financial statements for the previous three years at the time of offer submission.
106	The solicitation states: "To be determined responsible, an Offeror must have adequate financial resources to perform the contract or the ability to obtain them." We are a newly formed 8(a) subsidiary of an Alaska Native Corporation, and are utilizing a Meaningful Relationship Commitment Letter (MRCLs) in accordance with L.5.1.4. Our financial statements will not show activity much by way of income and expenses. Question - In addition to submitting our financial statements, is it acceptable to also provide financial statements of our Parent Company to demonstrate adequate financial resources?	The financials for the parent company may be submitted along with the Offeror's financials. Similar to a Letters of Credit demonstrating access to capital, the Contracting Officer will consider this information in the determination of financial responsibility. See excerpt from L.5.8.3 - For Offerors not able to supply financial statements from the previous three years, the OASIS+ CO reserves the right to seek interim financial documentation through clarifications. Additionally, the Offeror may be required to provide letters of credit or other documentation to demonstrate adequate financial resources are available.
107	Is it sufficient to complete only the Pre-Award Evaluation Tab in the J-3 template?	Yes, per Section L.5.8.4, Offerors must review the instructions for, and submit the Pre-Award Evaluation Basic Safeguarding Questionnaire within Attachment J-3... The other tabs within Attachment J-3 do not need to be completed or submitted as part of the Offeror's proposal.
108	Please clarify whether offerors should respond to Attachment J-3 by just selecting the yes/no dropdown, or whether a narrative is also requested for each response.	The yes/no drop down will be sufficient. The narratives are outlined in the questionnaires. Post-Award will require documentation for questions which require them.
109	Reference Section L.5.8, will the Government please clarify whether a Letter of Commitment is required for every proposed subcontractor or only for those the Offeror is relying on for experience, past performance, etc.?	Per L.5.1.3.2, The Offeror must submit a Subcontractor Letter of Commitment for each proposed subcontractor. However, proposed subcontractors would only typically be identified in a proposal if the Offeror is relying on experience, past performance, etc., for their OASIS+ proposal. The RFP includes no additional requirement for submission of a subcontractor teaming agreement.
110	Should the Pre-Award Evaluation Basic Safeguarding Questionnaire tab within Attachment J-3 be saved and submitted as a standalone tab, or should the entire Attachment J-3 be submitted with only the pre-award evaluation basic safeguarding questionnaire tab completed?	Only the Pre-Award tab should be completed during the Pre-Award phase by selecting the yes/no dropdown selections. The required narratives are outlined in the questionnaires
111	RFP Language: To be determined responsible, an offeror must have adequate financial resources to perform the contract or the ability to obtain them. Given the likely differences in company size/resources among bidders across the domains and the SB and UNR tracks, can the Government please define 'what "adequate financial resources" means'?	FAR 9.104-1 establishes the requirements for determining a prospective contractor to be responsible. In this section, the FAR states the prospective contractor must have adequate financial resources to perform the contract, or the ability to obtain them. All required financial documentation must be submitted for evaluation and Offerors will be evaluated for financial responsibility in accordance with RFP Section M.9.
112	To protect the offerors' confidential information, would the Government please allow the annual financial statements and letters of credit to be password protected and the password sent to the OASIS+ CO?	Amendment 0002 provides clarifying revisions to Section L.5.8.3 and outlining the process for Offerors consisting of established CTAs to submit password-protected information required by Section L.5.8.3 (e.g. financial statements) within the OSP. However, it is the Offeror's responsibility to ensure that team members are providing the required financial documentation and explanations, as applicable. The password to access the documents must be emailed directly to OAS1Splus@gsa.gov no later than the RFP closing date with the subject line "Password - L.5.8.3 Financial Resources".
113	Will the Government accept links to an Offeror's audited financial statements available online?	No, information shall be submitted in accordance with Section L.5.8.3 through the OSP.
114	Will the Government accept a copy of the offerors Employee Handbook for Professional Employee Compensation Plan if it details the information required to evaluate the offeror's method for determining professional compensation?	Yes, this is allowable and explicitly stated in Section L.5.8.1: Submission of the general compensation practices printed in the Offeror's employee handbook including salary and fringe benefits will often be sufficient.
115	Section L.5.8 - Responsibility - For populated joint ventures, all Section L.5.7 submissions must be submitted for the joint venture itself. For unpopulated joint ventures, all Section L.5.7 submissions must be submitted for each member of the joint venture." Should all references to L.5.7 refer to L.5.8?	Thank you for your feedback, Unrestricted RFP Section L.5.1.3.1 Joint Venture, #5 bulleted Section L.5.8 _ Responsibility, incorrectly references Section L.5.7 instead of section L.5.8. This will be updated in a future amendment to read: "Section L.5.8 - Responsibility : For populated joint ventures, all Section L.5.8 submissions must be submitted for the joint venture itself. For unpopulated joint ventures, all Section L.5.8 submissions must be submitted for each member of the joint venture."
116	Can the Government please confirm the only action required to satisfy the pass/fail C-SCRM requirements (defined in L.5.8.4) is to complete the "yes" or "no" drop down options for each question within the pre-award tab in RFP attachment J-3, and that no additional documentation is required to be submitted?	Confirmed.

117	<p>Please clarify some disconnect between these sections regarding Cybersecurity & Supply Chain Risk Management.</p> <p>L.5.8.4 Cybersecurity & Supply Chain Risk Management. Offerors must review the instructions for and submit the Pre-Award Evaluation Basic Safeguarding Questionnaire within Attachment J-3, which addresses the Offeror's baseline ability to identify, manage and mitigate supply chain and cybersecurity risk and no other tabs must be completed at this time.</p> <p>On page 141 (L.4.1 Proposal Format) Cybersecurity & Supply Chain Risk Management (C-SCRM) ii states Documentation is J-3 and limited to verification document.</p> <p>Question</p> <p>Please confirm that the only deliverable at the time of solicitation response that is required is the Pre-Award Evaluation tab labeled Basic Safeguarding of Covered Contractor Information Systems Questionnaire?</p>	<p>Confirmed. Per Section L.5.8.4, Offerors must review the instructions for, and submit the Pre-Award Evaluation Basic Safeguarding Questionnaire within Attachment J-3... The other tabs within Attachment J-3 do not need to be completed or submitted as part of the Offeror's proposal. The additional tabs within Attachment J-3 pertain to post-award reporting requirements stated in Section G.3.1.13.</p>
118	<p>For a Joint Venture, is the C-SCRM submitted in the name of the Joint Venture, member companies, or both?</p>	<p>IAW Section L.5.1.3.1: For populated joint ventures, all Section L.5.8 submissions must be submitted for the joint venture itself. For unpopulated joint ventures, all Section L.5.8 submissions must be submitted for each member of the joint venture.</p>
119	<p>Please clarify that Offerors should submit the J-3 form in Excel format.</p>	<p>Confirmed.</p>
120	<p>Section L.5.8.4 Cybersecurity & Supply Chain Risk Management describes the pre-award evaluation basic safeguarding questionnaire within Attachment J-3 as limited to the verification document. However, there is no description of the verification document required beyond completing the pre-award survey tab. Please elaborate on what verification document is required for submission.</p>	<p>Section L.5.8.4 and L.4.1 state this submission is limited to the Attachment J-3 Template. Offerors must review the instructions for, and submit the Pre-Award Evaluation Basic Safeguarding Questionnaire within Attachment J-3. The other tabs within Attachment J-3 do not need to be completed or submitted as part of the Offeror's proposal. The additional tabs within Attachment J-3 pertain to post-award reporting requirements stated in Section G.3.1.13.</p>
121	<p>In response to J-3+ Cybersecurity Supply Chain Risk Management (C-SCRM Post-Award Deliverable), are contract holders required to provide a C-SCRM completed for its internal ICT? Or is this only necessary for ICT developed, provided or used under a Government contract?</p>	<p>C-SCRM plans are required for awarded contractors in order to fulfill the OASIS+ Master Contract requirement. Orders issued from OASIS+ may require additional plans from third party suppliers or manufacturers.</p>
122	<p>For- the 'J-3 Cybersecurity _ Supply Chain Risk Management (C-SCRM) Deliverables' attachment, can NIST SP 800-53 Control specific context be added to Column F of the 'Pre-Award Eval. - Basic Safegua' Tab within the 'J-3 Cybersecurity _ Supply Chain Risk Management (C-SCRM) Deliverables' attachment? If not, is there a preferred alternate comment area? We find that our customers want to learn more about how we implement security controls and can benefit from this additional context.</p>	<p>The instruction document says to attach supporting documents to the completed SCRM Plan Template by embedding documents in line. You may provide links instead if documentation is available online and accessible.</p>
123	<p>Will the Government please clarify what is meant by "baseline" in the context of the following sentence: "Offerors must review the instructions for, and submit the Pre-Award Evaluation Basic Safeguarding Questionnaire within Attachment J-3, which addresses the Offeror's baseline ability to identify, manage and mitigate supply chain and cybersecurity risk?"</p>	<p>The Pre-Award Evaluation Basic Safeguarding Questionnaire within Attachment J-3 will be evaluated on an acceptable/unacceptable basis. GSA has created this questionnaire to align with FAR 52.204-21, Basic Safeguarding for Covered Contractor Information Systems, which is incorporated into this contract in full text. Offerors are required to conform with this contract clause in order to receive an award and perform successfully on this contract. If an Offeror responds "No" or fails to submit the Pre-Award Evaluation Basic Safeguarding Questionnaire within Attachment J-3, they will receive an unacceptable rating for this element.</p>
124	<p>Section L.5.8.3 contains the following note: "Note: 1) submission of a GSA Form 527 Contractor Qualifications and Financial Information does not meet the aforementioned requirements, and 2) Offerors must NOT submit tax returns."</p> <p>QUESTION: Would the government please clarify the circumstances under which an offeror is required to submit a GSA Form 527?</p>	<p>Offerors are not required to submit the GSA Form 527 as part of the OASIS+ solicitation, in any circumstance.</p>
125	<p>Will the Government please clarify who will be given access to company Financial Statements and confidential information requested for submission of this proposal?</p>	<p>Financial statements submitted in response to any of the OASIS+ RFPs will not be made available to the public, and will only be made available to those Government personnel evaluating OASIS+ proposals.</p>
126	<p>Will the Government please clarify who has access to company Financial Statements after the proposal evaluation and award?</p>	<p>After award, financial statements submitted in response to any of the OASIS+ RFPs will be securely stored in an electronic contract management system.</p>

127	In Section L.5.8.3, the solicitation states that "The Offeror must submit annual financial statements for the previous three years, (audited if available)." Further in Section L.5.8.3, the solicitation states that "For Offerors proposing as a populated joint venture, all Responsibility submissions must be submitted for the joint venture itself." Please confirm that financial statements may be from individual members of a populated joint venture if the joint venture has not been in operation for three years.	For Offerors proposing as a populated joint venture, all Responsibility submissions must be submitted for the joint venture itself. For unpopulated joint ventures, all Responsibility submissions must be submitted for each member of the joint venture. For Offerors not able to supply financial statements from the previous three years, the OASIS+ CO reserves the right to seek interim financial documentation through clarifications. Additionally, the Offeror may be required to provide letters of credit or other documentation to demonstrate adequate financial resources are available. In your example, Joint Venture member financials may be submitted for consideration when the CO is making a determination of financial responsibility.
128	If the offeror's 2022 annual audit has still not been finalized by the submission date, would it be acceptable to submit draft financial statements for 2022?	A draft may be submitted and accepted contingent the draft contains ALL the financials required for 2022, in addition to the previous two years financials. If inadequate, the draft in addition to the previous three years will be required.
129	Please confirm that, if the offering entity is an unpopulated JV, it is not required to submit financial documents in its own name. Rather only the members of unpopulated JV are required to submit.	Confirmed. For unpopulated joint ventures, all Responsibility submissions must be submitted for each member of the joint venture.
130	If a mentor protege joint venture has not been in existence for three years, let alone one year, should the populated joint venture (offeror) provide financial statements for the last three years from each joint venture partner?	SBA revised its regulations in 2016 to prohibit populated joint ventures as mentor-proteges. Therefore a mentor-protege joint venture would be considered an unpopulated joint venture.
131	In a Contractor Teaming Agreement relationship, is only the prime required to provide the requested information?	For Offerors proposing as a populated joint venture, all Responsibility submissions must be submitted for the joint venture itself. For unpopulated joint ventures, all Responsibility submissions must be submitted for each member of the joint venture.
132	Ref. L.5.7.3, in lieu of submitting annual financial statements for the previous three (3) years, will the Government accept a) a certified letter from a third-party accountant attesting to the offeror's adequate financial resources to perform the contract, or the ability to obtain them, or b) a certification from the contractor that it has adequate financial resources to perform the contract, or the ability to obtain them?	No, the Offeror must provide the requested financial information in accordance with Section L.5.8.3.
133	Please confirm that any required copies of the line of credit would be requested after the initial proposal submission?	Offerors without three years of financial statements are encouraged to provide this information with their initial proposal submission; however, as per the RFP, the CO reserves the right to seek interim financial documentation (such as lines of credit) through clarifications.
134	Can the Government please confirm as to whether salaries corresponding to Attachment J.P-9 are required to be made a part of an Offeror's Professional Employee compensation plan?	Offeror must submit a Professional Employee Compensation Plan that addresses the Offeror's methodology for determining salaries and fringe benefits for their professional employees in preparation of future task orders. The proposed rates in Attachment J.P-9 are not required to be a part of this plan.
135	A large component of offerors will likely be private companies, all of which may not have third-party audited financial statements compared to publicly-owned and traded companies. Would the Government confirm that it will accept non-audited financial statements such as internal financial statements or a statement of financial position, so as to not unnecessarily limit competition on this basis?	If audited financial statements are not available, the Offeror may submit non-audited financial statements IAW Section L.5.8.3.
136	Please confirm that, if the offering entity is an unpopulated JV, it is not required to submit financial documents in its own name. Rather only the members of unpopulated JV are required to submit.	Confirmed. For unpopulated joint ventures, all Responsibility submissions must be submitted for each member of the joint venture.
137	This Section states that an Offeror must submit annual financial statements for the previous three years, (audited if available). At a minimum, each financial statement must consist of a balance sheet which will disclose assets, liabilities and stockholder equity which are used to assess net worth; and an income statement which discloses net sales and expenses that are used to evaluate a business's profitability. Note: 1) submission of a GSA Form 527 Contractor Qualifications and Financial Information does not meet the aforementioned requirements. If the GSA Form 527 Contractor Qualifications and Financial Information does not meet the requirements to demonstrate adequate financial resources, what documentation is specifically required?	The Offeror must submit annual financial statements for the previous three years as required by Section L.5.8.3. Please be advised the GSA Form 527 is not required.

138	Section L.5.8.3 Financial Resources states that offerors must submit "annual financial statements for the previous three years, (audited if available)." For Joint Ventures that have existed for less than 3 years by the time of submission, how should the offeror indicate that to the government so as not to be mistakenly marked as noncompliant for not providing three years of financial statements?	For unpopulated joint ventures, all Responsibility submissions must be submitted for each member of the joint venture. This means that each member of the joint venture must submit annual financial statements for the previous three years, along with an explanation for any negative financial information disclosed, including negative equity or income.
139	Our company's financial statements are on a traditional calendar year basis which runs from January 1 to December 31 each year. For the purposes of this proposal, please confirm that given our situation, the government would be expecting annual financial statements for the 2020, 2021 and 2022 calendar years. Therefore, we would not be submitting any year-to-date 2023 (i.e., January 1 to date) financial information since the 2023 calendar year is not yet complete?	Confirmed.
140	Due to the sensitive nature of the required documents needed to fulfill the Financial Resources requirement, request the Government allow Offerors to submit the Financial Resources volume via email directly to the Contracting Officer (CO) rather than submitting via the Symphony portal? If so, please provide contact information for the responsible CO. If not, is there another alternative to safeguard the Offeror's sensitive information?	At this time, all documents must be submitted via the OSP. Financial statements submitted in response to any of the OASIS+ RFPs will NOT be made available publicly, and will solely be made available to those Government personnel directly involved in the OASIS+ contract process. Further guidance regarding the password/encrypted submissions will be outlined in Amendment 0002 for Offerors submitting proposals in Contractor Teaming Arrangements.
141	Please confirm that Offerors do not need to provide a MRCL if they are only providing financial statements from a Parent Company/Affiliate/Division/Subsidiary and they are not utilizing resources in regards to scored evaluation elements including QPs, FEPs, past performance, system(s), certifications, and/or clearances from a Parent Company, Affiliate, Division, and/or Subsidiary.	Correct. In this case, a MRCL will not be required.
142	In response to Section L.5.7.3 titled "Financial Resources," if required to submit financial statements, will the Government accept redactions of proprietary audited financials or marking them as proprietary/trade secrets information exempt from further disclosure?	Offerors must provide unredacted copies of financial statements.
143	Can the government clarify that SBA Mentor-Protege Joint Venture, all Section L.5.8 submissions must be submitted for each member of the SBA Mentor-Protege Joint Venture?	If unpopulated, all section L.5.8 submissions will be required for each member of the SBA M-P JV
Section G		
144	Will the government please explain how to obtain proof of a DCM accounting system given that the DCCA website (https://www.dcaa.mil/Small-Business/Small-Business-Presentations/Accounting-System-Requirements/) states that "there is no such thing as a DCM approved government accounting system"?	An accounting system review is not a requirement for award on OASIS PLUS. True. DCM does not "approve" accounting systems. DCM "reviews" a company's accounting systems for "adequacy" and compliance with CAS (and GMP) standards. DCM provides a report of adequacy or inadequacy following their review of a contractor's accounting system, and the CO "approves" or accepts the accounting system as being compliant for the purposes of their specific contract. The CO relies on the DCM review of the accounting system (among other information) in making their determination. If your company does not have a contract that meets the requirement for an accounting system review, then there is no sponsorship or "need" for the review to take place. Reviews are costly to the government and the contractor and will be sponsored only when required by the contract action. On OASIS+, the task order CO will make the determination as to whether an accounting system review is required for their specific requirement.
Attachments		
145	Please confirm: offerors are to complete tab: "Pre-Award Eval. - Basic Safegua" [and not complete tab: "Post-Award Deliverable - C-SCRM"]. To complete tab: "Pre-Award Eval. - Basic Safeguard": 1. Offeror is to complete the gray shaded cells: Sections 1.1-1.4. 2. Are offerors required to respond to Sections 2-7? If so, where should we enter the responses?	See Section L.5.8.4: Offerors must review the instructions for, and submit the Pre-Award Evaluation Basic Safeguarding Questionnaire within Attachment J-3, which addresses the Offeror's baseline ability to identify, manage and mitigate supply chain and cybersecurity risk. The other tabs within Attachment J-3 do not need to be completed or submitted as part of the Offeror's proposal. The additional tabs within Attachment J-3 pertain to post-award reporting requirements stated in Section G.3.1.13. The Pre-Award Evaluation Basic Safeguarding Questionnaire within Attachment J-3 will be evaluated on an acceptable/unacceptable basis.
146	DFAR Clause 252.219-7003, Small Business Subcontracting Plan is incorporated by reference and by full text however, this clause is not applicable per RFP section L.5.1.8, Subcontracting Plan Submissions Required for OTSBs Only. Will this clause be removed from the SDVOSB RFP?	The character limit for the narrative statement is 1000 characters; however, the Project Verification Form erroneously called out 750 characters. This has been updated in Amendment 1. The character limit includes spaces.

147	The RFP says for a domain narrative statement - "not to exceed 1,000 characters, including spaces, per Domain" and yet the J.P-3 form still says "Not to exceed 750 characters per Domain". Is it safe to assume it's 1,000 characters per the RFP?	Thank you for your feedback. We will take this into consideration.
148	Please explain the relationship between domains and additional functional areas, especially in regards to how the additional functional areas fit into Technology and Engineering.	Attachment J.P-5 has been revised with Amendment 0002 to provide more robust instructions to offerors. J.P-5 details distinct functional areas and sub-areas for the purpose of claiming evaluation credit for "Integrated Experience" in accordance with Section L.5.2.3.3. With the exception of the Enterprise Solutions Domain, each Domain in Section 1 of this document is considered a distinct functional area and is also included in Section C of the solicitation. Additional functional areas that are not currently included in this solicitation are detailed in Section 2 of this document. See the first page of the amended J.P-5 for additional instructions and examples.
149	Do we need to submit J5 with our bid proposal	No, this applies to task orders issued post-award, as applicable.
150	Do we need to submit J4 with our bid proposal?	No, this is not a proposal submission element. Ref Section 1.1.1: For DoD Task Orders issued under this Master Contract, provisions and clauses from the DoD FAR Supplement (DFARS) have been incorporated into the Master Contract Section J, Attachment J-4 Department of Defense Required Provisions and Clauses for Task Orders. If applicable, the OCO may utilize the Attachment J-4 to ensure the required DFARS provisions and clauses will flow down to the Task Order Level.
151	"Providing services in support of 3 or more distinct Federal Agencies." In the case of organizations such as the Department of Health and Human Services and National Institutes of Health (NIH), which are made up of various subordinate organizations (i.e., NIH consists of 27 Institutes and Centers such as the National Cancer Institute, the Fogarty International Center, and the National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases) with each having their own procurement authority, please confirm that each individual organizational element qualifies as a distinct Federal government agency.	Reference Section L.5.3.2 which states: If claiming credit for this qualification, the Offeror may submit FEPs demonstrating experience working with three or more unique Federal Government Customers. A Federal Government Customer is determined by the Funding Agency ID identified within the FPDS Report. For example, one project with Funding Agency ID 4732 (GSN Federal Acquisition Service) and another project with Funding Agency ID 2100 (Department of the Army) would qualify as two Federal Government Customers. Submitting projects with Funding Agency ID 4732 would only qualify as one Federal Government Customer and the second project with the same Funding Agency ID would not meet the requirements of this section for additional credits. To be considered under this qualification, the FEP must have been funded; Indefinite Delivery Vehicles (IDVs), BPAs, and IDIQ submissions whose only funding reflects the minimum guarantee under the IDIQ will not be considered.
152	Will the Government clarify whether Joint Venture Offerors must complete and submit column 2 (e.g., Work Done) Attachment J.P-7, Joint Venture Work & Qualifications Template, detailing the work done related to the domain they are bidding rather than all work done by the company?	Yes, joint venture offerors must complete Column 2 (e.g. Work Done) and detail the general work done/performed by the company as a whole, not just related to the Domain.
153	When providing verification of the Average Annual Value of relevant work within a QP using the Attachment J.P-3, will the Government please confirm that a statement, certified by the Customer, that relevant work supporting the Domain meets or exceeds the minimum domain threshold dollar value is sufficient? Rationale: in many instances, it is difficult to attribute an exact dollar figure representative of domain-relevant work based on contract CLIN structures and funds reporting.	Yes, the offeror can rely on Attachment J.P-3 to demonstrate/verify that a qualifying project meets or exceeds the minimum average annual value of relevant work performed.
154	Will the government consider adding PSC code R431 under the Small Business Set Aside Management & Advisory Domain?	Thank you for this feedback. While this PSC appears to be related to NAICS Code 541612, this PSC is not being selected for automatic relevance. Automatic relevance NAICS Codes and PSCs were selected based on a high confidence level of those contracts/orders being automatically relevant to each Domain. This PSC will likely be considered for automatic relevance for the future Human Capital Domain in Phase 2 Domain additions.

155	<p>Text Asking About: "I. Master Contract Attachments... Categories and Bureau of Labor Statistics Standard Occupational Classifications; J-2 Transactional Data Reporting (TDR) and Contract Access Fee (GAF); J-3 Cybersecurity & Supply Chain Risk Management (C-SCRM) Deliverables; J-4 Department of Defense Required Provisions and Clauses for Task Orders"</p> <p>Question: Confirming that GSA's intent behind inclusions of Attachments J-1 to J-4 is for the offeror's informational awareness as these items would be dealt with in the future at the task order level? In other words, there is no action regarding these items required to completing the bid/response to this solicitation for consideration of award for an on-ramp to the OASIS+ vehicle?</p>	<p>Attachments J-1, J-2, and J-4 apply post-award and there is no proposal submission element associated with these three attachments.</p> <p>Per Section L.5.8.4, Offerors must review the instructions for, and submit the Pre-Award Evaluation Basic Safeguarding Questionnaire within Attachment J-3, which addresses the Offeror's baseline ability to identify, manage and mitigate supply chain and cybersecurity risk. The assessment addresses how hardware, software, firmware/embedded components and information systems are protected from component substitution, functionality alteration, and malware insertion while in the supply chain; and identifies how the Offeror will maintain a high level of cybersecurity and SCRM readiness for performance of IT services to Federal customers. The other tabs within Attachment J-3 do not need to be completed or submitted as part of the Offeror's proposal. The additional tabs within Attachment J-3 pertain to post-award reporting requirements stated in Section G.3.1.13.</p>
156	<p>For Joint Venture (JV) submissions, must each member of a JV complete and submit the J-3 Cybersecurity Supply Chain Risk Management (SCRM) Deliverables spreadsheet?</p>	<p>Yes. See Section L.5.1.3.1 which states:</p> <p>Section L.5.8 - Responsibility - For populated joint ventures, all Section L.5.8 submissions must be submitted for the joint venture itself. For unpopulated joint ventures, all Section L.5.8 submissions must be submitted for each member of the joint venture.</p>
157	<p>Should all team members complete this Attachment J-3, or only the Prime offeror? For Unpopulated Joint Ventures, should all team members complete and submit this form, or only Managing Members of the JV?</p>	<p>For unpopulated joint ventures, all Section L.5.8 submissions must be submitted for each member of the joint venture.</p> <p>For Offerors with proposed subcontractors, the Pre-Award Evaluation Basic Safeguarding Questionnaire must be submitted only for the Offeror.</p>
158	<p>The J-3 references NIST SP 800-53 which is for the Government to comply with for their systems. Contractors are required to be NIST SP 800-171 compliant if not touching federal systems. Please confirm that NIST SP 800-171 compliance is sufficient for questions about NIST SP 800-53.</p>	<p>NIST SP 800-171 references have been added to J-3 with Amendment 0002, and appendix D of NIST 800-171 contains NIST 800-53 activities to fulfill the 800-171 requirements.</p>
159	<p>Similar to an ISO-9000 standard of practice, IS-BAO is specifically formulated for business aviation and accepted worldwide as the benchmark for safety and efficiency in business aircraft operations. Hundreds of operators on all continents around the world have adopted IS-BAO as the definitive standard for flight operations. Will the GSA accept IS-BAO certification in lieu of ISO 9001:2015 certification?</p>	<p>At this time GSA will not accept any alternatives to the ISO certifications which are not IAW section L.5.5.</p>
160	<p>If a company does not have ISO 9001:2015 certification for quality management, will the Government accept IS-BAO certification? In the same way that ISO 9000 specifies requirements for a quality management system overseeing the production of a product or service, IS-BAO is a similar standard developed for flight operations. IS-BAO is a standard for the management of risk in flight operations-including maintenance-how those risks will be assessed and the process of implementing changes to reduce the risks to as low a level as reasonably achievable.</p>	<p>At this time GSA will not accept any alternatives to the ISO certifications which are not IAW section L.5.5.</p>
161	<p>Reference: J.P-3, Project Verification form, states that IAW L5.1.7.1 the KO or COR must sign off as customer certification on our QP. However, L5.7.1 states that any combination of the following documents can verify claimed credits: 1.) FPDS Report, 2.) SOW, 3.) Signed Contract award with all supporting documentation, 4.) Project Verification Form. 5) Contract's Sec B, 6.) Any other contractual documents.</p> <p>Question: J.P-3 states any combination of documents ((does 1 suffice?)) verifies claimed credits, if we submit FPDS or CPARS will that suffice? Also, will that negate the COR/KO signature requirement?</p>	<p>Offerors shall use the options at Section L.5.1.7 to demonstrate claimed credits for projects, as applicable. In situations where project documentation cannot be submitted due to security classification (i.e. Contract, SOW, PWS, FPDS Report, etc.), Attachment J.P-3 is the only method available which requires signature by a CO with cognizance over the submitted project. If the cognizant CO's signature is unattainable, the Government will accept the signature of the COR or other Government Employee with cognizance over the submitted QP. Similar language is also included in Section L.5.1.7.2 for non-federal contracts." CPARS will be accepted for past performance evaluation and credits.</p>
162	<p>In relation to the J.p-1, Scorecard Matrix, lines 7 and 8, what defines a "distinct federal agency"? For example, is the National Institutes of Health considered a distinct federal agency or would they be considered part of the Department of Health and Human Services?</p>	<p>Distinct Federal Agency is defined as a specific agency within an organization/department. i.e. Department of Defense (DCMA - distinct agency), Department of Justice (Federal Bureau of Investigation - distinct agency).</p>

163	Do all the qualifying projects have to fall under the same NAICS code or can we have different qualifying projects using different NAICS codes provided they fall under the same domain?	Please be advised, projects should fall under the NAICS Codes and PSCs, which the Government can determine with a high level of confidence, that will be automatically relevant to the proposed Domain with no further analysis or supporting documentation required. However, an offeror may provide documentation to support relevance for projects that fall outside of the project NAICS or PSC codes outlined in Attachment J.P-4 as long as the Offeror can demonstrate its relevance within the submitted project documentation (SOW, PWS, CLINs, etc) or Attachment J.P-3, Project Verification Form.
164	Will the Government clarify whether an Offeror should document the Total Funded dollars and the Total Contract Value in the J.P-3 PROJECT VALUE Section depending on whether the contract is completed or ongoing?	Per Section L.5.2.1, for completed projects, value is determined by the total funded dollars (i.e., total obligated value for Federal Government or Commercial Contracts, as applicable). Completed projects with a period of performance of less than one year will not be annualized. For ongoing projects, value is determined based on the total estimated value (value inclusive of all option periods, regardless of completed/funded status; i.e., total contract value for Federal Government or Commercial Contracts as applicable). Ongoing projects with a period of performance of less than one year will not be annualized. Therefore, both should be included. There is only one area on J.P-3 to include the total contract or order value.
165	The Intelligence domain does not include any auto-relevant NAICS codes. Please provide auto-relevant NAICS codes for the Intelligence Domain.	Please be advised, due to the type of work performed in the Intelligence Domain, it generally includes work in multiple disciplines and is not associated with a specific NAICS Code. While there are predominant NAICS codes used in this industry, there is no intelligence-specific NAICS code which can be used to automatically determine relevance of an intelligence project.
166	FPDS reflects prime contract data only. Offerors submitting subcontract projects as QP need another way to provide verifiable PSC and NAICS codes assigned to these projects for verifiable auto relevant data. Will the government accept a statement from the QP prime contractor attesting to the NAICS and PSC codes assigned to their prime contract and flowed down to the subcontract agreement? If acceptable, where in the proposal response should this be provided?	A subcontractor performing under the Prime for a Federal Government contract must use Attachment J.P-6, Past Performance Rating Form, when CPARS did not exist to earn credit for past performance under Section L.5.6. for those QPs that meet relevancy. For Federal Subcontract, the Past Performance Rating Form MUST be completed and signed by a Corporate Officer/Official of the customer with cognizance over the submitted project validating the flow down. The Past Performance Rating Form must include the Rating Official's POC information with a direct telephone number and direct email address. Furthermore, documentation clearly outlining business relationship between prime and subcontractor must likewise be submitted for verification.
167	In the Q&A released dated 03-14-2023. Question 151 asks: "If a project/contract was created under one NAICS code but work performed on the contract falls under another NAICS code, can the contractor have the CO or other officiating officer fill the project verification form to provide proof/verification on the proposed NAICS?" The answer provided was yes. Is there another means to verify the NAICS for work actually performed if it differs from what was originally created? Back in the original OASIS RFP, there was an actual form that GSA provided. E.g., for Pool 1, it was titled: OASIS SMALL BUSINESS SOLICITATION ON-RAMP (POOL 1) SOLICITATION NO. GS00Q-13-DR-0002 SECTION J.15. ATTACHMENT (15) This form was essentially a NAICS Code change letter. Is there a similar form this time, or do we just use the project verification form? Alternatively, if we are using the same qualified experience for OASIS+ that we used for the most recent OASIS on-ramp (within period of relevancy), can we just use that (GSA-provided) form previously signed by the KO as justification for the project NAICS code for the OASIS+ effort?	Attachment J.P-3 is the only method available which requires signature by a CO with cognizance over the submitted project. If the cognizant CO's signature is unattainable, the Government will accept the signature of the COR or other Government Employee with cognizance over the submitted QP. Similar language is also included in Section L.5.1.7.2 for non-federal contracts." CPARS will be accepted for past performance evaluation and credits.
168	The government has not included NAICS 611430 in their list of auto-relevant NAICS codes for the Management & Advisory Domain. This NAICS refers to an industry that comprises establishments primarily engaged in offering an array of short duration courses and seminars for management and professional development. The industry includes continuing education online learning marketplace services, continuing education seminars or conferences, continuing education training online, and management development training. Would the government consider including this NACIS in the list of auto-relevant NACIS codes for the M&A Domain?	The NAICS code in question 611430 is not auto relevant under Management & Advisory Domain due to HCATS domain which is not currently available, however, will be incorporated in the phase II (near future). Thank you for the feedback.

169	There are no instructions in the RFP on what these mean or how to support credit for these items. Please define what SPOT, SOFA and ACSA mean and what work is considered relevant for Specialized Functional Experience.	SPOT = Synchronized Predeployment and Operational Tracker SOFA = status-of-forces agreements ACSA = acquisition cross-servicing support agreement
170	Classified contracts not having an FPDS record will not have an assigned PSC Code. For the "PROJECT NAICS/PSC Code" field within Attachment J.P-3 Project Verification Form, can the offeror list just the NAICS code and not the PSC Code?	Yes, the Offeror may submit the completed Project Verification Form (either from the OSP or Attachment J.P-3) signed by a CO with cognizance over the submitted project verifying the designated PSC Codes. The Project Verification Form must be validated and signed by a CO with cognizance over the submitted project. If the cognizant CO's signature is unattainable, the Government will accept the signature of the COR or other Government Employee with cognizance over the submitted project. The Project Verification Form must include both cognizant CO's and verifying Government Employee's direct telephone numbers and email addresses.
171	Can the government confirm if bidders are advantaged or disadvantaged or scored differently by submitting offers with any of the following: GSA CTA, Joint Venture (JV), or Prime/Sub teaming arrangements?	GSA cannot confirm whether there are advantages or disadvantages, given that each offer is evaluated separately and awarded on their own merits. However, Proteges solely in a MPJV need only meet 50 percent of the applicable Domain QP or FEP Minimum Average Annual Dollar Value and QP - Scale Thresholds. Moreover, this reduced threshold does not apply to projects submitted in the name of the offering MPJV entity itself, just those projects that are submitted in the name of the protege itself. L.5.2.1
172	The labor categories listed indicate the number of years' experience required. The minimum education levels are not indicated for each labor category. 1. Are there any minimum education levels applicable for each labor category? 2. May the Offeror substitute the number of years' experience with education levels? Examples, (a) 3 years' experience substituted by a Bachelor's degree, (b) 3 to 10 years' experience substituted by an Honor's degree, (c) 10 years' experience with a Master's degree.	Thank you for the feedback, unfortunately, there is no minimum educational requirements at the master contract level. However, ordering agencies, may require and/or accept educational or experience substitutions.
173	This row should have a Max of 5 Credits, not 4, according to the instructions as written. Please correct the scoring matrix.	Scoring matrix is correct, a maximum of 4 is intended due to only 4 QPs are to be evaluated for scoring. L.5.2.2 states The Offeror may submit a maximum of five distinct QPs for each Domain, except the Enterprise Solutions Domain where an Offeror may submit a maximum of four (4) distinct QPs.
174	Is the intent of the QP Minimum average annual for each domain to list the \$500k minimum?	Yes, it is the intent for the minimum average annual for each domain, however, the dollar value varies per domain e.g. Facilities (SB) is \$250K and (UN) is \$500k.
175	Would the Government please consider and add Solid Waste Management as a functional area under the Environmental Domain?	Solid waste management is included within the scope of the Facilities Domain and not the Environmental Domain. This is evidenced by the inclusion NAICS 562111 and "Waste management & recycling services" in Section C.2.7 and C.2.7.1.
176	Supply Chain Risk Management is a broad topic that can cover hardware components, software development, and cybersecurity. The deliverable instructions mention SCRUM but the template states (C)ybersecurity - SCRUM. Some of the questions in the template typically relate to manufacturing or purchasing components such as 1.2 and 2.2. Is the SCRUM plan that we provide supposed to focus on cyber and if so do the questions related to hardware fabrication and manufacturing apply?	Some orders may require equipment purchases in order to perform the IT Services that are in scope of the project. In these circumstances, GSA wants to ensure that OASIS+ contractors have appropriate practices in place.

177	What defines 1st and 2nd Tier ?	<p>For each QP submitted under L.5.2.2, if "QP - Scale" is included within the proposed Domain Qualifications Matrix (see Section M.7), the Offeror may claim credits for each QP that meets or exceeds the stated Domain thresholds for:</p> <p>Average Annual Project Value, or Employment of FTEs (where applicable)</p> <p>Qualifying Projects submitted in the name of the protege must only meet or exceed 50 percent of the "QP-Scale" value specified within Attachment J.P-1. This reduced threshold does not apply to projects submitted in the name of the offering MP-JV entity itself.</p> <p>As you'll notice in Attachment J.P-1, each scorecard includes two scale thresholds. For example: T&E SB/SE states:</p> <p>Offeror receives 1 credit for each QP that demonstrates any one of the following: _Average annual value \$1 Mor 5 FTEs _Average annual value \$4M or 20 FTEs (this credit is in addition to the credit for \$1M / 5 FTEs)</p> <p>The first value is the first tier scale threshold and the second value is the second tier scale threshold.</p>
178	J.P-1, Facilities Domain UR matrix, references L.5.5.7 Certifications. Given this subsection does not apply to all the functional specialties within the Facilities Domain would the government consider keeping this requirement at the L.5.5 level like the Environmental Domain - SB+SE matrix? Otherwise, this limits the ability to get points if you are not in a single specific functional specialty within the Facilities Domain.	Through our extensive market research and the feedback received from industry, we have chosen to include this criteria in all Unrestricted scorecards based on the balance of discrete capabilities and administrative priorities.
179	Can the Government please clarify how Offeror's are to assign points for Attachment J.P-1, Tab "T&E - SB+SE" row 7 #4, L.5.2.3.4?	The different criteria (e.g., surge capability, managing 3 or more first-tier subcontractors, and providing services that involve 5 or more personnel with individual security clearances as required by the project) each criterion is eligible for credit. A QP may obtain more than 1 credit for holding eligibility in each of these criteria. For Facilities Domain, Logistics Domain, Environmental Domain, or Intelligence Domain, the category of specialized functional experience or in Facilities Domain UrgenUEmergency work is available which differs a little from the three criteria previously mentioned because specialized experience is tailored to those industries to offer credit for more common attributes in those functional areas. Ultimately, credit is available up to the maximum number of credits in that category.
180	Are the attachments the same for each RFP? If not, how are unique attachments identified?	Yes, all attachments are the same for each RFP. Only Attachments J.P-10 and J.P-11 are applicable to OASIS+ Unrestricted.
181	Within the "M&A - SB+SE" and "INTEL - SB+SE" worksheets, column A's numbering of qualification criteria skips from #9 (cell A12) to #11 (cell A13). Will the Government confirm that this is a numbering error and that the worksheets are not a missing #10 criteria?	Thank you for this feedback. You are correct, this is a numbering issue and will be addressed in Amendment 0002.
182	Attachment J.P.8: Can GSA please confirm that the Direct Labor Rate Ranges shown in Attachment J.P-8 are hourly rates?	Yes
183	<p>Background: J.P-1, #3, QP - Integrated Experience, states that each QP can only achieve 1 credit max if Performance spanned 5 or more different Labor Categories OR Performance spanned 3 or more distinct functional areas (ref. Attachment J.P-5, Functional Areas and Subareas). Conversely, J.P-3, PART II: PROJECT IDENTIFICATION, Integrated (Page 3) provides relevancy options for Performance spanned 3 or more distinct functional areas, Performance spanned 5 or more distinct functional areas, Performance across all QPs spanned 8 or more distinct functional areas.</p> <p>Questions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Do offerors receive 1 credit for performance spanning 3 or more functional areas? - Are additional evaluation credits available for performance spanning 4 or more distinct functional areas? - Are additional evaluation credits available for performance spanning 5 or more distinct functional areas? - Are additional evaluation credits available for performance spanning 8 or more distinct functional areas? 	Attachment J.P-3 provides an exhaustive list of all qualifications listed in Attachment J.P-1 and is used for project verification in accordance with Section L.5.1.7. Evaluation credit is provided on a domain-by-domain basis. For example: for most scorecards, offerors can receive a unique max number of credits for submitting a QP demonstrating performance spanning 5 or more different labor categories or performance spanning 3 or more distinct functional areas (ref Attachment J.P-5). However, the Enterprise Solutions Domain on OASIS+ UR has a higher evaluation standard which provides credit for performance spanning 5 or more distinct functional areas and additional credit if ALL submitted QPs span 8 or more distinct functional areas. Offerors shall refer to Attachment J.P-1 scoring methodology for each proposed Domain.

184	ATTACHMENT J.P-3 PROJECT VERIFICATION FORM has a box for "Providing services in support of 3 or more distinct Federal Agencies" under FEDERAL EXPERIENCE: FEDERAL AGENCIES. Is a single FEP supposed to demonstrate work for 3 or more federal agencies? I thought this would be 3 FEPs that each demonstrated work for a single federal agency.	Thank you for this feedback. This has been removed as a result of Amendment 0001 because it is not a verifiable project element through customer verification.
185	Text Asking About: "Qual 7 - Offeror receives credit for competitive task orders awarded in MA-IDIQ environment (1 for each award). Task orders are only considered competitive if 2 or more businesses submitted a proposal. Offeror may include up to 4 additional projects for this factor. Qual 8 - Offeror receives 1 credit for providing services in support of 3 or more distinct Federal Agencies. Offeror may include up to 3 additional projects for this factor." Question: Can GSA confirm that for an offeror to earn points for both of these qualification categories that the offeror can only get credit for the contract's MA-IDIQ status as well as diversity across 3 or more agencies if it is a prime and not if it is taking credit for work done as sub another firm that was directly engaged with the federal government? If it is indeed confirmed that GSA's intent is to only award a point for those only in a prime role, we are concerned as this is a difficult bar for small businesses to attain. Small businesses overall will have lesser opportunities to serve as a prime and fewer opportunities when they do serve as prime to have those contracts be of a MA-IDIQ status. If GSA can allow small businesses to garner point credit for MA-IDIQ participation in a sub role on that MA-IDIQ, and likewise, take credit for engaging with a particular federal agency indirectly as a sub, we believe this will be more fair representation of what small business government contractors can realistically achieve across their past performance portfolios.	Your interpretation is correct that Offerors may only receive credit for this qualification for federal prime contracts. Federal subcontract work would not be considered for evaluation credit. Thank you for your question and feedback.
186	Provisional Attachment J.P-1 shows in Item #1, "Each Relevant QP receives 4 evaluation credits." Question, is there a scenario where a relevant QP receives only partial credit? In other words, if a QP meets the relevance criteria set forth in L.5.2.3.1, does that QP automatically score a value of 4 credits? Under what circumstances might a QP receive only 1, 2, or 3 credits?	A qualifying project that is substantiated and determined to be relevant in accordance with Section L.5.2.3.1 will receive maximum credits in accordance with Attachment J.P-1. Partial credit is not given for relevance. If the QP is determined to be Non-Relevant in accordance with Section L.5.2.1, zero credits will be given; however, these projects will be primarily used to demonstrate other Domain-specific qualification criteria in Section L.5.2.3 and its Subsections. Non-Relevant QPs will not be considered for evaluation credit under L.5.6, Past Performance, and will not receive any credit in accordance with Section M.7, Scoring Table.
187	File J.P-1+OASIS+Plus+Domain+Qualifications+Matrix+and+Scorecards (1) states the title for Section L.5.4 is Contractor Business Systems. RFP Section L.5.4 is titled Systems, Rates, and Clearances. Would the government please deconflict?	Thank you for this feedback. This has been revised in all scorecards with the "Contractor Business System" nomenclature to "Systems, Rates, and Clearances".
188	The Project Verification Form (J.P-3) Part III-Project Qualifications includes Multiple and OCONUS Locations as well as Federal Experience: Federal Agencies sections for Customer verification. Does GSA expect COs, CORs, Other Government Employees, or Corporate Customers to have knowledge of that information in order to verify/certify? It seems unreasonable to expect anyone outside of the Offerors to know that information.	Thank you for this feedback. As part of Amendment 0001, "Federal Experience - Federal Agencies" was removed from Attachment J.P-3 because it is not a verifiable project element. Multiple and OCONUS locations was retained because this is a project element a customer may be able to confirm/verify. If project documentation can verify this information, verification is not necessary in Attachment J.P-3.
189	The LOG tab includes 811118 Other Automotive Mechanical and Electrical Repair and Maintenance. 811118 is not included in C.2.8.1 Logistics Domain NAICS codes. Please either add it to C.2.8.1 or deleted it from J.P-4	Thank you for this feedback. New NAICS 2022 specialized automotive repair (80-811114) combined all of automotive exhaust system and transmission repair (80-811113) and all of other automotive mechanical and elec. repair (80-811118). NAICS 811114, Specialized Automotive Repair has replaced NAICS 811118 and has been added to Attachment J.P-4.
190	Can the Government confirm that the inclusion of "Performance that involved work at an OCONUS location" was included by mistake? Please clarify.	This qualification is found in the Enterprise Solutions Domain and was not included by mistake.
191	Within the "LOG - SB+SE" "R&D - SB+SE" worksheets, column A's numbering of qualification criteria skips from #10 (cell A13) to #12 (cell A14). Will the Government confirm that this is a numbering error and that the worksheets are not a missing #11 criteria?	Thank you for this feedback. You are correct, this is a numbering issue and will be addressed in Amendment 0002.

192	For the "Relevance to Proposed Domain(s)" section the instructions state that "If the Offeror is submitting a QP across multiple Domains, this form may be used to demonstrate/verify relevance for additional proposed domains by copying the below two rows and providing the requested information for each additional Domain." This form is an uneditable PDF file. It's not possible to add new lines within the table. Will the Government please provide a an editable file or one with additional lines for multiple Domains under the Relevance to Proposed Domain(s) section?	Thank you for this feedback. This was addressed in Amendment 0001 to provide form functionality for Attachment J.P-3 to be used for multiple Domains.
193	Does the bidder need to show that labor rates will need to be below the maximum rate for only Year 1, or does it need to be below the max rate for all 16 years of pricing?	The "high" column for the direct labor rate ranges in Attachment J.P-8 apply to the first year only.
194	Please confirm that the "Direct Labor Rate Ranges" within Attachment J.P-8 follow the guidance of the RFP, Section 5.7.1.1 Direct Labor Rates. "Direct Labor Rates" are labor rates that are not burdened with indirect rates such as fringe benefits, overhead, general and administrative expenses, and/or profit"	Correct, the direct labor rate ranges within Attachment J.P-8 are unburdened and do not include indirect rates such as fringe benefits, overhead, G&A expenses, profit, etc.
195	The auto-relevant NAICS codes are missing from this file. Can the Government please provide a revised J.P-4 that includes the auto-relevant NAICS for the Intelligence Domain?	Due to the type of work performed in the Intelligence Domain, it generally includes work in multiple disciplines and is not associated with a specific NAICS Code. While there are predominant NAICS codes used in this industry, there is no intelligence-specific NAICS code which can be used to automatically determine relevance of an intelligence project. For example, NAICS Codes like 541330, 541715, and 541990 are regularly used for intelligence contracts, but these NAICS codes could be general engineering, R&D, or professional services contracts without intelligence-related scope areas. Therefore the auto-relevant NAICS Codes and PSCs for the intelligence are extremely limited.
196	Issue with the text fields in the J.P-7 template: the font size decreases as text is added. Would the government please provide a corrected template?	Thanks for this feedback. We are updating this attachment to address the formatting issues with Amendment 0002.
197	The version of Attachment JP-7 provided with the Final RFP is a fillable PDF form. The fields for Offeror data are fixed in size, and as the Offeror adds information, the type gets progressively smaller until it becomes unreadable. Additionally, there are only three rows available to populate, which impedes the Joint Venture Offeror's ability to follow the instructions in L.5.1.3.1 (add rows as necessary to provide up to two pages per JV partner and two pages for the JV itself). Will the Government provide a version of Attachment JP-7 that Offerors can edit to provide the required information?	Thanks for this feedback. We are updating this attachment to address the formatting issues with Amendment 0002.
198	Credits awarded for this section are a max of 4. If submitting 5 QPs, do all 5 QPs submitted have to meet one (or more) of the criteria specified or just 4 of the 5 QPs to receive the awarded 4 credits listed?	Each QP that meets or exceeds one of the QP - Scale thresholds will receive credit, up to the maximum number of credits assigned to that capability/row. For example, if 4 QPs were submitted that exceeded \$1M, 4 credits would be given. If 2 QPs exceeded both scale thresholds (For example, each QP was \$5M), then each of these QPs would receive 2 credits (1 credit for exceeding \$1M, 1 credit for exceeding \$1M), and therefore the maximum 4 credits would be achieved through those 2 projects.
199	The signature field on Attachment J.P-6 does not have the "Sign with a Digital ID" option.	The Government Team acknowledges the Attachment J.P-6 does not include a digital signature option.
200	If the offeror is the Team Lead and has CTAs with one or more team members, can the offeror receive MAS CTA member certification, and if so, who is authorized to sign?	This is being clarified in Amendment 0002. See Section L.5.1.7.4: To verify the work performed as a member of a MAS CTA, the Project Verification Form must be signed by a member of the MAS CTA (other than the offeror) or the CO, COR, or other Government employee with cognizance over the submitted project, verifying the Offeror performed the work detailed in Parts II and III. The verification of the MAS CTA order must also be accomplished in accordance with Section L.5.1.7.1.

201	Section L.5.1.3.1 of the RFP states that "...For unpopulated joint ventures, Section L.5.7 submissions must be submitted for each member of the joint venture." Since Section L.5.7 is Cost/Price, does that mean that each member of an unpopulated JV will need to submit its own JP-9? If so, that would create a situation where one bidder would have multiple bill rates established for the vehicle. Please confirm if this is the intent.	Thank you for your feedback, the Unrestricted RFP Section L.5.1.3.1 Joint Venture ,#5 bulleted Section L.5.8 _ Responsibility, incorrectly references section L.5.7 instead of section L.5.8. This will be updated in a future amendment to read: "Section L.5.8 - Responsibility : For populated joint ventures, all Section L.5.8 submissions must be submitted for the joint venture itself. For unpopulated joint ventures, all Section L.5.8 submissions must be submitted for each member of the joint venture."
202	Section L.5.1.3.1 of the RFP states that "...For unpopulated joint ventures, Section L.5.7 submissions must be submitted for each member of the joint venture." Since Section L.5.7 is Cost/Price, does that mean that each member of an unpopulated JV will need to submit its own JP-9? If so, that would create a situation where one bidder would have multiple bill rates established for the vehicle. Please confirm if this is the intent.	Unrestricted RFP Section L.5.1.3.1 Joint Venture, Item #5, Section L.5.8 - Responsibility, incorrectly references Section L.5.7 instead of section L.5.8. This will be corrected in Amendment 2 to read as follows: "Section L.5.8 - Responsibility - For populated joint ventures, all Section L.5.8 submissions must be submitted for the joint venture itself. For unpopulated joint ventures, all Section L.5.8 submissions must be submitted for each member of the joint venture."
203	This qualification will benefit only those offerors who are GAS-compliant. A commercial items provider is unlikely to have had a cognizant organization certify its business systems. Since certified systems are not required for many of the task order contract types listed in Section 8.6, many otherwise highly qualified OASIS+ bidders are likely to score zero on this capability. A zero score in this area has no bearing on an offeror's ability to support the other Task Order types. There is no requirement that all offerors are required to support Cost-Reimbursement Task Orders. So having this as a scored capability unfairly penalizes any commercial item service provider. As a recommendation, please consider removing this restrictive capability from the Domain Qualifications Matrix or as an alternative, accept a third-party commercial auditor's certification? This language is very restrictive and eliminates many mid-tier companies from the competition. We believe that Government intends to not restrict competition.	OASIS+ intends to provide highly qualified, mission-ready vendors with systems and certifications that are applicable to task order requirements. A majority of Ordering Contracting Officers will not accept third party audits. Therefore, third party audits will not be considered for evaluation credit under the Systems, Rates, and Clearances criteria.
204	Could the government provide an explanation for how the government plans to utilize the proposed prices from vendors for award evaluation? What type of impact, if any, does the pricing have on proposal evaluation in terms of its importance compared to other factors, ranges, etc.?	Section L.5.7.1.2 provides some clarity here: In accordance with Section 8.8.6, OASIS+ only establishes ceiling rates for T&M/LH type Task Orders/CLINs awarded on a sole-source basis or when adequate price competition is not anticipated; therefore, the Offeror's ceiling rates do not apply to fixed-price, cost-reimbursement, or T&M/LH type task orders when adequate price competition is anticipated. For those instances when adequate price competition does not exist and the contract type is T&M/LH, the ceiling rates shall apply to OASIS+ task orders. Regarding evaluation, Section M.4 states: Once the proposal has been evaluated and validated, and as long as the Offeror has met or exceeded the Domain Qualification Threshold for at least one of the proposed Domains, the evaluation team will then verify that the Offeror has proposed fair and reasonable pricing. In the event that an Offeror has not provided fair and reasonable pricing, the Offeror shall be eliminated from further consideration for award unless discussions are conducted.
205	Please confirm whether Attachments J.P-2, J.P-3, J.P-4, J.P-5, J.P-6, J.P-7, J.P-8, J.P-9, J-1, J-2, J-3, J-4, and J-5 are identical across the Small Business, HUBZone, WOSB, SDVO SB, and 8(a) procurements.	Confirmed.
206	May an Offeror convert J.P-3 Project Verification Form to Word in order to accommodate additional rows to support (narrative of 1,000 characters) Part II: Project Identification, RELEVANCE TO PROPOSED DOMAIN(S) and RELEVANT WORK MEETS OR EXCEEDS MINIMUM QP \$THRESHOLD? Alternatively, will the Government provide a J.P-3 format that can accommodate a 1,000 character narrative for Part II: Project Identification, RELEVANCE TO PROPOSED DOMAIN(S) and RELEVANT WORK MEETS OR EXCEEDS MINIMUM QP \$THRESHOLD?	Yes, Offerors may make minor formatting changes to Section J and Section K templates used in proposal submission per L.3.
207	Respectfully request a definition of 1st Tier QP and 2nd Tier QP. We could not find a Tier 1 or Tier 2 QP reference in the RFP.	The 1st Tier and 2nd Tier QP-Scale thresholds refer to the two QP - Scale values in each scorecard. For example: on T&E SB/SE, an Offeror receives credit for each QP that demonstrates 1) Average Annual Value greater or equal than \$1M or 5 FTE and 2) Average Annual Value greater or equal than \$4M or 20 FTE. These are the 1st and 2nd tier QP-Scale thresholds.

208	<p>If the cognizant OCO is willing to attest to all elements contained in J.P-3, please confirm that an Offeror can use that in lieu of other verification documentation. For example, the OCO could validate the number of personnel who hold clearances via J.P-3. However, in L.5.2.3.4, Qualifying Project Experience - Management and Staffing - Verification of Individual Clearances first asks for the contract document, if a document cannot be provided, then a letter from the offeror's Facility Security Officer, and then finally J.P-3 as an alternative. Please confirm that if an OCO is completed J.P-3 for another element, that they may complete it for elements, such as security clearances, without needing to provide additional substantiation.</p>	Confirmed.
209	Which fields, if left blank, would invalidate Attachment J.P-3?	<p>The Offeror must fill out Parts I, 11, and III.</p> <p>Part IV - Applicable IAW Sections L.5.1.7.1 and L.5.1.7.2 for obtaining customer verification.</p> <p>Part V - Only applicable IAW Section L.5.1.7.3 for Joint Venture certification and signature (when a contract award form was not issued to the JV member).</p> <p>Part VI - Only applicable IAW Section L.5.1.7.4 for MAS CTA certification and signature (when a contract award form was not issued to the JV member).</p> <p>The Offeror is responsible for submitting the completed form with the claimed Qualifying Project or Federal Experience Project within the proposal.</p>
210	<p>The template requires us to provide only one set of hourly rates. The effort can be performed both on customer site and contractor site. As we have different overhead rates for both the sites we will need need two sets of rates. Please let us know whether we can provide two J.P-9 one for Government Site and the other for contractor site.</p> <p>Let us also know whether we should provide OCONUS rates separately since they will include additional compensation.</p>	<p>This is clarified in Amendment 0002 in Section L.5.7.1.2 to add: If an Offeror has multiple indirect rates for different sites/locations, then the highest rates should be used.</p> <p>Per Section L.5.7.1.1, OCONUS pricing is not a requirement as part of an Offeror's price proposal.</p>
211	<p>In the paragraph Automatic Relevance Consideration, the requirement states 'the Offeror must indicate in the OASIS+ Symphony Portal (OSP) that the QP is being submitted for automatic relevance consideration and must identify the assigned PSC or project-specific NAICS code that corresponds to the list contained in this workbook within the proposed Domain(s). If a project automatically qualifies under this criteria, no further evidence supporting the claim of "Relevance" is required.</p> <p>Question: Please confirm that if a qualified project is auto-relevant, only the following documents are required in the OSP: Most recent FPDS, CPARS or J.P.-6 Past Performance Rating Form and the Award Document.</p>	Confirmed, this is also addressed in Amendment 0002. Please see the added subsections at L.5.2.3.1.1 and L.5.2.3.1.2 to better illustrate automatic relevance and standard relevance.
212	What is the credit and qualification threshold for a Not-for-Profit 503(c) (with a Small Business size standard) company? Does it follow the Set-aside or Unrestricted qualification threshold?	<p>Per the SBA, In addition to meeting the numerical standards for small, your business must be a for-profit business of any legal structure. This would mean the firm would only be eligible for OASIS+ Unrestricted. More information below.</p> <p>https://www.sba.gov/federal-contracting/contracting-guide/size-standards</p>
213	In Attachment J.P-3 Project Verification Form, in Part III: Project Qualifications, the Government asks the offeror to account for "Performance that involved work at an OCONUS location." Does this include travel to OCONUS locations for temporary work?	Yes.
214	On J.P-1 under the definitions of Qualification #5 QP - Specialized Functional Experience (L.5.2.3.5), #1 includes Investigation and/or Remediation of UXO in the list of contaminants. The J.P-3 project verification form omits UXO from the list of contaminants to select under QP - Specialized Functional Experience. It lists "Investigation and/or Remediation of PFAS/PFOA, PCBs, VOCs, or Nuclear/Radiological Contamination". Can you please confirm that experience investigating and remediating UXO are included in this qualification for specialized functional experience (L.5.2.3.5)?	Thanks for highlighting this inconsistency. This was revised in the scorecards and in the project verification form to clarify UXOs are included for the Environmental Domain.

215	Please confirm the listed rates are per hour. Are they based on a 1,920 or 2,080 total hour labor year?	For estimating purposes under the OASIS+ RFP, 1 FTE will be considered 1,912 annual hours. Federal holiday observance information has been updated in the final RFP. This information is most appropriately included at the task order level, as specific scopes of work will be better suited to document/dictate this type of information.
216	In creating an hourly labor rate range, did GSA use 1,920 hours? This will be helpful in validating the labor rate ranges against salaries.	For estimating purposes under the OASIS+ RFP, 1 FTE will be considered 1,920 annual hours.
217	GSA made updates to form J.P-3 under Part II. Project Identification - "Relevance to Proposed Doman" and "Relevant Work Meets or Exceeds Minimum QP \$ Threshold." The USG states: " ... RELEVANT WORK MEETS OR EXCEEDS MINIMUM QP \$ THRESHOLD: Offeror must provide two pieces of information which will be validated in PART IV by the customer: 1) QP minimum average annual dollar value for each Domain where relevance is claimed 2) Average Annual Value of relevant work for each Domain where relevance is claimed." Regarding Item #1 - we understand this to be tagging and verification documentation showing offeror exceeds annual thresholds; can the USG affirm our understanding or provide clarification? Regarding item #2 - Are offerors expected to provide a dollar amount in this response within the template document? Please clarify.	To clarify, Item 1) represents the QP Minimum average annual value for the first Domain. For example, for Technical and Engineering Small Business, this would be \$500K. Item 2) represents the average annual value of the relevant work tied to the submitted project. For example, if the project had \$550K of engineering support work, this would be stated here.
218	In the Instructions tab, the Government included the following sentence: "If the Qualifying Project (QP) is a task order issued under a MA-IDIQ where multiple NAICS codes are applicable at the order level (e.g., OASIS, MAS, HCaTS, BMO, GSA GWACs), the NAICS code assigned to the IDIQ in FPDS-NG that automatically applies to all task orders is not sufficient, on its own, to automatically validate the order-level NAICS code." This seems to indicate the Government is attempting to define the "order level" as the specified IDIQ. Request that the Government clarifies this statement.	This statement is accurate. There are many MA-IDIQs (e.g., OASIS, MAS, HCaTS, BMO, GSA GWACs) in which the IDIQ is assigned a single NAICS code, but multiple NAICS codes may be used (i.e. applicable) at the task order level. In these cases, the IDIQ level NAICS code that automatically flows down to task orders is not sufficient and the offeror may rely on the PSC code which IS designated in FPDS-NG at the order level, or provide additional supporting documentation, such as the task order solicitation identifying the claimed NAICS code, or validation that all potential NAICS codes assigned to the MA-IDIQ are considered in-scope for that task order.
219	In the attachment J.P-1 OASIS+ Domain Qualification Matrix and Scorecards, the QP - Integrated Experience section states that "Under this category, each QP can only achieve 1 credit max". However, the number of projects exceeds the max amount of points collected for this section. Will the government please revise the language here to be clearer. Can each submitted project get a point, which is the current indication? Or can only 3 or 4 of the possible 5 projects get a point? The current setup is contradictory.	This is intentional. The limitation of credits for this criteria are not specifically tied to the number of QPs submitted. Relative weighting of the qualification criteria is based on customer feedback as to the importance of those criteria to them at the order level. This is why there are a "Max# of Credits" for each qualification, and in certain categories opportunity to earn multiple credits on a single QP.
220	Columns H9 through H28 of Attachment J.P-9, Cost/Price Template presumably represent the fully-burdened labor rates for the base period of the resultant OASIS+ contract; however, the formula in these base year cells include the 4.15 percent annual escalation identified in RFP section L.5.7.2, Cost/Price Template Instructions. Would the government please confirm whether offerors should include the 4.15 percent escalation rate when calculating the fully-burdened base year (year one [1]) labor rates (column H)?	The template is correct. Because GSA will be in evaluations for about a year, we request the current year rates and we will escalate for the first year to take into account for the estimated timeline for evaluations.
221	What proof do we need to provide for our pricing rates?	Please see RFP Section L.5.7 Cost/Price for requirements and guidance for submitting documentation.
222	How will Government site and contractor site rates be calculated and presented?	This is clarified in Amendment 0002 in Section L.5.7.1.2 to add: If an Offeror has multiple indirect rates for different sites/locations, then the highest rates should be used.

223	Does the government want the contractor to use the same rates for contractor site and govt site?	<p>If an Offeror has multiple direct or indirect rates for different sites/locations, then the highest rates should be used. The rates do not have to be specific to Government locations. However, do not include OCONUS work in the proposed rates.</p> <p>This is clarified in Amendment 0002 in Section L.5.7.1.2 to add: If an Offeror has multiple indirect rates for different sites/locations, then the highest rates should be used.</p> <p>Per Section L.5.7.1.1, OCONUS pricing is not a requirement as part of an Offeror's price proposal.</p>
224	If contractors have different onsite and offsite overhead rates, how should Attachment J.P-9 column E be completed? Should contractors propose a rate card for onsite and a separate rate card for offsite, or should contractors propose the higher of the two overhead rates for completion of the J.P-9 file?	No updates to J.P-9 will occur to accommodate different overhead rates per site. You are correct, please use the highest overhead rate. This is clarified in Amendment 0002 in Section L.5.7.1.2 to add: If an Offeror has multiple indirect rates for different sites/locations, then the highest rates should be used. It does not matter if it is a Contractor Site or Government Site.
225	<p>"The J.P-3 form states ""RELEVANT WORK MEETS OR EXCEEDS MINIMUM QP \$ THRESHOLD: Offeror must provide two pieces of information which will be validated in PART IV by the customer: 1) OP minimum average annual dollar value for each Domain where relevance is claimed. 2) Average annual value of relevant work for each Domain where relevance is claimed.""</p> <p>Please confirm a signed J.P-3 itself alone is enough to verify the project's value."</p>	For Part II of J.P-3, populating the form with the appropriate numeric answers to 1) QP minimum average annual dollar value for each Domain where relevance is claimed, and 2) Average Annual Value of relevant work for each Domain where relevance is claimed, is sufficient for completing J.P-3. No additional verification or forms are required, as the Customer will certify these project details in Part IV.
226	<p>Will the Government please clarify the following: "Offeror must provide two pieces of information which will be validated in PART IV by the customer: 1) OP minimum average annual dollar value for each Domain where relevance is claimed 2) Average annual value of relevant work for each Domain where relevance is claimed?"</p> <p>Is the intent for the Offeror to provide narrative in the box to the right of the language noted above or two contractual documents as substantiation?</p>	For Part II of J.P-3, populating the form with the appropriate numeric answers to 1) OP minimum average annual dollar value for each Domain where relevance is claimed, and 2) Average Annual Value of relevant work for each Domain where relevance is claimed, is sufficient for completing J.P-3. No additional verification or forms are required, as the Customer will certify these project details in Part IV.
227	Columns D-G will be onerous or impossible for some firms, including small businesses without approved accounting systems, to tie to an accounting methodology. For companies whose accounting systems do not operate on a cost-plus basis but who can bid fully burdened rates approved on the GSA Schedule, may Offerors delete or omit columns D-G, and provide fully burdened rates in lieu of a build-up?	No, all contractors are required to comply with the solicitation submission specifications. All offerors will be treated the same, and requirements will not be bifurcated. The OASIS+ contract scope encompasses all contract types, is a noncommercial contract (at the master level) that allows for commercial and noncommercial orders (the OCO makes the determination of task order type at the order level and applies the appropriate terms and conditions in their order solicitations) and therefore the submittal requirements documented in the solicitation apply to all offerors. All offerors must be treated the same, and staying true to the solicitation requirements will ensure this requirement is accomplished, and the minimum needs described in the OASIS+ master contract solicitations are met by each offeror prior to award.
228	Please confirm that, with the exception of all items in L.5.1, L.5.7, and L.5.8, offerors need only provide those items listed under L.5.2, L.5.3, L.5.4, and L.5.5 that are specifically requested in the domain qualifications matrices. For example, in the domain qualifications matrix for Technical and Engineering, under Section L5.5. Other Certifications, only the capability maturity model, ISO27001:2013, ISO9001:2015, and ISO22301 are required for credit, and not all other items listed under L.5.5 in the RFP.	Yes, that is correct, however, Offerors that can demonstrate the qualifications listed in Sections L.5.2, L.5.3, L.5.4, L.5.5, and L.5.6 will receive credit in their OASIS+ proposal, as these are the scored elements. For example, an Offeror submitting a proposal to the OASIS+ Small Business RFP, Technical and Engineering Domain, must meet or exceed 36/50 credits within their proposal. These credits can be obtained a number of different ways - through Domain-relevant experience, federal experience, certifications, systems, past performance, etc. Offerors have many avenues to meet or exceed the qualifying threshold for any given domain, although most of these will require a meaningful level of project experience. In each proposal, Offerors must ensure they submit the required elements in Sections L.5.1, L.5.7, and L.5.8.
229	In form J.P-2, the term "PSP" is used. Can the USG define the acronym?	This is suppose to refer to the OSP (OASIS+ Submission Portal). The attachment has been corrected in Amendment 0002.

230	Per Section C.1.1, NAICS Code 541990 has been assigned as the "preponderance scope of the OASIS+ Contract Program as a whole" and in Section C.2.2.1 Technical and Engineering Domain NAICS Codes, NAICS Code 541990 is also included, Given its extensive use in this area and the likelihood of significant competition, we request the government include this NAICS Code as "Auto-relevant" as referenced in Attachment J.P-4 OASIS Plus Domain Auto-Relevant NAICS Codes and PSCs.	Thank you for your question(s). NAICS Code 541990 does not automatically, or with a high level of confidence, denote a project that is within scope of any of the OASIS+ Domains; therefore, it will not be considered for auto-relevance. An Offeror may still submit a QP with this NAICS code and obtain credit for relevance if it provides contract documentation, which may include the Award Form or SOW/PWS/SOO that describes the general scope, nature, complexity, and purpose of the services the customer acquired under the contract. Additionally, the Offeror must tag those specific written passages in the contract documentation that support a relevance determination in the proposed Domain(s) in accordance with the scope of each Domain outlined in Section C.2.
231	Under the Management & Advisory Domain, the government has omitted NAICS 541990. Considering that this is the overall NAICS for the OASIS+ master contract, and that services under this NAICS include the provision of professional services, as well as management, scientific, and technical consulting services, would the government consider including it in the list of auto-relevant NAICS codes for the M&A Doman?	Thank you for your feedback. We do not plan on adding additional auto-relevant NAICS codes at this time, but continue to keep track of requests in each Domain and may do so in the future.
232	Will the Government add PSC R499 to the Automatic Relevant NAICS Code and PSC Code List for the Management and Advisory Domain, due to the fact that several Contracting Offices have aligned contracts to that PSC Code when the scope of the PWS/SOW is wide, but still within scope of the Domain?	Thank you for your feedback. We do not plan on adding additional auto-relevant NAICS codes at this time, but continue to keep track of requests in each Domain and may do so in the future.
233	A list of NAICS codes that may be used for orders under each domain can be found in Section C of the RFP. In some cases, the same NAICS codes appear on multiple domains. However, there are some NAICS codes that only appear in one domain. For example, 541310 Architectural Services and 611512 Flight Training only appear under the Technical and Engineering domain; 561499 All Other Business Support Services and 561611 Investigation Services only appear under the Intel Domain; 621511 Medical Laboratories only appears under the R&D domain; 238990 All Other Specialty Trade Contractors, 488490 Other Support Activities for Road Transportation, 531311 Residential Property Managers, 531312 Nonresidential Property Managers, 561990 All Other Support Services, 811310 Commercial and Industrial Machinery and Equipment (except Automotive and Electronic) Repair and Maintenance only appear in the Facilities domain; 481211 Nonscheduled Chartered Passenger Air Transportation, 485991 Special Needs Transportation, 488111 Air Traffic Control, 492110 Couriers and Express Delivery Services, 493120 Refrigerated Warehousing and Storage, 811114 Specialized Automotive Repair, 811121 Automotive Body, Paint and Interior Repair and Maintenance only appear in the Logistics domain. Question: As these NAICS codes only appear in one Domain, would the government please consider adding these NAICS codes to the Auto-Relevant NAICS Code List (J.P-4).	Thank you for your feedback. Only one NAICS Code has been added to Attachment J.P-4, which is NAICS 811114 in the Logistics Domain. This was added because the new NAICS 2022 specialized automotive repair (80-811114) combined all of automotive exhaust system and transmission repair (80-811113) and all of other automotive mechanical and electrical. repair (80-811118). To provide some context on how we developed our automatic relevant NAICS/PSC codes: Attachment J.P-4 only provides the NAICS Codes and PSCs, which the Government can determine with a high level of confidence, that will be automatically relevant to the proposed Domain with no further analysis or supporting documentation required. Many of the referenced Domains include broad scopes which cannot be automatically determined relevant based on the code alone.
234	There are currently no PSC codes for the Enterprise Solutions domain in J.P-4. Would the Government please provide the PSC codes for the Enterprise Solutions domain.	Thank you for your question. There are no auto-relevant PSC codes for the Enterprise Solutions domain.
235	For Management & Advisory Domain, Will the government consider adding PSC Code R499 "Support-Professional:Other" to the list of auto-relevant codes	Thank you for your feedback. We do not plan on adding additional auto-relevant NAICS or PSC codes at this time, but continue to keep track of requests in each Domain and may do so in the future.
236	For Part II of JP-3, PROJECT NAICS/PSC Code, is the NAICS/PSC Code requested what is listed in FPDS?	The NAICS Code in Part II of the J.P-3 should be the project level NAICS and PSC Code listed in FPDS and/or the contract award documents.
237	The J.P-3 form states "RELEVANT WORK MEETS OR EXCEEDS MINIMUM QP \$ THRESHOLD: Offeror must provide two pieces of information which will be validated in PART IV by the customer: 1) QP minimum average annual dollar value for each Domain where relevance is claimed. 2) Average annual value of relevant work for each Domain where relevance is claimed." Please confirm a signed J.P-3 itself alone is enough to verify the project's value.	Yes, the J.P-3 form alone is enough to verify that the project's relevant work meets or exceeds the minimum QP \$ threshold. The customer will certify this information in Part IV.
238	Are each of the Master Contract Attachments (J-1 through J-5) and RFP Solicitation Attachments (J.P-1 through J.P-9) the same documents for each final RFP (e.g., Small Business, 8(a), Unrestricted) or do any differ for each of the RFPs?	Yes, all attachments are the same for each RFP. Only Attachments J.P-10 and J.P-11 are applicable to OASIS+ Unrestricted.

239	If an offeror does not have an approved cost accounting system, is it acceptable to enter the fully burdened labor rate in column C of attachment J.P-9 instead of entering indirect rate percentages in columns D-G?	Indirect costs are required from all offerors. Indirect rates are not a product of an approved cost accounting system only.
240	Is a J.P-3 required for all discrepancies between verification documentation? For example, the FPDS and signed award show different TCVs or PoPs? Would a J.P-3 be required for an explanation, or are there other methods that can be used to show the discrepancy? Please provide examples.	Yes, It is recommended that you would complete a J.P-3 verification form to specify the correct information.
241	Can the Government confirm that if an offeror has all supporting validation documentation (e.g., FPDS), for a given reference, it does not need to have the JP-3 signed by the customer?	Correct.
242	Would the government please provide an updated form for the J.P-3? Currently, under "Part V: Joint Venture Certification" it will only allow numbers however, in our JV's UEID there are multiple letters.	An updated version of J.P-3 has been posted with Amendment 0002. The updated version of the J.P-3 will allow you to use letters and numbers.
243	Regarding Attachment JP-1, Protege Offerors Qualifying Project and Federal Experience Project Values matrix, please explain 1st Tier QP Scale Threshold vs 2nd Tier QP Scale Threshold. It does not appear to be tied to the lower threshold for MP JV members since one value is not 50% of the other value.	The 1st Tier and 2nd Tier QP-Scale Thresholds reference the two QP-Scale thresholds in each Domain's scorecard. This has been clarified in Attachment J.P-1 with Amendment 0002 within each Scorecard to clarify the 1st tier and 2nd tier scale thresholds.
244	The J.P-7 Joint Venture Work Qualifications Template was provided as a .pdf file with fillable text fields. These fields are character-limited and greatly restrict the ability of the offeror to input any Work Done or Qualifications. Furthermore, they format the text as a single line, in whatever font size makes it fit in said line. We recommend you allow offerors make appropriate alterations to increase the number of characters and the number of lines text may occupy in these boxes to allow offerors to provide all of their qualifications and to increase legibility for evaluators.	This is being addressed in Amendment 0002. Thank you for this feedback.
245	We recommend that the Government make the rows in the "To Be Completed" section taller on this form so the text doesn't become so small as the amount of text in the rows increases.	This is being addressed in Amendment 0002. Thank you for this feedback.
246	J.P-3 Project Verification Form Part II states: "If the Offeror is submitting a QP across multiple Domains, this form may be used to demonstrate/verify relevance for additional proposed domains by copying the below two rows and providing the requested information for each additional Domain. Question: The Offeror is concerned about altering this PDF form as provided, while maintaining compliance. Would the Government consider revising the J.P-3 Form with two rows per domain to accommodate all eight domains included in the solicitation?"	Thank you for this feedback. Attachment J.P-3 was revised in Amendment 0001 to provide form functionality for a QP to be verified across multiple Domains. Additional changes were made as a result of Amendment 0002 to Attachment J.P-3 as well. Versions of Attachments J.P-3 from the initial solicitation release and Amendment 0001 remain acceptable for use. If a previous version of this form was used and the contracting officer information was not included in the completed form, the Offeror must add an additional page at the end of the form identifying the Contracting Officer, their email address, and phone number, as required by Section L.5.1.7.1.
247	Does the government wish to have offerors provide both Contractor Site and Government Site rates? The J.P-9 template provides for only one set of rates.	This is clarified in Amendment 0002 in Section L.5.7.1.2 to add: If an Offeror has multiple indirect rates for different sites/locations, then the highest rates should be used. It does not matter if it is Contractor Site or Government Site.
248	On form J.P-3, can we delete and/or take out references to domains not being bid?	Yes, Offerors may delete Domain Pages within Attachment J.P-3 if they are unnecessary, to limit the page length of the form.
Section K		
249	Requirement states "Within the OSP, Offerors shall complete all required Representations and Certifications as prescribed in Section K ... " Where is this functionality within Symphony?	Section K Instructions have been revised with Amendment 0002. Offerors must complete the annual representations and certifications electronically via the SAM.gov website accessed through https://www.SAM.gov and upload a copy within its proposal. The Offeror is also required to complete the Section K representations, certifications, and other statements of offerors and certifications and return them with its proposal. The Offeror must also complete the representations and certifications along with company size information within the Offeror's OSP Company Profile. To ensure compliance with Section L.5.1.3, this must also be completed for all team members, if applicable.

250	<p>"Within the OSP, Offerors shall complete all required Representations and Certifications as prescribed in Section K, in addition to providing a copy of the annual representations and certifications completed electronically within https://www.SAM.gov."</p> <p>We understand Reps and Certs will be completed in the OSP, under Business Factors. Please provide details/instructions for" providing a copy of the annual representations and certifications completed electronically within https://www.SAM.gov." Is this the FAR/DFARS report in "Download Reports" in SAM.gov? Should offerors upload this report in Supporting Documents under Business Factors/Representations and Certifications and Company Size?</p>	<p>Section K Instructions have been revised with Amendment 0002.</p> <p>The Offeror must complete the annual representations and certifications electronically via the SAM.gov website accessed through https://www.SAM.gov and upload a copy within their proposal.</p> <p>The Offeror is also required to complete the Section K representations, certifications, and other statements of offerors and certifications and return them with their proposal.</p> <p>The Offeror must also complete the representations and certifications along with company size information within the Offeror's OSP Company Profile, Business Factors section. To ensure compliance with Section L.5.1.3, this must also be completed for all team members, if applicable. See Section L.5.1.3.1 and L.5.1.3.2 for Section K requirements specific to Contractor Teaming Arrangements.</p>
251	Can the Govt. confirm we are to do all three of the following: 1) complete the Reps & Certs drop-down section in OSP, 2) upload our executed Section K Reps & Certs in PDF, and 3) upload our SAM Reps & Certs in PDF?	Confirmed.
252	The Proposal Format Table states that Representations and Certifications are "Within OSP". Will Section K be available for completion in the OSP? Will offers be required to upload a copy of their annual representations and certifications to OSP?	<p>The Proposal Format Table has been updated to reflect the revisions made in Amendment 0002.</p> <p>SAM Reps and Certs - PDF Printout Section K - PDF Printout OSP Size - Within the OSP.</p>
253	Are proposed subcontractors required to complete the Reps and Certs as prescribed in Section K and provide a copy of their annual Reps and Certs completed within SAM.gov? If so, how will this be captured within OSP?	Yes, proposed subcontractors and joint venture members are required to submit the reps and certs required by Section K with the Offeror's proposal. Section K and L.5.1.5 have been revised as a result of Amendment 0002 to provide clarity on submission of reps and certs.
254	Will the Government clarify whether the JV and each member of the JV must submit completed Representations and Certifications in Section Kasa PDF or within the OSP?	To ensure compliance with Section L.5.1.3, reps and certs must also be submitted for all team members, if applicable. See Section L.5.1.3.1 and L.5.1.3.2 for Section K requirements specific to Contractor Teaming Arrangements.
Section L.1 through L.4		
255	The RFP states "Offerors should use file names that relate to the attachments (as identified in the table below) and link the file(s) to the claim within the OSP." Please provide further clarification. An example of an acceptable file name would be appreciated.	Clarifying language and examples have been added to the RFP.
256	Within the online OASIS+ Submission Portal (OSP/Symphony) training recording, there is a reference to uploading a cover letter (at minute 14:17 in the presentation) as part of a contractor's submission documents. The proposal instructions contained in Section L do not reference a cover letter. Please clarify if a cover letter is required as part of the OASIS+ submission. If a cover letter is required, please clarify if any information is required to be included and/or if there are any other instructions for the document.	Cover letters are NOT a required document, but can be submitted. Typically offerors use RFP cover letters to highlight proposal information and anything else they would like to bring to the CO's attention in review of the proposal. It is up to the offeror to determine if they would like to include an optional cover letter. "Cover Letters are not required, but can be submitted.
257	FAR 52.215-1 Instructions to Offerors-Competitive Acquisition, which the solicitation incorporates by reference, prescribes certain information for the "first page of the proposal" and the "title page," however a cover/title page is not included in the Proposal Format Table. Are Offerors permitted to provide a cover/title page? If so, please provide information regarding the file name, format, page limit, and OSP location.	Cover letters are NOT a required document, but can be submitted. Typically offerors use RFP cover letters to highlight proposal information and anything else they would like to bring to the CO's attention in review of the proposal. It is up to the offeror to determine if they would like to include an optional cover letter. "Cover Letters are not required, but can be submitted.
Section M.1 through M.4		
258	<p>RFP states "Each Domain has a specific Qualifications Matrix and corresponding qualifying threshold to ensure the highest quality, best-in-class standards are representative of customer needs in that mission space. To receive a Domain award, the offer must meet or exceed the Domain-specific qualification threshold at Section M.7 through the submission requirements in Section L."</p> <p>a) Does this mean Offerors that exceed the "qualifying threshold" for a specific domain will receive an award provided that all other proposal content is compliant and acceptable, and pricing is fair and reasonable?</p> <p>b) Is the "qualifying threshold" just an indication of the competitive range, meaning that only those Offerors with the "highest" score above the qualifying threshold when compared to other Offerors will be selected for an award?</p>	<p>a) Yes, GSA is not limiting the number of contracts awarded as a result of this solicitation. The Government intends to make an award to all qualifying offerors with a fair and reasonable price.</p> <p>b) No, the qualifying threshold refers to the number of credits an offeror must obtain to receive a Domain Award. For all Small Business and Socioeconomic Contracts, this is 36/50 credits. For Unrestricted, it is 42/50 credits. For the Enterprise Solutions Domain, it is 45/50 credits. All qualifying offerors with a fair and reasonable price will receive an award under OASIS+, there is no competitive range, and offers will not be compared.</p>

259	<p>Section M provides that "The evaluation team will evaluate and verify the proposal's supporting documentation for each evaluation element. If the Government determines there is a discrepancy between a claimed evaluation element and the supporting documentation, the Government will adjust the Offeror's claimed score by the credit value of the difference between the claimed credits and the credits substantiated by the supporting documentation. However, evaluation will continue as long as the adjusted total credits meet or exceed the Domain Qualification Threshold. If the proposal does not meet or exceed the Domain Qualification Threshold, the evaluation for that proposal will stop and the Offeror will be eliminated from further consideration for award."</p> <p>The language as-is does NOT afford the Offeror the opportunity to review/clarify/confirm the discrepancies PRIOR to being eliminated. We respectfully request that GSA consider affording the Offeror with a chance to review/clarify/confirm the discrepancies PRIOR to making the decision to eliminating the Offeror's submission.</p>	<p>The Government intends to award contracts without discussions; and therefore, initial proposal submissions should contain the highest quality/best offer. The Government may conduct clarifications, as described in FAR 15.306(a). The Government reserves the right to conduct discussions if determined necessary.</p>
260	<p>The RFP states, "The evaluation team will evaluate and verify the proposal's supporting documentation for each evaluation element. If the Government determines there is a discrepancy between a claimed evaluation element and the supporting documentation, the Government will adjust the Offeror's claimed score by the credit value of the difference between the claimed credits and the credits substantiated by the supporting documentation." Does the Government intend to enter into communications with Offerors over deducted points to allow the offeror to submit additional information to justify its points for the evaluation element.</p>	<p>The Government intends to award contracts without discussions; and therefore, initial proposal submissions should contain the highest quality/best offer. The Government may conduct clarifications, as described in FAR 15.306(a). The Government reserves the right to conduct discussions if determined necessary.</p>
Symphony		
261	<p>Symphony requires the following data: What is the Total Value of Other Direct and Indirect Costs? (File Reference Tag: COSTS)</p> <p>Please expand on what offerors are to provide as documentation.</p>	<p>This is an optional field for additional information on cost-reimbursement type contracts. It is not a requirement for the OASIS+ solicitation. We intend to have this removed from Symphony.</p>