

QUESTION NUMBER	DRAFT RFP SECTION NUMBER	COMMENTS/QUESTIONS/SUGGESTIONS
CLARIFICATIONS:		
1	Offeror's Proposal Checklist, Section J.4, Attachment (4)	Section L.5.1, #5 it clearly says that small business offerors are ineligible for an award if they do not have an existing CTA. Why is no CTA grounds for being ineligible? RESPONSE: You seem to be misinterpreting this. Please note the "if applicable" labeling. Existing CTAs only apply to existing Joint Ventures competing for an OASIS or OASIS SB award. This does not apply to individual companies.
2	Section J.4	On page 4 of the questionnaire checklist, question 2—we would appreciate some clarification. Are you asking if the average per year value is \$2M, \$3M, \$4M, or \$5M? As an example of our interpretation, if we have a project that spanned 3 years and had the following values each year of the contract: 1) Base Year: \$1M, 2) Option Year 1: \$5M, 3) Option Year 2: \$3M. Total Value of this example is \$9M with an average over the 3 years of \$3M/year so would we check the \$3M box for that past performance project? Are we interpreting this question correctly? RESPONSE: You are interpreting that correctly. We are asking for the average value per year of each requirement.
3	L.5.1.2 / Page 78	Section J.3., Attachment 3 asks us to select the pools that we desire to be considered for. Can a company compete and potentially receive awards both as a SB in pools 4, 5 & 6 and also as a LB (unrestricted) in pools 1, 2 & 3? RESPONSE: We read this question as asking if a company can apply for both OASIS and OASIS SB, but for different Pools on each contract. The answer to that question is definitely "yes".
4	G.2.6, Page 28	Are the Corporate OASIS SB Program Manager (COPM) and Corporate OASIS SB Contract Manager (COCM) anticipated to be full-time or part-time employees? Can these individuals have other corporate responsibilities, or do they have to be solely dedicated to OASIS? RESPONSE: We have no expectations or authority regarding the employment status of Key Personnel. We only expect that the contract requirements be provided. If a contractor chooses to give OASIS Key Personnel other corporate responsibilities, that is fine. However, additional duties will not be considered as an excuse for not carrying out OASIS responsibilities.
5	G.2.6, Page 28	Does the Government intend to pay for key personnel, or would that responsibility fall to the contractor? RESPONSE: Please refer to the last sentence of Section G.2.6, which states, "All costs associated with the COPM and COCM shall be at no direct cost to the Government."
6	G.3.1, Page 30	What does the Government anticipate the Contract Access Fee (CAF) will be in terms of percentage? RESPONSE: This is an issue being vetted within GSA right now and is yet to be determined. The CAF will absolutely be no more than the .75% currently charged for other GSA vehicles, but OASIS may utilize a different approach. More to follow on this issue.
7	H.6.2, Page 43; Attachment J.4, Page 2	Section H.6.2 indicates that contractors "are encouraged to have an acceptable estimating system", which suggests that this requirement is desired but optional. However, Section L.5.5 of Attachment J.4 (Offeror's Proposal Checklist) indicates that an answer of "NO" for Question 2 regarding the estimating system makes an offeror ineligible for award. Is an acceptable estimating system a mandatory requirement for award? RESPONSE: The checklist contains a typo. Estimating systems are not required. Thank you for the catch.
8	H.7.4, Page 49	Please provide additional clarification regarding the Government's expectations regarding the development of marketing materials. Other than OASIS-specific brochures, what materials are expected to be developed? Will the Contractor or the Government be responsible for the cost of the development of these materials? RESPONSE: No materials other than an OASIS-specific brochure and contractor website are expected to be developed. Any and all marketing materials are to be provided at the sole expense of the contractor. We will clarify this in the solicitation.
9	H.6.6, page 44	ISO 9001 Certification - Necessary to bid for award of Prime for SB MAC Contract (or just to bid on Task Orders)? RESPONSE: No. The citation states that Contractors are "encouraged" to have this certification. Please also see Sections L and M for Pass/Fail Evaluation Criteria.
10	H.6.8, page 45	CMMI - Necessary to bid for award of Prime for SB MAC Contract (or just to bid on Task Orders)? RESPONSE: No. The citation states that Contractors are "encouraged" to have this certification. Please also see Sections L and M for Pass/Fail Evaluation Criteria.
11	H.6.9, page 45	EVMS - Necessary to bid for award of Prime for SB MAC Contract (or just to bid on Task Orders)? RESPONSE: No. The citation states that Contractors are "encouraged" to have this system. Please also see Sections L and M for Pass/Fail Evaluation Criteria.
12	J.7 and J.9	I notice that there is no DRAFT SECTION J.7 and J.9 in the FBO released documents for OASIS SB. Is that intentional? RESPONSE: Yes.

13	OASIS SB - Section H 6.5 Approved Purchasing System - Page 44	Does the government want an approved system or a certified system? An approved system would require a contractor utilize a previously identified list of approved systems. A certified system is a two-fold process that is out of the contractors control. First, a contractor can purchase an approved system, which is based on industry-leading compliant systems. Any system would then need to be certified by DCAA, which comes at the request of an agency, not the contractor. Additionally, wait times for DCAA audited systems is years. Therefore, if a contractor doesn't get an agency to request or sponsor the system compliant, the contractor cannot get it certified. A very large amount of points is assigned to the Purchasing System. Is the intent to have the Purchasing system audited or does the government request contractors utilize an approved system, which would be inclusive of a certain number of systems? If the later, would the government provide the list of approved systems.
		RESPONSE: We are seeking a system audited and certified by DCAA, DCMA, or any other government agency whose responsibility it is to audit and certify a contractor's purchasing system. One of the matters of complexity that OASIS and OASIS SB are attempting to solve revolves around Ancillary Support (commonly referred to as ODCs). The Purchasing System is critical in addressing this and saves Ordering Contracting Officers an enormous amount of time. Accordingly, a significant amount of points were assigned to this particular system. There is no list of Government "approved" or "compliant" systems that we are aware of, regardless of what any marketing material may suggest. EDIT: Requirement has been relaxed. See changes blog for details.
14	OASIS Unrestricted - Section L.5.3.1 - Page 85	Under the requirement of 5 Prime contracts with at least \$5M per year, there will be no participants in Pools 1 & 2 as that is \$25M revenue to meet this requirement, understanding size standards require 3 years average. Is that the governments intent to not utilize the 6 pools?
		RESPONSE: You seem to be misinterpreting this. On OASIS, companies may be of any size in any Pool. On OASIS SB, this would be a serious consideration, but not on OASIS.
15	H.3.1	It is noted that OASIS SB is a total small business set-aside contract. Does this mean that a small business cannot have a large business as a sub contractor?
		RESPONSE: No. The only limitation for OASIS SB subcontracting is that the OASIS SB Prime contractor must perform at least 50% of the labor performed on the contract. Beyond that, OASIS SB primes may subcontract with whomever they see fit at the task order level.
16	L.5.1.7	Excluding existing CTAs, does GSA want to know about the team? Does the team need to be established at the time of the OASIS SB submittal, or can a team be established dynamically for responding to task orders?
		RESPONSE: We designed OASIS and OASIS SB to be as flexible as possible in responding to task order solicitations. We are not considering teams at the master contract level.
17	L.5.3.2	Under Section L.5.3.2., Relevant Experience Minimum Requirements, there are five VERY limiting requirements for any SB. #1. You may not use experience from a CTA formed specifically for this opportunity, only JV. #2. All work must have been completed as the prime and not a subcontractor - where much of SB get their work; #3. The prime must provide THREE of the SIX core disciplines on each project; #4 each project must be at least \$2M; and #5 at least one of the five project must have completed as a Cost-Reimbursement contact - which comes with expensive DCAA audited accounting requirements. Please let me know if I am misreading these requirements.
		RESPONSE: You are interpreting those requirements correctly except for #3. The relevant experience examples must include 3 of the 6 core disciplines. Those may have been performed by the Prime, a sub, a teaming partner, or whomever. Please bear in mind that we are not looking for every SB to be able to compete for an OASIS SB award. We are looking for the highest technically rated SBs to perform complex requirements. We are looking for SB companies with proven, verifiable success performing complex work as a prime contractor. We are looking for SB companies with the existing systems, certifications, and resources to perform at a high level for these kinds of requirements. Accordingly, the standards are set high. We are certainly open to feedback, but recommendations designed to reduce the standards would only be considered if it is apparent that there would not be a sufficient pool of contractors to compete for the 40 spots we will be awarding in each Pool. EDIT: Requirement has been relaxed. See changes blog for details.
18	L.5.3.1; pg 80	Relevant Experience Minimum Requirements #3: Have a total award value of at least \$2 Million Per Year. Does this refer to each cited contract or does the statement refer to the combined value of the cited contracts?
		RESPONSE: The \$2M per year applies to each relevant experience reference.
19	L.5.4.2; pg 82	Past Performance: At least Three (3) out of Five (5) past performance projects must be for work that was for the Federal Government under a contract or task order awarded by the Federal Government AND must be the past performance for the same Five (5) relevant experience projects under Section L.5.3.2. Can a bidder cite an IDIQ-type project as a single reference or must the projects cited be just individual task orders within an IDIQ?
		RESPONSE: As there is no work performed at the IDIQ level, relevant experience should reference a specific task order or contract where work was actually performed.
20	C.2.1. Core Disciplines page 17	How are the Core Discipline Areas related to the NAICS Pools?

		RESPONSE: The core disciplines are not related to the Pools. The pools are based upon size standard and only size standard.
21	H.4.2.1. NAICS Pools page 40	Does a SB have to do 3 of the 6 Core Discipline Areas in each of the 6 NAICS Pools to qualify doing work in a particular Pool?
		RESPONSE: An SB has to provide a total of 5 samples of relevant experience. These samples are not related to Pools. Pools are only based upon size standard.
22	L.5. PROPOSAL CONTENT page 81	In Section L the requirements for Volume's 3 & 4 are close enough to be combined into one volume, why are they different volumes when essentially the same information is requested?
		RESPONSE: While relevant experience and past performance are not the same information, we will take that under advisement.
23	M.3. SCREENING AND EVALUATION PROCESS page 89	In Section M the evaluation process only seems to be a two-step screening process to limit you to the top 40 candidates for each pool and nowhere in either step does it state the relevant experience and past performance is going to be a strong factor in scoring (especially when most sections are Pass/Fail evaluated), can you explain how the process for award will be completed clearly?
		RESPONSE: Please read the entire Section M. Section M.5 clearly indicates the relative scoring for all factors.
24	M.4. ACCEPTABILITY REVIEW PROCESS page 92	If only a contractor is ONLY ENCOURAGED to have certifications than why use it as an evaluation criteria when there will be lopsided results? Will a contractor that has an ENCOURAGED certification be scored with a pass and a contractor without is scored with a fail (again it's only scored on a Pass/Fail evaluation)?
		RESPONSE: Offerors receive points based upon relevant experience, past performance, and systems, certifications, and resources as specified in Section M.5. Certifications are not evaluated on a pass/fail basis.
25	L.5.3.1, page 85	Please confirm that "project" can be a task order, a contract, an MA/IDIQ or a BPA
		RESPONSE: A project can be any contractual vehicle where work has been performed. Receiving a MA/IDIQ contract or BPA is not a project. Task orders, orders, and/or calls made under those vehicles would be considered projects, but the vehicles themselves would not.
26	L.5.3.1, page 85	Please clarify the definition of "total award value" for projects that are completed or active. For projects that are completed, is "total award value" the actual value divided by the number of months of period of performance. For projects that are active, is "total award value" the ceiling value (or total estimated value) divided by the number of months of period of performance.
		RESPONSE: For completed projects, "total award value" is the total obligated value of the project divided by the number of months of period of performance multiplied times 12 to yield an annual value. For active projects, "total award value" is the total estimated value of the project (including all options) divided by the number of months of period of performance multiplied times 12 to yield an annual value. We will clarify this in the solicitations.
27	L.5.3.1 Page 80	The relevant experience instructions state "projects" not "contracts". Is it acceptable to cite multiple "projects" that were performed under one "contract"?
		RESPONSE: No. The term projects was used to try to prevent confusion about the allowance of task orders or other contractual vehicles. All work performed under a single contractual instrument such as a single contract or task order may only count as one project. Multiple, separate task orders under a single IDIQ contract may be counted as multiple projects.
28		If a subcontractor operates a DCAA approved system but a prime contractor does not, would this be considered sufficient?
		RESPONSE: No.
29		Could you please provide guidance to which other auditors or agencies would be considered equivalent to DCAA for the purposes of meeting this requirement (accounting system)?
		RESPONSE: Any federal agency can be considered a cognizant audit agency. Please refer to FAR 42.003 for clarification of cognizant agency and FAR 42.101 for contract audit services. Normally, for contractors other than educational institutions and nonprofit organizations, the Defense Contract Audit Agency (DCAA) is the responsible Government audit agency. However, there may be instances where an agency other than DCAA desires cognizance of a particular contractor. In those instances, the two agencies shall agree on the most efficient and economical approach to meet contract audit requirements.
30		Finally, would a provisionally approved system or an active application for a DCAA certification be considered sufficient to meet this requirement (accounting system)?
		RESPONSE: An active application will not meet the requirement. A provisionally approved system will meet the requirement, however, in the event of award, the Contractor shall be placed in Dormant status for cost reimbursement task orders until the system is in full compliance. EDIT: Requirement has been relaxed. See changes blog for details.
31	C.2 (Pages 16-20)	Will the final solicitation include more detailed descriptions of the Core Disciplines and/or their service areas?
		RESPONSE: No. If you have suggestions as to how that might be accomplished, please advise. We feel that the definitions and examples are sufficient, but we are open to feedback.

32	C.3 (Page 20)	Will the final solicitation include a more detailed description of the Ancillary Support services?
		RESPONSE: No. As the solicitation states, Ancillary Support services are any "other" services required that are integral and necessary to complete a total integrated solution.
33	G.2 (Page 30) and L.5.5.11.2 (Page 86)	Section G.2 states the following COCM qualifications: "The COCM shall have a minimum of 5 years experience in negotiating and administering Indefinite Delivery, Indefinite Quantity (IDIQ), multiple award, multiple agency, or agency-wide contract vehicles including all contract pricing types and contract life-cycles." However, Section L.5.5.11.2 (Page 86) states the following COCM qualifications: "The COCM shall have a minimum of 5 years experience in negotiating and administering Indefinite Delivery, Indefinite Quantity (IDIQ), multiple award, multiple agency, or agency-wide contract vehicles including demonstrated experience in negotiating and administering all contract pricing types and contract life-cycles."
		RESPONSE: We will edit the solicitation to ensure the passages are identical.
34	Section L.2.3 (Page 74); Section M.2 (Page 89); Section M.3 (Page 90)	"In the event of a tie at the position of number 40, all Offerors tied for this position will receive a contract award." (L.2.3) "In the event of a tie at the position of number 40, all Offerors tied for this position shall receive a contract award." (M.2) "In the event of a tie at the position of number 40, all Offerors tied for this position shall receive a contract award." (M.3) For clarification purposes, this means that technically more than 40 offerors can win contract awards even though there are only 40 award positions?
		RESPONSE: Yes. For example, If two Offerors are tied for the 40th position, 41 awards shall be made. If five Offerors are tied for the 40th position, 44 awards shall be made.
35	Section L.2.4 (Page 74)	"The Government intends to award multiple contracts for the same or similar advisory and assistance services in 6 separate Pools of 40 awardees in each Pool under this solicitation." Will the same conditions stated in Sections L.2.3 (Page 74), M.2 (Page 89) and M.3 (Page 90) apply here in the event of a tie?
		RESPONSE: Yes.
36	Section L.2.4 (Page 74)	"Advisory and Assistance Services" are not clearly defined in the solicitation. Are they the same as the Ancillary Support services discussed in Section C.3 (Page 20)?
		RESPONSE: No. Advisory and Assistance Services are defined at FAR 2.101. Advisory and Assistance Services are a subset of the services that can be performed on OASIS and OASIS SB, so the clause that mentions them is required.
37	Section L.4 (Page 77)	For clarification purposes, as per the Table Legend, the government wants the Cost/Price Rationale discussion submitted in an Excel file (ABC-VOL6.RATIONALE.xls) and not a PDF (i.e., first composed and formatted in a Word file)?
		RESPONSE: Yes.
38	Section L.5.3.1 (Page 81)	If an offeror has a DCAA-certified accounting system, will that be sufficient in place of projects performed under Cost-Reimbursement contracts?
		RESPONSE: The requirement in the draft calls for at least one of the relevant experience projects to have been performed on a cost reimbursement basis, not all five. EDIT: Requirement has been relaxed. See changes blog for details.
39	Sections L.5.5.1 – L.5.5.10 (Pages 83-85)	If an offeror marks "No" for a Volume V section on the Offeror's Proposal Checklist (Section J.4., Attachment (4)), does the offeror still need to include the corresponding proposal section stating that the offeror does not have the representative system, certification or resource (i.e., do offerors include volume sections for items marked "No" on the checklist)? Also, would this apply to Volume I's Existing CTA section (required in Section L.5.1.7 (Pages 79-80))?
		RESPONSE: No. If an Offeror marks "no" for any proposal segment, any corresponding document/attachment should not be present.
40	Section M.5 (Page 94-95)	One of the Relevant Experience requirements Section L.5.3.1 states is "The primary scope of work must be One (1) of the Six (6) OASIS Core Disciplines," but this is not represented in the Scoring System table (although the "...integration of at least Three (3) out of the Six (6) OASIS SB Core Disciplines" requirement is).
		RESPONSE: The Scoring System reaches above and beyond the basic requirements.
41	Section M.5 (Page 94-95)	The Scoring System table begins listing for projects exceeding \$3 million per year in total award values, including options. However, Section L.5.3.1 (Page 80) states that projects must "Have a total award value of at least \$2 Million Per Year." Why doesn't the scoring begin at the minimum requirement?
		RESPONSE: The Scoring System and the points therein are given to recognize distinguishing factors that exceed the minimum requirement. There would be no reason to provide points to be given all Offerors who pass the pass/fail segment of the evaluation.
42	Section M.5 (Page 94-95)	The Scoring System table begins listing for projects integrating "4 out of 6 Core Disciplines." However, Section L.5.3.1 (Page 80) states that projects must "Involve the performance and/or integration of at least Three (3) out of the Six (6) OASIS SB Core Disciplines." Why doesn't scoring begin at the minimum requirement?
		RESPONSE: The Scoring System and the points therein are given to recognize distinguishing factors that exceed the minimum requirement. There would be no reason to provide points to be given all Offerors who pass the pass/fail segment of the evaluation.

43	Section M.5 (Page 94-95)	The Scoring System table only lists rows for four (4) past performance projects, but five (5) are required for proposal submission.
		RESPONSE: The Scoring System table is accurate and allows for 5 projects.
44	Section J.4, pages 4, 5, 6, 7, and 8	Item 2 requires each project to exceed at least \$2m per year in total award value or the offeror is ineligible for an award. Why must a small business offeror have 5 eligible projects, each of which must have an annual value of at least \$2m?
		RESPONSE: Given the price of professional labor, we calculated that the \$2M threshold is probably where requirements start to take on an integrated aspect. OASIS and OASIS SB are new contracts. As such, we have no historical information to pull from. Examining some of our GWAC contracts, it seemed that \$2M/year might actually be a bit low, but gathering feedback is what the draft RFP process is for. If we get substantial feedback that \$2M/year is too high, we'll adjust accordingly. EDIT: Requirement has been relaxed. See changes blog for details.
45	Page 48, Sections H.6.14 & H.6.15	These 2 sections, along with several others clearly indicate that GSA expects there will be teaming for support of OASIS, as these 2 sections each reference 'subcontracting' requirements. This appears to be somewhat contradictory to the requirement in Section L.3 that proposals may only represent the Prime Contractor (except for existing CTA's) for relevant past experience and associated past performance. Is GSA trying to discourage teaming for response to this solicitation?
		RESPONSE: To be perfectly clear, we are not allowing teaming at the contract level. However, we are allowing and encouraging teaming at the task order level.
46	Page 48, Sections H.6.14 & H.6.15	Are there any special rules that GSA anticipates it will require for small business who wish to team?
		RESPONSE: Teaming will not be considered for OASIS or OASIS SB contract level awards.
47	Page 48, Sections H.6.14 & H.6.15	Is GSA aware that many small businesses will need to team, particularly in order to support the ancillary services required to enable a full integrated solution response as outlined in Section C.3 page 20?
		RESPONSE: Yes, we are aware of the need to team. Teaming will be done at the task order level and primes will be free to team with whomever they deem the best fit for the requirement at the task order level.
48	Page 48, Sections H.6.14 & H.6.15	If a solicitation response is only able to show the experience/past performance of the prime, how is GSA proposing to 'vet' the capabilities/viability of any subcontractors a prime may need in order to provide a comprehensive response?
		RESPONSE: Teaming will not be considered for OASIS or OASIS SB contract level awards.
49	L.5.4.3 / Page 87	As a successful SB, we have only recently become ineligible to compete as a SB under certain NAICS codes. Since we don't qualify as a SB under all the OASIS NAICS, we would like to compete for an OASIS award under the unrestricted RFP. As a SB Prime BPA holder, we established and met or exceeded our socio-economic goals. However, since it was a SB award, we were not required to report it. Therefore, we could not gain any points in the scoring for this paragraph. Is there an alternative for a transitioning SB to get credit for meeting socio-economic goals?
		RESPONSE: No. In accordance with the feedback we received from both Industry and clients, we geared the evaluation strategy towards rewarding actual performance, but also tried to provide ample flexibility in the scoring system to overcome situations like you mention. Any suggestions you might have will definitely be considered.
50	Page 48, Sections H.6.14 & H.6.15	Why has GSA chosen to present the OASIS solicitation in such a way that subcontracting appears to be significantly less of a factor for concern in review of a prime's overall capabilities?
		RESPONSE: Your series of questions concern teaming. There are several reasons that we do not support teaming at the contract level. These include: 1. We do not want to compromise flexibility at the task order level. One of the key elements of OASIS and OASIS SB is flexibility at the task order level. Accordingly, we do not want to implement teaming arrangements at the contract level that may not be the best teaming arrangement for individual task order requirements. 2. The Government has no privity of contract with subcontractors or teaming partners, which means that the teaming agreement could literally be changed the day after award. We do not feel that basing an OASIS or OASIS SB award on something that could evaporate the day after award is a sound approach. 3. Our experience and feedback received indicate that teaming arrangements at the contract level generally turn into paperwork exercises and that many team members that were used to get a contract award are never actually utilized in performance under that contract. 4. We are searching for businesses with an actual history of performance, not the promise of what a group of contractors might be able to do. We are very firm in our opinion on this.

51	Page 48, Sections H.6.14 & H.6.15	Given these questions, should a prime still consider responding to the OASIS RFI solicitation with the 'full team' capabilities, even though past experience/past performance of the undisclosed subcontractors will not be presented within the context of the response?; 7) If the answer to question 6 is 'NO', can GSA advise how the issue of subcontracting will be addressed in the context of the future RFP (i.e., solicitation) that will follow this RFI?; 8) if the answer to question 6 is 'YES', can GSA advise how it expects primes to appropriately and fully incorporate the use of subcontractors in its RFI (and future RFP) solicitation responses without addressing any subcontractor past experience in its solicitation response?
		RESPONSE: Teaming will not be considered for OASIS or OASIS SB contract level awards. Proposals submitted from "teams" who are not pre-existing entities shall not be considered.
52	Section M.5 (Page 94-95)	The Scoring System table begins listing CMMI Maturity at Level 3. While Section L.5.5.8 (Page 84-85) does not state any minimal CMMI Level requirements, Section H.6.8 (Page 45) encourages offerors to have CMMI Maturity Level 3 or higher. Should Section L.5.5.8 say something to the same affect (as well as any evaluation conditions given in Section M of the final solicitation)?
		RESPONSE: Section H are Special Contract Requirements. Section L is Instructions to Offerors. Section M is Evaluation Criteria. These sections do not need to repeat themselves within each other. The systems, certifications, and resources desired for OASIS and OASIS SB Contractors are outlined in Section H. Contractors are provided instruction on how to submit proposal documents in support of those items in Section L. Finally, the relative value of those items is identified in the Scoring System of Section M.
53	Section M.5 (Page 94-95)	The Scoring System table lists for projects that include OCONUS work, however, it references Section L.5.3.1 (Pages 80-81) which does not state any OCONUS project requirements or preferences.
		RESPONSE: The Scoring System and the points therein are given to recognize distinguishing factors that exceed the minimum requirement. OCONUS work is not mandatory, but does demonstrate an added degree of complexity. Accordingly, more points are provided for OCONUS projects.
54	Section M.5 (Page 94-95)	The Scoring System table lists for projects that "include Ancillary Support" and were "Performed in Multiple Locations," however, it references Section L.5.3.1 (Pages 80-81) which does not state any requirements or preferences regarding these past performance factors.
		RESPONSE: The Scoring System and the points therein are given to recognize distinguishing factors that exceed the minimum requirement. Projects performed in multiple locations are not mandatory, but those projects demonstrate an added degree of complexity. Accordingly, more points are provided for projects performed in multiple locations.
55	Section M.5 (Page 94-95)	The Scoring System table begins listings for a COPM and COCM each having at least 10 years of experience. However, Sections L.5.5.11.1 and L.5.5.11.2 (Pages 85-86) states "a minimum of 5 years experience" for each position. Why doesn't scoring begin at the minimum requirement?
		RESPONSE: The Scoring System and the points therein are given to recognize distinguishing factors that exceed the minimum requirement. There would be no reason to provide points to be given to all Offerors who pass the pass/fail segment of the evaluation.
56	Section H.6.1, Page 42	This page states that "The Contractor must maintain an adequate accounting system by the Defense Contract Audit Agency (DCAA) or other cognizant auditor for the entire term of OASIS SB." Section L.6.2 implies that either a DCAA or a DCMA "approved" bill rate system is acceptable. Please clarify what constitutes a "cognizant auditor." For example is a system approved by DCMA acceptable? Is a private sector audit report acceptable? Are there other organizations or entities that satisfy this requirement in addition to DCAA? If a "cognizant auditor" is used other than DCAA, what documentation is required for submission with the proposal?
		RESPONSE: Please see the other response about cognizant and audit services. EDIT: Requirement has been relaxed. See changes blog for details.
57	Section C.2 starting on Page 16; section L.5.3.1 starting on Page 80 Section L.5.3.1; and M.2 starting on Page 89.	The requirement for past performance submission requires five past performance submissions that meet the minimum conditions described in Section L.5.3.1. In addition, section M.2 states that "A Contractor may be eligible for award in multiple Pools under a single Contract Number." Please confirm that GSA wants only one proposal that covers all possible pools for which the bidder is competing and not individual proposals for each pool.
		RESPONSE: We are seeking only ONE proposal.
58		Please confirm that the requirements listed in section L.5.3.1 apply to the five past performance submission collectively and not for each past performance individually.
		RESPONSE: The requirements listed in Section L.5.3.1 apply to each relevant experience and past performance example.

59		Please clarify how the GSA will evaluate past performance across the various pools when a bidder is competing for an award that would include more than one pool. We see the mix of capabilities that must be included in five past performances as being difficult to achieve for companies that want to compete for an award in more than one pool. Only having five past performances to cover multiple pools appears to be overly restrictive and difficult, and can limit a company's ability to submit a viable proposal-especially where past performance from subcontractors is not permitted. Also, we believe that it also will severely limit competition and the ability of GSA to receive bids companies that would otherwise be very viable candidates for award.
		RESPONSE: Past performance and relevant experience is not Pool specific. Pools have absolutely nothing to do with the relevant experience and past performance examples. We aren't even asking for the NAICS codes that were reported for these examples. Pools only reflect size standards and nothing more. This is as open and unrestrictive as we can imagine. We are operating from a couple of key principles that might shed more light on this: 1. NAICS codes do not define scope. NAICS codes are reporting codes developed by the Department of Commerce to categorize how the Government spends its money. The SBA decided to use those codes to establish various Small Business size standards across industries. 2. The OASIS core disciplines are present in every single NAICS code assigned to OASIS. 3. We believe that the high quality Contractors that will end up with OASIS and OASIS SB awards will pursue work that they are proficient in and forego work that they are not as proficient in. Every single OASIS and OASIS SB awardee will have experience integrating various disciplines, so our Contractor base will not be "niche" or highly specialized contractors who only have expertise performing one discipline. Accordingly, we feel that OASIS and OASIS SB contractors will only select the Pools they want to perform in, and beyond that, will only propose on requirements they feel they can perform successfully. 4. Failure is not an option in performing OASIS and OASIS SB task orders and we have built in contractual "teeth" to ensure OASIS and OASIS SB contractors perform at a high level.
60	Section K.1.4, starting on Page 68, and Section M.2 starting on Page 89	This section provides the NAICS codes for each pool and past performance instructions. Section M.5 includes the scoring sheet. The blog posting on April 4, 2013 provides examples of how the pool system evaluation will work. In each example in the blog there is an activity where "evaluations" are conducted..." Beyond the pass/fail criteria and the objective scoring in the score sheets, what other types of evaluations will be performed? Will there be scoring or evaluation that counts regarding the technical proposal content, pricing, or the contents within each of the past performance submissions? If there will be, how will those evaluations occur and be scored. If there will not be additional evaluation, does this mean that the only criteria for evaluation is the pass/fail criteria and the objective numbers entered on the score sheet?
		RESPONSE: The Pass/Fail process, the Scoring mechanism, and validation of fair and reasonable pricing make up the entire evaluation process.
61	Section K.1.4, starting on Page 68, and Section M.2 starting on Page 89	This section provides the NAICS codes for each pool and past performance instructions. Section M.5 includes the scoring sheet. The blog posting on April 4, 2013 provides examples of how the pool system evaluation will work. In each example in the blog there is an activity where "evaluations" are conducted..." Beyond the pass/fail criteria and the objective scoring in the score sheets, what other types of evaluations will be performed? Will there be scoring or evaluation that counts regarding the technical proposal content, pricing, or the contents within each of the past performance submissions? If there will be, how will those evaluations occur and be scored. If there will not be additional evaluation, does this mean that the only criteria for evaluation is the pass/fail criteria and the objective numbers entered on the score sheet?
		RESPONSE: Yes, the last sentence is precisely correct. The pass/fail criteria and the objective scoring mechanism is the only evaluation to be conducted.
62	K.1.4, starting on Page 68, and Section M.2 starting on Page 89	This section provides the NAICS codes for each pool and past performance instructions. Please clarify that the first two requirements in section M.2 ("1. The primary scope of work must be One (1) of the Six (6) OASIS Core Disciplines. 2. Involve the performance and/or integration of at least Three (3) out of the Six (6) OASIS SB Core Disciplines. The OASIS SB Core Disciplines are described in Section C and include Program Management Services, Management Consulting Services, Scientific Services, Engineering Services, Logistics Services, and Financial Management Services") mean that the past performance must include performance across all of the NAICS codes in the list for a pool, some of them, or some other combination. It is not clear how the past performance is to be compared to multiple NAICs within each pool.
		RESPONSE: Past performance and relevant experience are tied to the OASIS core disciplines. The OASIS core disciplines make up the scope of OASIS. Past performance and relevant experience have absolutely nothing to do with NAICS codes or Pools. NAICS codes and Pools only determine what size standard applies for a given task order requirement and which group of contractors get to compete for that requirement.

63	Section H.10.2 on Page 52	<p>This page states that "The Government contemplates that leases may be part of a task order solution offered by a Contractor, but the Government, where the Contractor's solution includes leasing, must not be the Lessee. Under no circumstances on any task order awarded under OASIS SB shall the Government be deemed to have privity-of-contract with the Owner/Lessor of the Leased Items; or, the Government be held liable for early Termination/Cancellation damages if the Government decides not to exercise an option period under a task order unless the Contractor has specifically disclosed the amount of such damages (or the formula by which such damages would be calculated) as part of its proposal and the OCO for the task order has specifically approved/allowed such damages as part of the task order terms and conditions." While we understand the government's position on leasing, we believe that this requirement places an extraordinary risk on the contractor and may also increase the government's cost. Request that GSA consider revision to reduce the risk to contractors. In addition, are we correct to assume that the term "personal property includes equipment, vehicles, licenses and other non-real estate property? If this is an incorrect assumption, please clarify the term "personal property."</p>
		<p>RESPONSE: Contractors are not required to propose leases as part of task order proposals and should refrain from doing so if they deem it too risky. Please refer to FAR 2.101 for the definition of personal property.</p>
64		<p>Can a GSA Protégé who is interested in Priming OASIS use the Past Performance of their Mentor in qualifying for the effort?</p>
		<p>RESPONSE: No.</p>
65		<p>Can a Small Business use their Prime IT Past Performance Qualifications in qualifying for the effort?</p>
		<p>RESPONSE: No.</p>
66		<p>Will a Small Business be allowed to use their Prime Past Performance, inclusive of their subcontracted work to Team members, in qualifying for the effort?</p>
		<p>RESPONSE: If we read this question correctly, you are asking whether you may use a project where you were the prime and subcontracted out work to other companies. If that is the question, the answer is Yes.</p>
67		<p>Will GSA relax the requirement on Past Performance and allow Small Business to use their Past Performance as a Subcontractor?</p>
		<p>RESPONSE: We will consider it, but are unlikely to do so.</p>
68	L3, Page 75 & form J-10	<p>Given the generic nature of the proposal instructions, it was our understanding that all GSA is seeking to receive by April 29, 2013 is vendor comments, questions and suggestions, etc., provided via this form/format, regarding the multi-part OASIS draft solicitation. However, there are multiple attachments to the solicitation documents and a number of statements/forms that make it appear as though a comprehensive, 6 volume RFI response is being requested at this time. We have encountered significant vendor community confusion regarding this specific requirement for response to this RFI at this time, so we are asking that GSA please confirm decisively the information/response it desires from prospective vendors by April 29th? Thank you.</p>
		<p>RESPONSE: The only thing we are seeking by April 29th are Industry questions and feedback. The draft solicitation has attachments because the actual solicitation will have the same attachments. We provided as complete of a draft as we could to get the most feedback possible.</p>
69	Section B.2.1; page 11	<p>Please clarify how the "Contractor shall become proficient in the use of the BLS SOC system." Is there training available? Is there a website that offers guidance?</p>
		<p>RESPONSE: Contractors who win OASIS awards will be trained by the OASIS Program Office at the OASIS Kickoff meeting and OASIS PMRs in the future.</p>
70	Section H.6.14, page 48	<p>Limitations on subcontracting does not speak to the type of concern permitted as a subcontractor. Is a SB concern permitted to subcontract to a large business?</p>
		<p>RESPONSE: OASIS SB primes may subcontract with whomever they so desire on an OASIS task order.</p>
71	Section L.3, page 75	<p>Will the Government provide sufficient time between the final RFP release and proposal due date to allow compliance with the requirement to register in the AAS Business Systems Portal at least one month prior to submitting proposal documents?</p>
		<p>RESPONSE: Unless significant changes dictate otherwise, the OASIS CO intends to leave the formal solicitation open for 30 days. Potential Offerors could sign up for the system right now if they haven't already. The instructions provided are intended to assist Offerors in avoiding last minute complications at proposal due date.</p>
72	Section J.1 (Attachment (1), page 1	<p>Will the Government accept additional experience in lieu of the required degree for the Junior, Journeyman, and/or Senior Level positions?</p>
		<p>RESPONSE: Any exception to the definitions of Junior, Journeyman, and Senior will need to be identified at the task order level. The contract standard is as stated. If you would like to suggest an alternative, please provide us a recommendation and rationale for the recommendation.</p>
73	Section J.1 (Attachment (1), page 1	<p>The draft RFI states, "Contractors may deviate from the definitions above." What is the criteria for acceptance of the deviations under which contractors may propose individuals?</p>
		<p>RESPONSE: We have attempted to provide a great deal of flexibility to both clients and OASIS primes where it concerns labor categories. Deviations will be examined at the task order level to determine how those deviations affect the task order requirement being responded to. We suggest collaboration with the OCO prior to submitting deviations.</p>

74	Section J.1 (Attachment (1), page 1)	How do the OASIS SB Labor Categories and BLS SOC map to the NAICs Pools?
		RESPONSE: They don't. The Pools are based on size standards and nothing else. Labor Categories and SOCs are universal.
75		Are there two separate contract vehicles <u>each</u> with 6 NAICS pools and a minimum of 40 contractors in each pool?
		RESPONSE: That is correct.
76		How is a "small business" defined for the purposes of the IDIQ awards?
		RESPONSE: Each OASIS and OASIS SB Pool has a different size standard.
77		Is the NAICS business size based on a 3-year average or based on current year at the time of proposal submittal?
		RESPONSE: 3-year average. Please check with your local SBA representative if you have any questions regarding your Small Business status.
78		When a task order is issued, are all contractors within the applicable pool eligible to bid?
		RESPONSE: Yes. Fair Opportunity shall be provided to all Industry Partners within a given Pool unless a justification for an exception to Fair Opportunity is accomplished in accordance with FAR Part 16.
79		What is the specific process to transition Small Business contractors who outgrow their size status?
		RESPONSE: Please read Section H.11.2 of the OASIS SB draft solicitation.
80		Is the Relevant Experience requirement to address 3 of the 6 SB core areas cumulative across the 5 past performance citations, or does it apply for each citation?
		RESPONSE: We are looking for companies with experience in Integration. The requirement applies to each citation.
81		Is the Relevant Experience requirement to address 4 of the 6 unrestricted core areas cumulative across the 5 past performance citations, or does it apply for each citation?
		RESPONSE: We are looking for companies with experience in Integration. The requirement applies to each citation.
82	L.2.3, page 74	Section states that "The Government intends to establish a Multiple Award IDIQ Contract that consists of 6 separate Pools of Contractors based upon size standards and 40 contract awards for each Pool." Is it the Government's intent to have 40 contracts awarded per pool for both the large and small business contracts for a total of 480 awards?
		RESPONSE: That is the maximum number of potential awards between both contracts. However, we expect that contractors will win multiple Pools.
83	L.5.3.2.2.	Please provide greater detail on how the Government will verify that a past experience is relevant to one of the six core disciplines. Is having a word in the contractual/proposal document that matches one of the core disciplines or its subdisciplines sufficient? Or is a paragraph on relevant material needed? More than a paragraph?
		RESPONSE: There is no set number of words or verbiage. The citation should be self evident.
84	L 5.4.1 / 86	The requirement states "Offerors must verify that the <u>overall</u> past performance evaluation was finalized in CPARS prior to proposal submission." The CPARS process requires that each year of a contract be assessed independently and no one CPAR would cover the <u>overall</u> past performance for a multiple year contract. Given this, we recommend that requirement for the overall past performance be dropped.
		RESPONSE: The CPAR process calls for annual updates during performance and an overall evaluation once the project is complete.
85	Section L.5.3.1, page 85	Please define "total award value" per year. How is this metric to be calculated? What contractual documents are to be used to provide inputs for this calculation?
		RESPONSE: Please see earlier response regarding total award value.
86	M.5	Why are there no points provided for minimum requirements?
		RESPONSE: A contract evaluation strategy is designed to distinguish between Offerors. If points are given for minimum requirements, then everyone scored would receive them. This generates no distinction between Offerors. Accordingly, points are given when Offerors go above and beyond the minimum requirements to distinguish who are the highest rated.
87		What are the GSA costs for customers using OASIS? At one time we had heard standard GSA costs were .75% to the user.
		RESPONSE: That is the standard fee for GSA contract vehicles. The fee for OASIS will not exceed that rate. However, the contract access fee for the OASIS vehicles has not yet been determined.
88		Will Key Personnel be required for each TO or just an overall PM?
		RESPONSE: Task order requirements will vary and be specified in each task order solicitation. The OASIS and OASIS SB master contract requirements for key personnel are identified in Section G.2.6.
89		What do expect the number of awards or seats to be on each effort?
		RESPONSE: Please see Section L of the Solicitation. The Government intends to establish a Multiple Award IDIQ Contract that consists of 6 separate Pools of Contractors based upon size standards and 40 contract awards for each Pool. A single Contractor may compete for more than one Pool.
90		Is there a maximum ceiling companies can reach for work they win?
		RESPONSE: No.

91		Do we have to bid on every TO once our pools are established? RESPONSE: No.
92		Can sole source awards be worked through OASIS? RESPONSE: Yes.
93		Will teams who qualify and win seats on both efforts be effected for dual qualification to the negative? How will that dynamic be managed or work be "doled out?" RESPONSE: First, we are not considering teams for prime awards. Secondly, we do not understand the remainder of the question. Please clarify.
94		We have seen numerous estimations ranging from \$4B to \$47B of the ceilings for both efforts? Are you any closer to providing rough or true estimates? RESPONSE: There have been no ceiling estimates provided by GSA. This is an issue that is being vetted internally at this time.
95		Regarding OASIS SB Draft Solicitation Number: OASIS_SB_RFI, can you please clarify whether a small business can include a large business on their team in responding to this solicitation? RESPONSE: No. Small businesses may subcontract to large businesses on task orders, but teams are not being considered for OASIS SB prime awards.
96	Page 30 - G.2.6.1.	"Corporate OASIS Program Manager (COPM): The COPM duties include, but are not limited to: Implementing the Contractor's Marketing Plan, incorporated into OASIS by reference." Is the market plan part of the proposal? RESPONSE: No. This reference was left in by mistake and shall be removed.
97	Page 31 – G.3.2.	Does the OMM exist? Has it been tested and is it ready for operations? Can contractors review it now? RESPONSE: No. The OMM is currently in development.
98	Page 34 - G.3.3.1.	"ISR Reporting: Contractors are encouraged to meet the subcontracting goals presented in the table." We are smaller than many large businesses. Can we be awarded a contract if our Subcontracting plan does not use these specific goals? Bidding OASIS is a major investment for a company our size, and the federal market is in a period of contraction. To make this investment while essentially committing to providing at least half of the business to other companies is a significant burden, restrains trade, and places an unfair burden on capable companies who exceed an arbitrary size standard based on the selected NAICS codes. The OASIS PMO should seriously consider an arrangement that allows for a sliding scale of small business goals based on an inverse relationship between the size of the company making the offer and the size of the ISR goals. For example, a scale like the following might be considered: >\$1 Billion revenue or >10,000 employees = ISR goal of 50%; <\$1 Billion revenue or <10,000 employees = ISR goal of 40%; <\$100 Million revenue or <3,000 employees = ISR goal of 30%; and <\$10 Million revenue or <1,000 employees = ISR goal of 20%. We believe this helps level the playing field among large businesses of varying sizes and will enable successful small businesses who have grown beyond small business standards to make the investment in bidding by seeing the potential for a sustainable return on investment. For small businesses it will provide the opportunity to team with companies with cultural affinity closer to their own and with a record of success doing what they are trying to do – grow. RESPONSE: In response to the first question present, a company can potentially be awarded a contract even if their subcontracting goals do not match those provided in the solicitation. However, we strongly encourage the use of these goals and do not agree that utilization of small business for subcontracting inhibits corporate growth.
99	Page 42 - H.4.2.1.	What is the purpose of the NAICS Pools for the Unrestricted Solicitation? Based on your responses to Round 1 Questions, it appears that any company can apply for all pools in the unrestricted solicitation. RESPONSE: The purpose of Pools on the Unrestricted solicitation is to account for the different size standards on the OASIS and OASIS SB contracts. A business may be considered large or small depending upon which size standard is applied.
100	Page 49 - H.7.4.	NAICS Pools: We qualify as a SB in pools 4, 5, and 6. Do we require a subcontracting plan? Are we considered a SB or a LB? RESPONSE: A subcontracting plan is not required on the OASIS SB contract.
101	Page 49 - H.7.4.	"Marketing: The Contractor shall develop company specific OASIS brochures for distribution at trade shows, conferences, seminars, etc., and distribute printed materials to enhance awareness of OASIS. The Contractor shall participate in various conferences and trade shows to facilitate outreach efforts for federal agency customers and to aid in the marketing of OASIS." Is the government really requiring contractors to invest in specific marketing materials, at the company's own cost when awarded an ID/IQ contract? This can greatly increase the overhead and unallowable budgets. This is a major burden for smaller businesses. Is the OASIS Program Office ready to address this marketing activity with the appropriate client audit agencies to accept these expenses as allowable expenses since it is required or is the PO ready to relieve businesses of this requirement? RESPONSE: Yes and yes.
102	Page 74 - L.2.3. and L.2.4., Page 75	Is the government really going to award 40 contract awards for each of 6 separate Pools on the unrestricted solicitation? This seems excessive given that all companies can compete for all pools in the unrestricted solicitation. RESPONSE: Yes. We are seeking the highest technically rated Offerors within each size standard.

103	Page 100 - M.5.	Grading Criteria for L.5.4.3. "Meets or Exceeds Total Small Business Goal." L.5.4.3. merely requires the submission of the Individual Summary Report (ISR) or Summary Subcontract Report (SSR) that was finalized in the eSRS system. However, the grading criteria mentions goals. Is this referencing the goals in Section L.5.1.6.2? If the latter is the case, how will you account for companies that were small businesses when they were awarded the contract used for the relevant past performance project? As a small business, we were required to perform 51% of the work and therefore could not have subcontracted 50% of the work to other small businesses.
		RESPONSE: If the project was performed as a small business, the ISR or SSR would not apply.
104	L.5.3.1 Relevant Experience Min	Do you want exactly five projects (no more, no less) whose total aggregate value is at least \$5million per year?
		RESPONSE: No. We are asking for exactly five projects whose total average value is \$5M each.
105	L.5.3.1 Relevant Experience Min	Can one or more of the five include a blanket purchase agreement under which we have been awarded individual task orders?
		RESPONSE: No. Please see the earlier response regarding BPAs.
106	B.1.3, p. 10	Will alternative proposals be allowed at the task order competition level?
		RESPONSE: Task order terms and conditions will dictate this. There is nothing in the OASIS contracts that forbids it.
107	B.2.5, p. 12	Given the standardized labor category and pricing approach of OASIS, will contractors be allowed to discount from their OASIS labor category price list on individual task order competitions?
		RESPONSE: There are no fixed prices on OASIS. Offerors may provide any pricing appropriate to their offer on competitive procurements.
108	B.3.1, p. 14	GSA has stated that it may, based on specific task order needs, add new labor categories to OASIS during the contract. How will contractors propose against new labor categories? Will there be a rate negotiation process?
		RESPONSE: Additional labor categories should be proposed at the task order level and will be negotiated at the task order level. Offerors should pre-coordinate with OCOs prior to submitting new labor categories.
109	G.3.12, p. 37	Could you clarify the intent of the statement "...and maintaining a strategic partnership between the OASIS SB Contractors..."? Given that OASIS small business primes will be competing against one another, what is the expectation in terms of strategic partnering amongst the primes?
		RESPONSE: All OASIS primes will be expected to treat each other with respect. We expect an environment of sharing best practices and lessons learned. We expect collaboration through Special Interest Groups. The OASIS Program Office intends to foster a "family" or "team" environment amongst OASIS contract holders and our clients. It is our fundamental belief that the success of one vendor does not come at the expense of another vendor and that the OASIS contracts will be at their strongest when all OASIS contract holders are successful. Together, everyone achieves more.
110	H.4.2, p. 40	It is our understanding that the pooling concept around NAICS codes is strictly to determine size standard, not necessarily NAICS functional areas. For example, though the codes for Pool 2 are predominately financial type codes, it does not mean that an engineering or logistics task order could not be competed in Pool 2 because it is a better fit from a size standard perspective (i.e., a slightly larger small business would have a greater potential for successful execution vice a smaller small business). Is this interpretation correct?
		RESPONSE: You are 100% correct in that the pools are based upon size standard. The OCO will select a NAICS code that best represents the task order to be competed. That NAICS code will automatically determine which Pool the task order gets competed within. No contracting officer has the authority to select any size standard they want for their task order requirement. Size standards are based upon NAICS code selection. So while the Pools are not functional areas, they are associated with NAICS codes simply because every NAICS code has an associated size standard.
111	L.2.5, p. 74	Our understanding is that protests are not allowable at the task order competition for the DHS TABSS IDIQ. Will the same approach be used for OASIS?
		RESPONSE: The limitation on protests on IDIQ task orders applies to all IDIQ contracts, including OASIS and OASIS SB. Please refer to FAR 16.505 for details.
112	B.2.1, p. 11	The Contractor shall become proficient in BLS SOC system to submit cost/pricing proposal? Is this proficiency obtained just through use of the system or are there specific expectations?
		RESPONSE: Proficiency should be obtained through use of the system as well as OASIS Program Office training that will be provided after contract awards and throughout the life of the OASIS contracts.
113	G.3.1, p. 30	Is the Contract Access Fee (CAF) similar to the Industrial Funding Fee of .75% assessed to our GSA contracts?
		RESPONSE: Yes.
114	G.3.2, p. 30	Are there any particular requirements for a company to be able to access the OMM within the GSA AAS Business Systems Portal other than registering?
		RESPONSE: The OMM does not yet exist. It is currently in development.

115	General	Will GSA OASIS include a "bid-up" option, allowing Pool 1 primes to bid-up into Pool 2-6 (and so on) on task order competitions? Or, will OASIS SB primes be restricted to task order competitions in their pool?
		RESPONSE: As of right now, OASIS and OASIS SB primes are restricted to task order competitions in their awarded Pool(s). We are, however, exploring the idea of a "bid-up" approach on OASIS SB.
116	L.3 on page 75	Offerors are hereby instructed to register in the AAS Business Systems Portal at least one month prior to submitting proposal documents. Please verify RFP response dates will be greater than 30 days in order to comply with requirement upon receipt of Final RFP.
		RESPONSE: Potential Offerors may register for the system at any time, including right now. The stated instructions are intended to prevent last minute complications at the proposal due date.
117	Section L.5.3 VOLUME 3 Relevant Experience	For relevant experience, can offerors use GSA Schedule projects, if the project had multiple disciplines, more than one SIN, and more than one schedule?
		RESPONSE: Yes, so long as it is a single task order.
118	Section C.2.1.4, Engineering Services; page 18	Section C.2.1.4 states "Engineering Services covered by the Brooks Architect-Engineers Act (40 U.S.C. 1102) are not covered by OASIS and are specifically prohibited to be performed on OASIS task orders." In many cases, A/E firms provide a wide range of services under Brooks Act A/E services contracts that would not be considered A/E services and do align with the scope of services in the OASIS contract. <i>Is it allowable to include such task orders as part of our Relevant Experience that clearly are not A/E design services, but are delivered under a Brooks Act procurement?</i>
		RESPONSE: If the relevant experience example could not have been performed under the OASIS contract, it is not an acceptable submission.
119	Section C.4, Services Not in Scope; page 21	Section C.4, Services Not in Scope, lists Hazmat Abatement as a service that will not be issued under the OASIS contract. <i>Please define, specifically, the scope/services that would constitute Hazmat Abatement. We want to clearly understand the difference between that and "Environmental Consulting and Remediation" services listed under Section C.2.1.4, Engineering Services (page 18).</i>
		RESPONSE: The Section actually states, "The OCO shall not issue a task order and a Contractor shall not accept or perform work for the following services when the primary task order scope of work is..." Hazmat abatement, on it's own, is typically included as Service Contract Act labor under "Hazardous Waste Pickup and Disposal Services" and not considered professional labor. This labor could be added as ancillary when integral and necessary to the overall requirement, but not be the primary scope of a task order. The distinction here is what the primary scope of work to be performed is and the utilization of professional labor.
120	Section L.5.3.1, Relevant Experience Minimum Requirements; page 85	GSA states, "Using the relevant experience template in accordance with the instructions in Section L.5.3.2, the Offeror must demonstrate five (5) distinct projects . . ." <i>Please confirm whether multiple task orders from the same contract may be combined under a single project description. The previous Q&A response to Question 20 (April 4, 2013) did not specifically address this aspect of the question.</i>
		RESPONSE: No. Task orders may not be combined.
121	Section H.6.14 on Page 48	This page states that "In performance of services awarded under OASIS SB, at least 50% of the cost of task order performance incurred for personnel shall be expended by the OASIS SB Prime Contractor." Does this requirement apply to each task order awarded or across task orders over a period of time (e.g. one year or five years)? Also, please confirm that this 50% requirement is for labor pricing only and not for ODCs, licenses, equipment purchases or other expenses.
		RESPONSE: As the rules currently exist, this requirement exists at the contract level and applies to the cumulative of all task orders performed. We plan to review this annually. However, it is our understanding that a proposed change may take affect that changes this requirement to the task order level, would apply to all dollars spent, and would allow for subcontracting to other small businesses to count towards the 50%. We will implement whichever rule is in effect at the time of contract awards.
122	G.3.2.4, p. 32	Are there specific requirements a small business would need to meet in order to pay CAF via pay.gov?
		RESPONSE: Answer pending.
123	G.3.8, p. 35	FAPIS – is entering required information accomplished by the information we enter into SAM (old CCR stuff)?
		RESPONSE: Answer pending.
124	G.3.10, p. 36	Are there particular requirements needed prior to award in order to complete FSRS reporting requirements?
		RESPONSE: Answer pending.
		New This Week:
125	A.1.1	In reference to (c) question 3, will individual projects be eligible for multiple scores if they satisfy requirements in multiple categories?
		RESPONSE: We are sorry, but we do not understand this question. Please expound.
126	A.1.1	In reference to (c) question 3, will L.3.5.1 be scored differently if a project has been performed in more than 2 locations, or is more than one the best evaluation possible?
		RESPONSE: More than one is the best score possible.

127	A.1.1	In reference to (c) question 3, will individuals and certs be eligible for scoring under multiple categories if those categories are satisfied by the specified individual or cert?
		RESPONSE: We are sorry, but we do not understand this question. Please expound.
128	C	States that the CAF would be determined by GSA. In subsequent documents, it has been stated that the CAF was under consideration by GSA and that an alternative option was being considered. Have any additional details emerged on what GSA is considering, if not a standard CAF?
		RESPONSE: Not yet. We will update as soon as a decision is made final.
129	H	In reference to Scope. Has GSA settled on this and, if not, what are the anticipated additions or subtractions to this list?
		RESPONSE: The scope is final unless changes emerge from this draft process.
130	L	Does the Pool approach referenced with regard to the NAICS code table represent the final determination of the Program team, or are additional or different approaches being considered with regard to business size classifications?
		RESPONSE: It is final unless changes emerge from this draft process. If you have a different suggestion, please let us know. We have to ensure that the correct size standard applies for each task order. We developed the Pools based upon size standard instead of creating Pools for each NAICS code, which would have been overly burdensome.
131	Attachment J2	What surveys or methods were used to assemble these rates and are they specific to any regions? If they are not specific to any regions, will the contractor be allowed to adjust rates based on Department of Labor or recognized industry data for regional salary adjustments?
		RESPONSE: The direct labor rates provided were extracted from the DoL SOC data. These represent the highest direct labor rates for each corresponding labor category amongst every state in the US and amongst all industries.
132		The table lists Small Business Direct Labor Ranges. Are the min/max rates provided for each labor category the individuals' direct labor, burdened rate, burdened rate with fee, or some other consideration?
		RESPONSE: Those are direct labor rates.
133	L.5.4.2., pg 86	We have Federal Government contracts with the Department of Defense and with the Intelligence Community that do not participate in CPARS because of the classification of the work. Will it be acceptable to submit unclassified Past Performance Evaluations in lieu of CPARS evaluation?
		RESPONSE: Yes, but Offerors are instructed to exercise extreme caution regarding classified work and classified handling procedures. Under no circumstances shall an Offeror send classified information or material to the OASIS team as part of a proposal submission. Additionally, any Past Performance evaluation not in CPARS needs to utilize Attachment J.6 as part of your proposal.
134	L.5.3.2.3, p 86	Most of our federal contracts are marked "CLASSIFIED" which means they have special handling requirements; do you have a mechanism for submitting and scoring Classified Relevant Experience submissions?
		RESPONSE: No.
135	L.5.3.2.3, p 86	Some of our contracts are marked "Unclassified / For Official Use Only" (FOUO) which is a mechanism to control how documents are handled because they are restricted from public release. Most agencies do not allow these documents to be passed among other agencies without signed authority. Are there mechanisms in place to get signed authority from these agencies?
		RESPONSE: Unclassified information can be submitted. Government solicitations are official use, so there are no special handling procedures for this material for our purposes that we know of. We would strongly advise checking with your client before submitting information.
136	Section H.7.5, Page 50, and Q&A April 4, Section Recommendations, Item 2	It is stated in the answer to the recommendation concerning the requirement for a Contractor to attain a minimum number of task order awards prior to the exercise of Option 1, "Simply because we reserve the right to do something in the contract, doesn't mean that we have to." This requirement is subject to many outside factors not under the control of the Contractor, and the statement "must" implies a "shall" contract requirement. There may be a valid exception/reasoning for a Contractor having less than a minimum number of awards. Please clarify the intent of the term "must" and if it is more in line with "the Government reserves the right to ..." as stated in your answer. Suggest changing the language to be more in line with Section H.12 Dormant Status, which implies that there will be a case-by-case review before placing any Contractor in a dormant status and the statement that this "may" result in dormant status.
		RESPONSE: We will clarify the language.
137	Attachment J.4 #8 on Pages 4,5,6,7,8; Question 8 Did the Project Meet or Exceed Small Business Goals?	The SDVOSB small business goal is missing from the list of SB goals but awarded points in the Section M.5.4.3 Scoring table. Should SDVOSB be included in J.4.8?
		RESPONSE: Thanks for bringing this to our attention. We are currently looking into this.

138	Section L.4 Proposal Format, Page 76; Section L.6.1 Direct Labor Rate, Page 93; and L.6.2 Indirect Rates/Profit. Page 93	Section L.4 states that the Cost/Price Rationale is limited to 2 pages. However, Section L.6.1 and L.6.2 require, "clear and convincing rationale". In order to provide sufficient information to meet the requirement, some additional information or copies of supporting information may be required (i.e., copy of Contractor's Forward Pricing Indirect Rate proposal, copy of Contractor's payroll records supporting direct labor rates). Will GSA permit the Contractors to provide supporting information in an attachment which does not count toward the page limit?
		RESPONSE: Yes. We will edit the solicitation to reflect this.
139	Section L.5.3.1 #1 and #2 Relevant Experience, Page 85 and Section C.2.1.1 Program Management Services, Page 17.	The relevant experience requirements state that the primary scope of work for each project must be one of the 6 OASIS disciplines and involve the performance and/or integration of at least 4 of the 6 OASIS disciplines. In order to count the Section C.2.1.1. Program Management Services discipline for each project, can the project management service areas be performed to support the contract that the offeror has with the Government, or is this a discrete set of services provided to the Government for other projects?
		RESPONSE: The project management service areas performed to support the contract that the offeror has with the Government will suffice.
140	Section L.5.3.1, #4, Page 85	This section states, "Have been completed within the Past Five (5) Years prior to the solicitation closing date or be ongoing with at least One (1) Year of performance completed prior to the solicitation closing date." Can we use a project that is completed within the past Five (5) years, meets the \$5M threshold, but had a duration of less than One (1) year?
		RESPONSE: Yes.
141	Section L.5.3.2.3, Page 86	In accordance with the template's Paragraph C Contractual and Proposal Documents, does the Government want full versions or excerpts of the contractual/proposal documentation? Which documents are mandatory - the ones that demonstrate the requirements are met or all those listed?
		RESPONSE: Only information necessary to demonstrate that the requirements have been met need be provided.
142	Section L.5.3.2.3, Page 86	Regarding Paragraph C Contractual and Proposal Documents, should we highlight the relevant information in the proposal/ contractual documents corresponding to the page numbers and information identified in the Relevant Experience Matrix to make it easier for the evaluator to find?
		RESPONSE: Please do. We will edit the solicitation to reflect this.
143	Section L.5.3.2.3, Page 86	Regarding Paragraph C Contractual and Proposal Documents, can sensitive/FOUO information in the proposal/contractual documents be redacted (blacked out)?
		RESPONSE: Yes, but Offerors are instructed to exercise extreme caution regarding classified work and classified handling procedures. Under no circumstances shall an Offeror send classified information or material to the OASIS team as part of a proposal.
144	Section L.5.4.3, Page 87 and Section M.5 Scoring System, Page 100 .	Under L.5.4.3, why are Offerors losing potential points if the projects do not have the specific small business goals listed? Offerors can lose up to 2,000 of the 3,000 points available for Volume 4 if the projects do not have small business goals. The Federal Government determines whether there are small business goals, and the goals are not the Offeror's choice. Should Offerors be penalized because the Government has chosen not to have small business goals in our relevant projects?
		RESPONSE: The points have been edited, but the intent of the question is being considered. We wanted to award companies who had actually lived up to small business subcontracting goals. All federal projects above \$650,000 should require a subcontracting plan. Technically speaking, the Government does not set goals, only encourages them.
145	Section L.6.3 Cost/Price Template Instructions, Page 94; Section J.8; Attachment 8, Cost/Price Template Enter Section Number and Page Number. Page 62	Section L.6.3 states that Offerors shall not change any information or formulas on the spreadsheets, including the cell protection. However, Offerors with a different indirect rate structure than that identified in columns D through F may adjust their columns accordingly. Can the Offeror add columns to accommodate additional indirect rates or facilities capital cost of money factors which may be applicable to specific contractors?
		RESPONSE: Yes.
146	Section M.5 Scoring System Under L.5.3.1, Page 100	In the M.5 Scoring table Under L.5.3.1 of the Open Competition – how many points are awarded for projects that exceed the minimum annual value of \$5M but are less than \$10M? Having a contract that meets the minimum threshold (\$5M but less than \$10M) is not awarded any points in the scoring system. Is this intentional?
		RESPONSE: Yes, this is intentional. The minimum requirement is at least \$5M. The first scoring bonus is at \$10M.
147	Section M.5 Scoring System Under L.5.3.1, Page 100	The minimum requirement is for projects to perform 4 out of the 6 OASIS disciplines; yet under the M.5 Scoring table, there are no points assigned for meeting the minimum requirement. Is this intentional or should there be points assigned for each project performing 4 out of the 6 OASIS Disciplines?
		RESPONSE: This is intentional. If a company doesn't meet the minimum requirement, they are not considered for award. For companies who do meet the minimum requirement, we have a scoring system to differentiate between Offerors. If we give points for minimum requirements, then everybody scored will receive those points and there will be zero impact with regards to differentiation. Pardon the pun here, but there would be no "point" in doing that.

148		We are an ANC corporation, so by default we are a Small Disadvantaged Business. We have approximately 280 employees, so we sometimes qualify by NAICS code as a Small Business by number of employees. We have had an avg of over \$50M in revenue over the past 3-years, which makes us large by Revenue standards. Can we Prime on OASIS SB? Ie. What are the qualifying criteria to Prime on GSA OASIS SB?
		RESPONSE: Given your stated number of employees and revenue, you would be eligible to prime in OASIS SB Pools 4, 5, and 6.
149		Would the operations and maintenance of any of the core disciplines contained in the primary and secondary requirements include a helpdesk function?
		RESPONSE: The core disciplines are descriptive terms and will require no O&M or helpdesk.
150	Attachment 4, Section J.4	After examining the Offeror's Proposal Checklist and noting that answering "No" for items 1 - 5 for Volume I would qualify an offeror as ineligible for award, could you please clarify the difference between "No" and "N/A" for the following question: Does your offer include an Existing Contractor Team Arrangement? Yes, No, or N/A
		RESPONSE: If you are a not part of a Joint Venture (JV), your answer would be N/A. If you are part of a JV, then your answer is yes or no.
151	Section J	May templates be modified to accommodate a company's disclosed practices and indirect rate structure?
		RESPONSE: Yes.
152	Solicitation, A.1 Notice of Offerors, pg 8/96	The referenced section states: "GSA is soliciting feedback on this Draft Solicitation to finalize the solicitation that will be used in the upcoming OASIS SB acquisitions for the unrestricted and small business contract." The reference to the "upcoming OASIS SB" and "the unrestricted...contract" seem to be in conflict. Are bidders to assume that the terms for both solicitations will be exactly the same and are anticipated to be as reflected in this draft document? It would seem that the requirements might vary between the two RFPs given that one is aimed at small businesses with annual revenue thresholds of \$14M or less who are unlikely to possess all of the systems, certifications, and breadth of capabilities possessed by large business primes anticipated to bid the unrestricted solicitation.
		RESPONSE: There will be two solicitations. One will be subject to full and open competition and one will be a 100% Small Business Set Aside. These drafts reflect those two solicitations.
153	Solicitation, B.1.5 Contract Access Fee (CAF)	The referenced section states: "The CAF represents a percentage to be paid to GSA based upon the paid invoice total regardless of contract type (See Section G.3.1)." Please confirm that the CAF under OASIS SB will apply to all costs including travel, materials, other ODCs and not just to labor costs.
		RESPONSE: That is correct. CAF applies to ALL costs incurred.
154	Solicitation, B.2.1. Labor Categories and Standard Occupational Classifications, pg 11/96 and Attachment J.1, Attachment (1) OASIS SB Labor Categories	The approach of stating the federal wage grade level equivalent also sets a specific rate per labor category and level upon which bidders are to base their proposal pricing allowing the government to make a fair assessment (apples to apples) of what the comparative cost for a specific position is among bidders. Using the current approach will result in a broad range created from combining a multitude of SOC categories with rates in over 640 metropolitan and non-metropolitan areas in the CONUS and US territories. With the latter approach there is no fair comparison of rates between bidders because the basis for direct labor rates from which final bid rates are developed potentially have ZERO similarity. One bidder will simply choose the most expensive rate from the potentially thousands represented by the available pool (multiple SOC categories times 3 percentile levels times 640+ locations) while another will pick the lowest and yet others will pick something between. That approach will obscure the rate comparison of actual value to the GSA and its customers, especially for cost plus type task orders, which is the total burdens bidders will add to the actual direct labor cost.
		RESPONSE: We do not understand the point you are trying to make here and suspect that you do not fully understand the point of the labor category groups or the SOC structure. There are no "federal wage grade level equivalents". Please expound.
155	Solicitation, B.2.1. Labor Categories and Standard Occupational Classifications, pg 11/96 and Attachment J.1, Attachment (1) OASIS SB Labor Categories	The instructions in B.2.1 and in the Attachment state: "when responding to a request for proposal under task order solicitations, regardless of contract type, the Contractor shall identify both Prime and Subcontractor labor using the Labor ID Numbers, OASIS SB Labor Categories, as well as, the corresponding SOC Number that applies." There are several referenced SOC categories that appear irrelevant to requirements that might reasonably be expected to be solicited under this vehicle. For example, 13-1021 Buyers and Purchasing Agents, Farm Products, 13-1032 Insurance Appraisers, Auto Damage, 11-2022 Sales Managers, and 11-9131 Postmasters and Mail Superintendents (limited to mgmt of US Post Offices). Are the SOC categories listed in Attachment J.1 intended to be all inclusive or representative, meaning will bidders at the TO level be free to select other more appropriate SOC categories? Also...the approach to pricing that uses federal equivalent assignments would drastically simplify the data needed during TO level solicitations. Bidders would merely need to identify the OASIS SB labor category without reference back to the SOC data.
		RESPONSE: The SOC categories are intended to be all inclusive. GSA supports every agency. Different agencies have very disperse requirements. While some SOCs are easy to see being utilized and some are not, we tried to include as many as possible. Whether you use a particular SOC in your proposal preparation is up to you and will depend on the requirement you are proposing on.

156	Solicitation, B.2.1. Labor Categories and Standard Occupational Classifications, pg 11/96 and Attachment J.1, Attachment (1) OASIS SB Labor Categories	While bidder is aware that the intent of OASIS SB is to provide service solutions that are not IT related/based, it is unrealistic to preclude all IT expertise when delivering "total integrated solutions" ("includes any and all components required to formulate a total solution to a professional services based requirement" SOW C.2, pg 16/96) for GSA's customers in this day and age. It appears that ALL/ANY IT-related services have been excluded from the labor categories listed in Attachment J.1. Any/All total integrated solutions required by the government will require contributions by IT staff/experts. Request that GSA review the labor categories provided and provide for this expertise to be included when bidders propose solutions at the TO level. For example, it would be virtually impossible to support either "Operation and Maintenance or Direct Support of an existing Weapon System or Major System" (SOW, C.2.1.4 18) or "Disaster Management/Contingency Operations" (SOW, C.2.1.5 3) without IT support. IT equipment/systems/knowledge are integral to all current weapons systems and essential for all disaster recovery efforts today. Alternatively, is it GSA's intent for all IT expertise to be provided as Ancillary Support under paragraph B.3.1. Specialized Professional Services Labor (pg 14/96) and C.3 of the SOW on pg 20 ("other services that are integral and necessary to complete a total integrated solution under a professional service based requirement within the scope of OASIS SB")?
		RESPONSE: Yes. IT support is considered ancillary.
157	Solicitation, B.2.5.1. Ceiling Rates for T&M and L-H Task Orders, pg 13/96	Please clarify this statement in the referenced section: "The ceiling rates that are in effect at the time a task order is awarded shall remain with the task order award during the entire term of the task order, including task orders with option periods." Does this mean if a task order with two option years is awarded in Year 1 of the OASIS SB contract that rates for all three years of the task order are capped at the OASIS SB Year 1 rates OR does it mean that rates for the TO are capped at the rates in the OASIS SB contract for years 1-3 (Yr 1 on OASIS SB contract rates = base year rates on TO, Yr 2 OASIS SB rate caps apply to TO Option Yr 1, etc.)? Also...if a TO with options is issued in Year 5 of the OASIS SB contract and an adjustment to rates is made in accordance with Section B.2.5.1, does this statement preclude adjustment of option year rates for the TO?
		RESPONSE: What this means is that the rates awarded in your task order are the rates that will apply for the life of that task order regardless of any adjustments made in the future to the ceiling rates. At task order award, rates will be identified for the base period of performance and any optional periods of performance. Those awarded rates will remain valid for that task order regardless of any changes to contract rates after task order award.
158	Solicitation, B.2.5.1. Ceiling Rates for T&M and L-H Task Orders, pg 13/96	The referenced section states: "In Year 10 of OASIS SB, if the average annual Bureau of Labor Statistics Economic Cost Index for the previous three years is higher than Year 5 of OASIS SB, the ceiling rates for Years 11 through 15 will be adjusted by the difference of percentage increase in accordance with the example above. If the average index in Year 10 is equal to or below the average index in Year 5, the ceiling rates will remain unchanged." While Section F.3 on pg 23/96 indicates the Period of Performance for the OASIS SB contract is limited to 10 years and 6 months. Please clarify the total period of performance for the contract.
		RESPONSE: The period of performance runs 10 years. There is an additional 6 months that can be added to this if required. Task Orders may be awarded up until the final day of the OASIS SB period of performance, however, and last for up to 5 years. Accordingly, ceiling rate pricing for certain T&M orders has been established for 15 years.
159	Solicitation, F.4.2. Compliances, H.16.14 Limitations on Subcontracting, pg 26/96	The referenced section states: "At least 50% of the cost of task order performance incurred for personnel shall be expended by the OASIS SB Prime Contractor." Is this requirement measured at the OASIS SB contract level or at the task order level? Contractor recommends the OASIS SB contract level to allow for variability of business realities which occur during task order execution. For example, vendor may initially allocate work to subs at less than 50% but direct labor dollars may vary on a given task order at any given point in time based on "gapping" of positions and/or appropriate use of various subcontractor expertise related to specific task order milestones.
		RESPONSE: Currently, this is measured at the contract level. However, it is possible that an SBA rule change may require this at the task order level. OASIS SB will include and enforce whichever rule is in place at the time of contract award.
160	Solicitation, G.3 Contract Administration Requirements, G.3.1. Contract Access Fee (CAF), pg 30/96	The referenced section states: "Total CAF Remittance is calculated as follows: Total Paid Invoice(s) multiplied by the CAF Percentage." Please confirm that CAF is calculated on all cost incurred, including Other Direct Costs such as materials and travel.
		RESPONSE: CAF is charged against all expenses.
161	Solicitation, H.3 Ordering Procedures, H.3.1 Set-Asides Based on Socio-Economic Group, pg 39/96	While vendor understands the new guidelines related to FSS contracts, it is our understanding that this contract will specifically not be an FSS contract. SBA guidelines for other contracts for small business set asides typically rely on identification of less than three qualified sources (for example, SDVOSB guidelines specify identification of two responsible sources). Why is OASIS SB requiring a larger number than SBA standards to allow an OCO to set aside a requirement?
		RESPONSE: OASIS and OASIS SB are focused on competition at the task order level. Given the broad scope of OASIS, and general competition guidelines, we felt that 3 was a more appropriate minimum number.

162	Solicitation Section H.6 Systems, Compliances, and Certifications, pg 42/96	Section H.6 states "Failure to meet any one of the following Systems, Compliances, and Certifications may result in Dormant Status and/or result in the Contractor being Off-Ramped." Several of the systems, compliances and certifications are only available with sponsorship by a government customer and/or are not relevant to all requirements (for example, CMMI only applies to software development processes). In addition, several are extremely expensive and time-consuming such that many small businesses will not have invested in those not related to their previous business requirements. Please confirm that the requirement for a vendor to possess/comply with the listed specific systems will be determined at the task order level.
		RESPONSE: Please read the entire solicitation. These are only required if applicable.
163	Solicitation Section H.6 Systems, Compliances, and Certifications, H.6.1. Adequate Accounting System. H.6.2. Acceptable Estimating System, H.6.4. Forward Pricing Rate Agreements and Approved Billing Rates and H.6.5. Approved Purchasing System, pg 42-44/96	The referenced sections all say something similar to: "Contractors are encouraged to have a <insert system name> system approved by the Defense Contract Management Agency (DCMA) or other cognizant Government administration office for the entire term of OASIS SB." Contractors may not request approval of their accounting, estimating or purchasing systems or forward pricing/billing rates by DCMA/DCAA. DCMA/DCAA will only conduct the audits necessary for these approvals based on the request by a government customer for these reviews. Will bidders without an existing approved estimating be eligible for award of an OASIS SB contract? Will GSA request DCMA/DCAA audit and approval for all apparent winners of OASIS SB to allow them to meet this requirement?
		RESPONSE: With the exception of accounting systems, none of the systems mentioned are required. They are encouraged. Offerors can win OASIS SB contracts without these systems. Please see the scoring matrix. The 40 Offerors within each pool with the highest score will receive awards regardless of where those points come from.
164	Solicitation Section H.6 Systems, Compliances, and Certifications, H.6.6. ISO 9001:2008 Certification, pg 44/96	Referenced section states: "Contractors are encouraged to have ISO 9001:2008 Certification during the entire term of OASIS SB." Does this statement mean contractors will not be considered for award if the don't possess an ISO 9001:2008 Certification at the time of submitting their OASIS SB proposal? Strongly encourage GSA to apply this requirement at the task order level versus at the OASIS SB contract level. Many qualified small businesses deliver exceptional service (as indicated by CPARS and other customer assessments) without having incurred the expense of obtaining a formal ISO 9001:2008 Certification. Requiring the ISO Certification will raise the cost for all GSA customers without a directly corresponding increase in quality.
		RESPONSE: Offerors are not required to have any certifications. Encouraged is not mandatory.
165	Solicitation Section H.6 Systems, Compliances, and Certifications, H.6.8. CMMI Maturity Level, pg 45/96	Referenced section states: "Contractors are encouraged to have CMMI Maturity Level 3 or higher, during the entire term of OASIS SB." Does this statement mean contractors will not be considered for award if the don't possess CMMI Level 3 or higher certification at the time of submitting their OASIS SB proposal? Strongly encourage GSA to apply this requirement at the task order level versus at the OASIS SB contract level. CMMI is a certification related to software development processes, given the focus of OASIS at non-IT projects, it is highly likely that CMMI would not be relevant for most OASIS SB task orders. Requiring the CMMI certification for all OASIS SB primes will raise cost for all GSA OASIS SB customers when most will likely get no benefit from this certification.
		RESPONSE: Offerors are not required to have any certifications. Encouraged is not mandatory.
166	Solicitation Section H.6 Systems, Compliances, and Certifications, H.6.9. Earned Value Management System, pg 45/96	Referenced section states: "Contractors are encouraged to have an EVMS ANSI/EIA Standard-748 during the entire term of OASIS SB." Does this statement mean contractors will not be considered for award if the don't possess EVMS ANSI/EIA Standard-748 compliant systems at the time of submitting their OASIS SB proposal? Strongly encourage GSA to apply this requirement at the task order level versus at the OASIS SB contract level. EVMS is an extremely expensive system for contractors to implement that is only required by FAR for "major acquisitions for development" (Subpart 34.2) and applicable in accordance with DoD policy only when cost of single program efforts are expected to exceed \$20M. It is highly unlikely that these thresholds will be met by the majority of the efforts awarded under OASIS SB. If this requirement is applied at the OASIS SB level, all GSA OASIS SB customers will be forced to pay for requirements that will apply to a small number of the competed requirements.
		RESPONSE: Offerors are not required to have any systems other than an Accounting System Encouraged is not mandatory.
167	Solicitation Section H.6 Systems, Compliances, and Certifications, H.6.10.1. Facility Clearance Level, pg 46/96	Referenced section states: "The Contractor, at its own expense, must maintain their FCL by the Defense Security Service (DSS) for the entire term of OASIS SB." Contractors may not apply for or receive an FCL without sponsorship from a government organization. Will GSA sponsor apparent OASIS SB winners for an FCL?
		RESPONSE: No. This only applies if you already have an FCL.
168	Solicitation, L.4 Proposal Format , L.5.1.4 and L.5.1.5, pg 75/96	In the Table Legend, specific page limitations are listed for the "Professional Employee Compensation Plan" and "Uncompensated Overtime Policy". If vendors provide direct excerpts from corporate policy manuals and they exceed the stated page limitations, will all submitted pages be evaluated? If no, how should vendors shortened the policies to meet the page limitation requirements (for example, may pages be inserted as images with font size smaller than those stated?

		RESPONSE: We will edit the solicitations to remove page limits for this.
169	Solicitation, L.4 Proposal Format, L.5.2.1, pg 76/96	The Table provided in the referenced section refers to the requirement to submit a GSA Form 527 as Volume 2. Please confirm the desired form is Rev .3-99 as available in the GSA Forms Library (http://www.gsa.gov/portal/forms/download/115238) or provide the desired version of the GSA Form 527 in a fillable format.
		RESPONSE: Answer pending.
170	Solicitation, L.4 Proposal Format, L.5.5.3, pg 76/96 and Section J.4, Attachment (4)	The Table section L.5.5.3 states bidders are to provide a copy of the Audit Report Documents/Letters "if available" while Attachment (4) states "(Note: If NO regarding questions 1 and 2 in this section, your offer is ineligible for award)" where #2 is "an Acceptable Estimating System." These directions appear to be in conflict. Is an Acceptable Estimating System a pass/fail criteria for award and, if yes, does "an Acceptable Estimating System" require the acceptability of the vendor's estimating system to be documented via an audit letter from an appropriate agency? If the audit letter is not required, what documentation is required? Given that audits are only conducted based on the request of a Contracting Officer upon award of a contract requiring an approved estimating system, request that GSA waive this requirement as a pass/fail requirement for award of an OASIS SB contract. Alternatively, request that GSA sponsor the audit of the estimating system of any apparent winner or award the contract and limit the types of task orders that can be awarded to a winner until the approval is received via an appropriate audit
		RESPONSE: The estimating system is not a requirement. The table is being corrected.
171	Solicitation, L.4 Proposal Format, L.5.5.4 through L.5.5.10, pg 76/96,	Please confirm that vendors are not required to have the systems referred to in the referenced sections at time of submission of proposals to be eligible to be awarded an OASIS SB contract.
		RESPONSE: Only an acceptable accounting system is required. The other systems are encouraged, but not required.
172	Solicitation, L.5.3 Volume 3 - Relevant Experience, pg 80/96	The referenced section states that "the Offeror must demonstrate 5 distinct Projects, each as a prime contractor, that meet the following minimum conditions..." Will past performance of subcontractors (in a prime-sub relationship versus a Contractor Team Arrangement (CTA)) on the bidders team be considered if on the cited past performance the subcontractor on the offerors OASIS SB team was the prime? In other words, will GSA allow SB teams to submit past performance for both the bidder and its subcontractors on OASIS SB? Request that GSA allow and evaluate Relevant Experience for OASIS SB bidders. Few small businesses that meet the established NAICS thresholds will have the breadth of experience necessary to cover the scope of the OASIS requirements when only experience of the small business prime is considered.
		RESPONSE: We are not certain exactly what the question/recommendation is that you are asking/presenting. If you are asking if work performed by a subcontractor be used by an Offeror, where the Offeror was the prime contractor on the project, then yes, we already allow that. If you are asking if an Offeror can claim that they will use a subcontractor in the future and use that subcontractors performance to meet the minimum requirements, then the answer is no.
173	Solicitation, L.5.5.3 - L.5.5.10, pgs 83-85/96	L.5.5.3 - L.5.5.10 say "If available, the Offeror must provide" but Section H.6 states "Failure to meet any one of the following Systems, Compliances, and Certifications may result in Dormant Status and/or result in the Contractor being Off-Ramped." Does the wording of L.5.5.3 through L.5.5.10 mean that the listed systems are "preferred" but not "required" for small business bidders? Must small businesses who want to prime OASIS SB possess all listed systems at time of proposal submission?
		RESPONSE: Offerors do not have to have these systems in order to compete for an OASIS SB award. What the language means is that if an Offeror was awarded points in the evaluation system for a system or certification, then the Offeror is responsible for maintaining that system or certification throughout the life of the OASIS SB contract.
174	Solicitation, L.6.1 Direct Labor Rates, pg 87/96 and J.2 Attachment (2)	The referenced section states: "For the Subject Matter Expert labor category, the "low" end of the range begins at one penny above the highest paid Senior labor category." However, the highest "senior" rate reflected on Attachment 2 is Sr. Manager , Group 1 (row 49) is \$108.90 while the SME low end of the range is \$108.36 (row 22). Please clarify the range for the SME.
		RESPONSE: Thanks for bringing this to our attention. The low end of the range for SME should begin at \$108.91. The Dept of Labor has just recently provided the annual update to the direct compensation information. We are updating the draft solicitations to reflect the latest data.
175	Solicitation, L.6 Volume 6 - Cost/Price and L.6.1 Direct Labor Rates, pg 86-87/96 and J.2 Attachment (2)	The second paragraph in section L.6 states: "These ceiling rates <u>are to be based upon the highest qualified employee within a given labor category or group, working in the highest paid area within CONUS</u> , on a highly complex requirement, excluding Secret/Top Secret/SCI." Section L.6.1 states: "For most of the OASIS SB labor categories in Section J.2., the "low" end of the direct labor rate range is the National estimate and the " <u>high</u> " end of the direct labor rate range is the estimate data for the State identified as the highest paid." and "Offerors are encouraged to propose a direct labor rate for each OASIS SB labor category within the ranges provided in Section J.2." The provided directions appear to be in conflict. Given the direct in L.6 it appears all bidders MUST use the "Maximum" direct labor rates provided for each labor category as the basis of their ceiling rates as those would represent the highest qualified employee in the labor category in the highest paid CONUS locations in each state. Please clarify guidance for bidders on use of Attachment (2) data.

		RESPONSE: As the solicitation states, Offerors may propose whatever direct labor rates they desire to propose. We have simply provided the basis that we are using for determining fair and reasonable pricing. If an Offeror deviates from the basis we have provided, they should provide clear and convincing rationale as to why their proposed rates are fair and reasonable.
176	Solicitation, M.4.1.4, pg 91/96	Please clarify the highlighted statements in the referenced section: " <u>The Government will evaluate proposed compensation levels, including salaries and fringe benefits for the professional labor categories on the contract. The salary rates or ranges must take into account differences in skills, the complexity of various disciplines and professional job difficulty. Supporting information must substantiate the compensation, such as recognized national and regional compensation surveys or studies of professional, public and private organizations, used in establishing the total compensation structure. Proposed compensation levels should reflect a clear understanding of work to be performed and should indicate the capability of the proposed compensation structure to obtain and retain qualified personnel to meet mission objectives.</u> " What does GSA anticipate evaluating in this section given that GSA dictates in L.6 what rates bidders must use in their cost proposals ("ceiling rates are to be based upon the highest qualified employee within a given labor category or group, working in the highest paid area within CONUS") and provides those rates in J.2 Attachment (2). What data does the government anticipate would be provided in this plan by
		RESPONSE: As a point of clarification, we are not dictating what rates shall be proposed. We have simply provided the basis that we will use in determining fair and reasonable pricing. If proposed pricing for direct labor falls within the ranges provided, no justification is necessary. If proposed prices are outside the ranges provided, Offerors must provide clear and convincing justification that the proposed direct labor rates are fair and reasonable. The source selection strategy is "highest technically rated with fair and reasonable pricing". Accordingly, price is not used to differentiate between Offerors. Scoring of technical factors found in the scoring matrix will differentiate between Offerors.
177	J.4 Attachment (4), Section L.5.4, pg 2/8	Please clarify the limitation implied by these statements in this section: "Does your offer include the required past performance rating form for any project that is Non-Federal work or Federal work that was not finalized in CPARS?" and "If Yes above, is it limited to 1 or 2 projects only? (Note: if NO your offeror is ineligible for award)" Contractors have no control over whether Federal contract customers submit the required CPARS ratings and it is, unfortunately, not uncommon for required CPARS not to be filed. The implication of this question and associated limitation is that if bidders have otherwise qualifying Federal contracts for which the Federal customer has not filed CPARS they will not be eligible to be awarded an OASIS SB contract. Request that the requirement be clarified to state that bidders for whom either CPARS or Past Performance Ratings Forms are provided on any Federal contract are compliant/acceptable.
		RESPONSE: If your projects are for Federal work, then they should have CPARS information available. If CPARS has not been accomplished, then provide the survey in Attachment J.6. The limitation applies to non-Federal work. Only 2 of the 5 projects provided may be for non-Federal work.
178	Solicitation Section H.6 Systems, Compliances, and Certifications, H.6.2 - H.6.9, pg 42-45/96	If an OASIS SB prime's subcontractor possesses certificates as described in the referenced sections that are required at the task order level but the prime does not, will the prime be qualified to bid on the task order in reliance on the subcontractor's certifications if the subcontractor will execute the portion of the work on the task order requiring the certifications?
		RESPONSE: Subcontractor qualifications are not being considered for OASIS SB prime awards.
179	Solicitation, Section M.3 Screening and Evaluation Process, pg 90/96	The 9th paragraph in the referenced section refers to "three Small Disadvantaged Veteran-Owned Small Businesses (SDVOSB)." Should this reference be to "three Service-Disabled, Veteran-Owned Small Businesses (SDVOSB)?"
		RESPONSE: Yes, thank you for bringing this to our attention.
180		Based on the defined draft requirements of an offeror's price proposal, is it the Government intent to apply the Price Reduction Clause to the proposed labor category prices provided within a OASIS bid response? In other words, if an offeror provides a lower labor category price due to cost efficiencies (as realized by the OASIS offering team) that such a lower labor category price would impact, via the Price Reduction Clause, the other GSA schedules held by the Offeror(s)? To illustrate, if (due to cost efficiencies of the OASIS team) the unit labor price of an Engineer (Level I) is proposed for OASIS at \$100, and this rate is lower than that on the same offeror's Professional Engineering Services (PES) schedule, that the Price Reduction Clause would be triggered on the offeror's PES schedule?
		RESPONSE: The OASIS contracts are not affiliated with the Schedules program. Please refer this question to your schedule contracting officer.
181	Section L.5.3.1 Relevant Experience Minimum Requirements	We have provided 4 of the 6 core disciplines on a single project through multiple, follow-on task orders under both IDIQ contracts and/or BPAs. Where this has occurred, can we aggregate these multiple task orders as a single project?
		RESPONSE: No.

182	Section H.6 and M.5 Scoring System	The OASIS scoring system gives points if a contractor has purchasing and estimating systems that have been approved by DCMA or other cognizant government auditors. Due in part to government manpower and budget constraints, many mid- sized companies with substantial GSA schedule sales or other sales to civil agencies will not have been subject to these reviews by government agencies because of the lack of "qualifying" sales that trigger these type of reviews. Therefore, the scoring system could be viewed as biased against mid-sized companies and favoring large contractors with substantive direct DOD business. Accordingly, will GSA consider eliminating this feature of the OASIS scoring system? Alternatively, will GSA alter the scoring system so that the same amount of points are awarded to companies without approved systems as to those with approved systems, as long as an adequate and acceptable description of their estimating and purchasing systems in use is provided to GSA by those companies without approved systems?
		RESPONSE: As a point of clarification, there is no such thing as a "mid-sized" company in Federal procurement. However, we feel that there are "mid-sized" companies that do have some of these systems. The scoring mechanism is designed to differentiate between Offerors and is most heavily weighted towards past performance, which favors no particular classification of contractor. We also feel that the broad range of scoring and making 40 awards in each Pool provides opportunity for mid-sized contractors to be competitive for OASIS awards. If you have recommendations for independent audit functions that could evaluate estimating and purchasing systems, similar to what we have allowed for accounting systems, we would consider awarding points for that. The points would be lower than those provided for approved systems, but we would consider such a recommendation.
183	Section H.4.2.1 NAICS Pools	33% of the pools (#5 & #6) are for very limited NAICS codes covering specialized services that appear to be appropriate for a very limited, if not single, single agency and would benefit a limited number of companies. Why are these pools needed when the NAICS Codes assigned to these pools are identical to pool # 4? Please clarify GSA's intent.
		RESPONSE: We do not establish size standards or size standard exceptions. The work to be done in those Pools may be performed under OASIS and as a result, need to have the appropriate size standard applied to them in accordance with the new proposed rule being issued by SBA. Our intent is to ensure the appropriate size standard is applied to each and every task order issued on OASIS.
184	B.2.5 T&M and L-H Task Orders, Page 12	B.2.5 states Ancillary subcontract labor shall be proposed and awarded as Materials in accordance with FAR 52.232-7. This appears to be in conflict with B.3.1 Specialized Professional Services Labor and C.2 Ancillary Support Services. Please clarify.
		RESPONSE: Specialized professional services labor would apply to labor being performed as the Prime that isn't covered by an existing OASIS labor category or SOC code.
185	B.2.5 T&M and Labor Hour Orders, Page 12	Please define blended labor rate.
		RESPONSE: Please refer to FAR 52.216-29.
186	B.2.5.1 Ceiling Rates for T&M and L-H Task Orders, Page 13	"Based on the specific task order requirements, the OCO is authorized to exceed the OASIS ceiling rates for those labor categories that include Secret/Top Secret/SCI labor and/or OCONUS locations, if necessary." Question: For the purposes of reporting, GSA has requested hourly rates/hours by OCONUS be reported separately, however, there is no category for reporting the Secret/Top Secret/SCI labor. Does GSA consider these to be "Specialized Professional Services" categories as described in B.3.1? If not, how should these labor categories be reported?
		RESPONSE: Thank you for bringing this to our attention. Our reporting requirements identify OCONUS, but not security requirements. We will add a reporting element in the OMM to identify this.
187	B.3 ANCILLARY SUPPORT, Page 13	"The contractor should propose and identify each ancillary service separately and the OCO should identify each ancillary service by a separate CLIN on the task order award." Please clarify if all ancillary services should be included in a single CLIN or if separate CLINS must be established for each type of ancillary service.
		RESPONSE: This will be at the discretion of the OCO. We will train them to create separate CLINS for ease of tracking and administration, but this decision will be up to their judgement based upon their requirement. The task order solicitations should be clear as to what is required.
188	F.4.1 Deliverable and Reporting Requirements table, row 3, Page 24	The third row in the table references sections G.3.2.1 through G.3.2.4 OASIS Management Module, Task Order Award, Modification, Invoice, and CAF data with a frequency of "Monthly." This contradicts page 33 sections G.3.2.3 and G.3.2.4 that states the invoice and CAF data shall be reported quarterly. We suggest you insert an additional row stating that the invoice and CAF data shall be reported on a quarterly basis and delete these two items from row 3.
		RESPONSE: Thank you for bringing this to our attention. We will clarify the language.
189	F.4.1 G.3.5 Task Order Close-Out and Close-Out Reporting, Page 26	"The Contractor shall submit timely and accurate task order close-out reports and provide the OCO the final invoice, release of claims, and all other required close-out documents within 60 calendar days after task order completion". Sixty (60) days for close out is only possible with FFP orders which do not have adders that need to be audited. Suggest changing the language to clarify close outs for CR, T&M and FFP orders with auditable adders will be closed out 60 days after final rates have been established by DCAA.
		RESPONSE: Thank you for bringing this to our attention. We will clarify the language.

190	G.3.2.1 Task Order Award Data, Page 31	Since the GSA AAS Business Systems Portal will generate all of the information required to complete this requirement, please confirm that orders that are awarded within the GSA AAS Business Systems Portal will auto populate all data required for Task Order Award Data and the contractor will only enter data for task orders received out side of the GSA AAS Business Systems Portal. RESPONSE: We are trying to confirm this right now.
191	G.3.2.1 (11) Task Order Award Data, Page 31	Please confirm the OCO will be required to provide the Agency Code and Bureau Code in each Task Order RFP and award document. RESPONSE: Yes.
192	G.3.2.3(5) Invoice Data, Page 33	Why are contractors not being asked to report Labor Category, SOC Number and price billed for T&M orders. Why are contractors being asked to report Labor Category, SOC Number and Direct Labor Rates for each Contractor employee performing on Cost-reimbursement task orders? Direct Labor rates for each employee is very sensitive information and audited by DCAA to ensure conformance with our disclosed practices. Request for Cost-Reimbursement task orders contractors report total amount paid. RESPONSE: Contractors are required to report labor category, SOC, and rates for T&M orders, but it is reported in award entry data instead of Invoice Data. Direct labor rates are reported on Cost Reimbursement task orders through Invoice Data because they are subject to change and variation, unlike T&M. The Government requires prices paid information. All information submitted will be controlled appropriately.
193	G.3.8 RESPONSIBILITY AND FAPIIS, Page 37	RFP states, "...by posting the required information in the Central Contractor Registration database." The CCR reference needs to be changed to reflect the new SAMs. RESPONSE: Thank you for bringing this to our attention. We will edit accordingly.
194	H.6.1 - H.6.10.1 (SYSTEMS, COMPLIANCES, AND CERTIFICATIONS), Pages 42 - 47	The information regarding systems, compliance and certification is not public information for all contractors. Please confirm that this information will only be only available to government individuals. RESPONSE: We can safegaurd information where appropriate and required. We would like more feedback, however, on why this is not public information. Please expound.
195	H.6.11 Sustainability, Page 47	RFP states, "GSA encourages Contractors to provide the location(s) (Internet URL or URLs) of one or more sources of publicly available information regarding its company-wide environmental impacts and sustainable management practices (sustainability disclosures) on the Contractor's OASIS webpage." Do we need to address this in our proposal and if so, where? There is no reference to sustainability in Section L or M. RESPONSE: No, Offerors do not need to address this in their proposals. This is simply an encouraged step for website development and is not mandatory.
196	H.6.12 Proprietary Solutions, Page 48	The statement that contractors are "discouraged from proposing proprietary solutions" appears to discourage contractors from providing innovation, cost effective solutions to task order requirements. Please elaborate on why proprietary solutions are discouraged. Please provide a definition of "proprietary solutions". RESPONSE: The citation in no way discourages innovation. The intent here is to identify elements of a proposal that would prevent competition at a future point or require sustained and non-competitive support. Contractors are free to propose these things, but we require that they be identified. This protects both OCO and contractor.
197	H.9.1 Supervision, page 50	"The Contactor shall not supervise, direct, or control the activities of Government personnel or the employee of any other Contractor under OASIS" Please confirm the contractor may supervise other contractors who are a subcontractor of the Prime on an OASIS task order. RESPONSE: Yes.
198	J. 1 Attachment 1	We are having a difficult time understanding how several of the labor category Standard Occupational Classification (SOC)s map to the Scope Disciplines (for example, SOC 33-9021 Private Detective and Investigators or SOC 11-9013 Farmers, Ranchers, and other Agricultural Managers). Can you please elaborate on the process used to determine the SOC's for OASIS? RESPONSE: We examined many of the Professional Service Schedule labor categories as well as took our known and/or theoretical client requirements for professional labor and then cross-walked that to the SOC and tried to include all professional labor SOC's that client agencies might need at part of an overall solution. There is no guarantee that all SOC's will be utilized in OASIS task orders. We simply felt that it was better to error on the side of inclusion, especially given that Offerors are not being asked to price each and every SOC. We understand that OASIS is very broadly scoped and our clients needs are very diverse. The various SOC's identified are a product of that.
199	J.3 Attachment (3) BACKGROUND AND POOL IDENTIFICATION, Page 1	B. Offeror Information: RFP states, <i>NOTE: The Offeror is instructed to provide the official Company Name, Address, and DUNS Number of the legal bidding entity as specified on the SF 33. The DUNS Number must be located in the Contractor Central Registration (CCR) and the XCompany's Official Name and Address must match the Company's Name and Address with the corresponding DUNS Number.</i> Recommend all references to CCR be changed to SAMS. RESPONSE: Thank you for bringing this to our attention. We will edit accordingly.

200	J.3 Attachment (3) BACKGROUND AND POOL IDENTIFICATION, Page 1	B. Offeror Information: RFP states, <i>NOTE: The Offeror is instructed to provide the official Company Name, Address, and DUNS Number of the legal bidding entity as specified on the SF 33. The DUNS Number must be located in the Contractor Central Registration (CCR) and the XCompany's Official Name and Address must match the Company's Name and Address with the corresponding DUNS Number.</i> Recommend to replace all references to DUNS Number with TIN Number based on the following rationale: DUNS/CAGE codes are unique to a particular facility and most contractors operate out of multiple facilities/DUNS/CAGE Codes. A Taxpayer Identification Number (which can be an Employer Identification Number or a Federal Tax Identification Number) is used to identify a business entity and is provided by the contractor as part of their representations and certifications under 52.204-3 Taxpayer Identification. The Tax ID number applies to multiple DUNS/CAGE codes under a given legal entity.
RESPONSE: Thank you for bringing this to our attention. We will edit accordingly.		
201	L.5.3.2.3, (3,) Contractual and Proposal Documents for Relevant Experience Projects, Page 86	Please confirm that contractors may submit redacted proposal documents so that only the required relevant information (labor category descriptions, scope discipline, WBS, etc) is available for review.
RESPONSE: Yes, but there is no reason to redact information presented in response to a solicitation.		
202	L.6.2 Indirect Rates/Profit, page 93	Please confirm the Indirect rates and profit discussed in this paragraph only apply to calculating the ceiling T&M rates for sole source scenario.
RESPONSE: That is correct. Technically, it refers to scenarios where adequate price competition does not exist or is not anticipated, but that is likely to only occur in sole source scenarios.		
203	Section B.2.1, Page 12 and Section B.3., Page 13	Within Section B.2.1, it states "Except for ancillary labor as defined under Section B.3., when responding to a request for proposal under task order solicitations, regardless of contract type, the Contractor shall identify both Prime and Subcontractor labor using the Labor ID Numbers, OASIS SB Labor Categories, as well as, the corresponding SOC Number that applies." Under Section B.3, it identifies subcontractors as ancillary support : "Other ancillary support, integral and necessary as part of a total integrated solution within the scope of OASIS SB for which there is not a labor category specified in OASIS SB or includes other direct costs such as travel, materials, equipment, Subcontractors, etc., to obtain a total professional service solution, are allowable costs and may be included within an individual task order under OASIS SB." Please clarify the intent of ancillary support as it relates to subcontractors.
RESPONSE: We do not fully understand the question. Please expound or rephrase.		
204	Section H.6, Page 42	Solicitation states that "Failure to meet any one of the following Systems, Compliances, and Certifications may result in Dormant Status and/or result in a Contractor being Off-Ramped (See Sections H.12. and H.13.)." Is this intended? The Scoring Matrix and subsequent language within the subsections of H.6.X indicate "if applicable."
RESPONSE: They are all "as applicable". If you have any of these systems or certifications, you must maintain them. That is what the reference in Section H pertains to.		
205	Section L.5.3.1, Pages 80-81	While we understand that professional and management services contracts were historically cost-reimbursable (as much as 50% per GSA statistics), usage of cost-reimbursement contracts is discouraged by recent Federal policy. As such, many of our relevant contracts (within past 5 years) are Firm Fixed Price, Fixed Price/Labor Hours, and Time and Materials. Would GSA reconsider this requirement?
RESPONSE: The requirement for at least one of the relevant experience examples to be cost reimbursement has been removed.		
206	Section L.5.3.1, Pages 80-82	In the general Q&As document provided on April 12, Question and Answer 1 stated that the OASIS contract is not for IT services. Please confirm that Relevant Experiences related to IT implementation, software development, and systems integration services are not applicable for the five Relevant Experiences.
RESPONSE: Any requirement that could not have been performed under the OASIS contracts shall not be considered relevant.		
207	L.5.5.3 page 83	In evaluating acceptable estimating systems, DCMA no longer sends an certification document to vendors. Instead, they simply approve or disapprove rates submitted by the vendor. We have an email from DCMA confirming acceptance of our rates. We recommend the Government accept this email or other related documentation in lieu of official certification.
RESPONSE: Please send us a copy of this letter so that we may verify and investigate the issue further. Thank you for bringing this to our attention.		
208	M.5 page 94	Does contractor TDY to OCONUS locations count as OCONUS contract performance?
RESPONSE: No.		
209	M.5 page 94	We interpret "multiple locations" to mean any customer locations not co-located in the same building/complex. Is this interpretation correct?
RESPONSE: No. Multiple locations means different geographic locations. Places of performance should be verifiable through contract award documentation.		
210	L.5.3.1, bullet 5, page 81	If an offeror uses its DCAA-certified accounting system to manage all projects that it performs, will such projects meet the "Cost Reimbursement" requirement, or will you ONLY be looking very specifically for the words "Cost Reimbursement (such as Cost Plus Award Fee)" on the submitted contractual/proposal documents?

		RESPONSE: We have eliminated that requirement in response to feedback received.
211	L.5.3.1, bullet 5, page 81	If an offeror uses its DCAA-certified accounting system to manage Time and Materials tasks, will this be considered a Cost Reimbursement contract type?
		RESPONSE: No.
212	L.5.5.11.1, p. 91	COPM Degree Requirement Clarification. Would a Masters degree in Management of Information Systems Technology or a Masters Degree in Systems Management be considered adequate to meet the desired requirement for a Masters degree in Program/Project Management or an OASIS discipline? We suggest that they should since the focus of these graduate degree programs is on the management of projects.
		RESPONSE: Yes.
213	Section L.5.4.2, Page 86 and Attachment J.4, Page 2, #1.	Section L.5.4.2 requirements state that only 2 of the references can be non Federal, and for all non Federal and Federal projects that do not have finalized CPARs, we must submit an Attachment J.6 Past Performance Rating Form. The Attachment J.4 Question #1 states that at least 3 of the references must have a CPARs or Offerors will be ineligible even if all 5 are Federal references. Was it the intent to render Contractors ineligible if their Federal Government customers did not complete CPARs on their Federal contracts? Was it the intent for Offeror's to submit the Attachment J.6 Past Performance Rating Form for those contracts that did not have finalized CPARs (as long as only 2 are non-Federal)? It seems unfair to render a contractor ineligible because their Government customers did not complete CPARs on their relevant projects.
		RESPONSE: No. We are editing the language here. For federal projects, CPARS info or a survey (if CPARS has not been accomplished) is acceptable.
214	ATTACHMENT J.4, Pages 4,5,6,7,8; Question 8, "Did the Project Meet or Exceed Small Business Goals?"	If the contract has small business goals but did not specify a small business goal for one or more of the listed small business categories (Goal would be zero (0)), and the Contractor has no recorded small business participation in that category/those categories (Achievement is zero (0)), would this count towards meeting the goal to check the box to show that we "met" the applicable small business category goal(s) since the goal was zero and the actual was zero?
		RESPONSE: No.
215	DRAFT_SECTION_J.8.,_ATT._(8),_OASIS_UNRESTRICTED_COSTPRICE_TEMPLATE.XLS X Government and Contractor Worksheets	In accordance with our standard accounting principles, indirect expenses can be applied differently than the method used by the formulas in these worksheets. Since the Government will not allow changes to these formulas, request the Government provide clarification on how offerors should address this situation in their proposals.
		RESPONSE: Offerors are allowed to modify the spreadsheet to comply with their indirect structure.
216	DRAFT_SECTION_J.8.,_ATT._(8),_OASIS_UNRESTRICTED_COSTPRICE_TEMPLATE.XLS X Government Worksheet, Cell A9	It would appear that the Labor ID# for this category should be "1G" rather than "1C". Please clarify.
		RESPONSE: You are correct. Thank you for bringing this to our attention.
217	DRAFT_SECTION_J.8.,_ATT._(8),_OASIS_UNRESTRICTED_COSTPRICE_TEMPLATE.XLS X Contractor Worksheet, Rows 34 and 36	It would appear that rows 34 and 36 have been transposed on this worksheet. Please clarify.
		RESPONSE: We do not see an error. Please expound.
218	M.5., p. 100	What constitutes Ancillary Support, and why is the point value as high as integrating all 6 Core Disciplines?
		RESPONSE: Other ancillary support means work or other support such as other direct costs like travel, materials, equipment, Subcontractors, etc required to deliver a total solution. The point value is based upon complexity of experience.
219	L.4 Proposal Format TABLE LEGEND **Note 1, p.77	Do supporting documents need to be reformatted to the requirements specified in Note 1. We recommend allowing supporting documents to be submitted in their original formatting as a PDF file.
		RESPONSE: Supporting documents to not need to be reformatted.
220	Section J2, pp 1-2	Please clarify whether the rates in Section J2 represent fully-burdened labor rates inclusive of fee. If so, please indicate whether these rates are envisioned to be representative of Government site rates or Contractor site rates. For some companies, the burdens for these two sites varies greatly, which affects the rates.
		RESPONSE: Those are direct, unburdened labor rates.
		End of Questions for this Week
221	Section H.6, Systems, Compliances, and Certifications; page 42	The requirements stated in Sections H.6.1 through H.6.5 are all readily available from DCAA/DCMA. Would GSA consider getting this information directly from those Government agencies?
		RESPONSE: No.

222	Section L.5.1.1, SF 33; page 79	GSA has asked for a minimum acceptance period of not less than 365 calendar days. <i>How will you deal with contractor proposal data changes between the time of proposal submission and final award as it pertains to updating contractor proposals, ensuring the GSA is receiving the most current data?</i>
		RESPONSE: If we need updated proposals, we shall ask for them. Otherwise, proposals shall be evaluated as submitted.
223	Section L.5.1.6, Subcontracting Plan; page 80	OASIS will be a new contract vehicle which means there is no history of work and the amount of work given under this contract is unknown. 1) <i>Based on these facts, how are contractors to estimate the amount of subcontracting dollars it is going to have?</i> 2) <i>Are contractors going to be held to subcontracting percentages or dollars? If dollars, how would you suggest contractors estimate the amount of work?</i>
		RESPONSE: Official answer pending.
224	Section L.5.3.1, Relevant Experience Minimum Requirements; page 85	GSA states, "At least three of the five projects must be for work that was for the Federal Government under a contract or task order awarded by the Federal Government." <i>Will Offerors be scored higher for submitting all five Federal projects?</i>
		RESPONSE: No.
225	Section L.5.4.3, Socio-economic Past Performance; page 87	GSA states " If any of the relevant experience projects are <u>Non-Federal</u> , Socio-economic past performance will <u>not</u> be considered. <i>In instances where Socio-economic past performance is not considered, how will points be awarded? For example, will all Non-Federal projects be awarded zero points and the maximum achievable points in that category deducted from the Top Point Value, or will those projects all be awarded maximum points to level the playing field?</i>
		RESPONSE: Non-federal projects will receive zero points for socio-economic past performance. Offerors need to weigh which projects make them most competitive based upon the entire scoring system.
226	Section L.6, Cost/Price; page 92	GSA states, "OASIS will only establish ceiling rates for T&M/L-H task order/CLINs placed on a sole source basis or when adequate price competition is not anticipated, therefore, the proposed ceiling rates do not apply to fixed-price, cost-reimbursement, or T&M/L-H task orders when adequate price competition is anticipated." <i>How should contractors price fixed price, cost-reimbursable or T&M/LH task orders when there is adequate price competition?</i>
		RESPONSE: Offerors should provide fair and reasonable pricing in response to task order solicitations that accounts for contract type, risk, complexity, and other factors associated with the task order requirement.
227	Section L.6, Cost/Price; page 92	GSA states, "OASIS will only establish ceiling rates for T&M/L-H task order/CLINs placed on a sole source basis or when adequate price competition is not anticipated, therefore, the proposed ceiling rates do not apply to fixed-price, cost-reimbursement, or T&M/L-H task orders when adequate price competition is anticipated." <i>Since the rates in OASIS would not apply, what rates would the contractor use to provide the detail for the prior mentioned cost proposals?</i>
		RESPONSE: Cost proposals are based upon actual cost elements and not fully burdened rates.
228	Section L.6.2, Indirect Rates/Profit; page 93	GSA is requesting we propose in accordance to our most current DCAA/DCMA approved billing rates and/or forward pricing rates . . . ". You are also requiring us to keep our minimum acceptance period at 365 days. <i>How should contractors notify GSA if they have indirect rate changes during the GSA's proposal review period?</i>
		RESPONSE: We don't anticipate the process will require 365 days, but if we need updates to proposals, we shall ask for them from everyone. Otherwise, proposals will be evaluated as submitted.
229	Section L.6.3, Cost/Price Template Instructions, page 94	The GSA asks contractors to enter in Row 4 their cost element breakdown of Direct Labor, Fringe Benefits, Overhead, General and Administrative (G&A) . . . ". <i>If a contractor only has an overhead rate, for example, is it acceptable to leave the other columns in Row 4 blank?</i>
		RESPONSE: Offerors are to input whatever elements are included in their adequate accounting system for fully burdened rates.
230	Section M.2, Basis for Award; page 95	<i>By submitting a proposal, will each offeror be considered for an award in each of the six pools automatically? Or, will Offerors be asked to identify which of the six pools they request to be considered for? If the latter, suggest you dictate a specific area in the proposal response where contractors should clearly state this.</i>
		RESPONSE: Please refer to attachment J.3. Offerors shall identify which Pools they wish to compete for.
231	Section M.3, Screening and Evaluation Process; page 96	GSA states "In the event the evaluation team discovers misleading, falsified, and/or fraudulent proposal information or support, the Offeree shall be eliminated from further consideration for award. Falsification of any proposal submission, documents, or statements may subject the Offeror to civil or criminal prosecution under Section 1001 of Title 18 of the United States Code." <i>How should contractors keep their data current during the GSA's evaluation process?</i>
		RESPONSE: Offers should be current up to the date of submittal. Any subsequent changes after that point does not constitute misleading, falsified, or fraudulent information.

232	Attachment J.3, Background and Pool Identification; page 2 of 3	It is our understanding that the size requirements stated for Pools 1-6 are relevant to small businesses only. <i>In the section which states "The Offeror shall check which pool or pools that the offeror desires to be considered for", how are large-business Offerors to respond? Since we meet none of the criteria, should we leave it blank?</i>
		RESPONSE: Offerors should indicate which Pools that they wish to be considered for. The Pools are relevant to both contracts because hypothetically, a company considered "Large" in some OASIS Pools could qualify as "Small" in the other OASIS Pools.
233	Attachment J.5, Relevant Experience Template; page 1 of 2	Section A, Project Identification. <i>In the line item titled "Total Period of Performance, including Options", if the Offeror submits a project that is not yet complete (under the conditions stated and allowed in the RFI), shall the Offeror give the total expected period of performance including options? Or only the current period of performance through the date of proposal submission?</i>
		RESPONSE: Offerors should provide the anticipated period of performance. Every contract has a base period of performance. Many contracts contain options for continued period of performance. Provide information inclusive of all options.
234	Section H.6.1 Adequate Accounting System and Section L.5.5.1 Adequate Accounting System	The text as written states that the evaluators will accept as evidence of adequacy a letter from DCMA stating that the contractor's accounting system is adequate. The text as written also does not use the word "approved" as is called out in DFARS 252.242-7006.
		Please confirm that this means an adequate accounting system may be determined by DCMA through the use of SF Form 1408 or similar means. Please also confirm that a letter from the cognizant DCMA stating that the contractor's accounting system is "... free of all known deficiencies..." would be considered evidence that the accounting system is adequate. Would the Government consider modifying the text to indicate that, to supplement the written evidence, additional verbal or written input from the applicable Administrative Contracting Officer (ACO) or Divisional ACO confirming the adequacy of the contractor's accounting system would also be accepted?
		RESPONSE: The DFARS clause shall be added to the OASIS contracts, however, the clause does not use the term "approved". We do not instruct DCMA as to how they conduct reviews of accounting systems. Documented evidence from a cognizant audit agency that an accounting system meets the standards of the SF Form 1408, FAR Part 31, and/or the standards of DFARS 252.242-7006 will suffice.
235	Section L.5.5.1 Adequate Accounting System GSA OASIS Program Manager meeting with Professional Services Council, April 18, 2013	During the April 18, 2013 OASIS meeting, GSA staff indicated that a possible approach to determining adequacy of an accounting system is through the use of independent auditors. This approach represents a costly action for contractors. It is also not clear whether independent auditors could perform such audits in the time remaining. It is also not clear which auditors might be acceptable to GSA. Does GSA anticipate providing more detailed guidance in regard to this aspect of the requirement?
		RESPONSE: Please see the recent changes. An adequate accounting system is a requirement of the OASIS contracts. If a contractor considers this too costly, they should refrain from applying for an OASIS award.
236	L.5.3.1 #5	What is the rationale for requiring offerors to have previously performed on a Cost Reimbursement contract type? If the rationale is to show performance on all contract types, why isn't it also required to include an FFP, a T&M, and a Labor-Hour as well given they present more risk to the offeror and less risk to the government? We recommend removing this requirement all together as it unnecessarily reduces competition from potential offerors who possess qualified experience meeting all other minimum requirements in L.5.3.1--which are far more relevant factors in determining adequate expertise.
		RESPONSE: Please see the recent changes. This is no longer a requirement.
237	B.1.5, page 11	Is the Contract Access Fee in section B.1.5, page 12 a fee that will be imposed in addition to the Industrial Funding Fee (IFF) included in the GSA schedule contracts? We recommend that no additional fees be imposed on small businesses that are awarded contracts under the OASIS procurement.
		RESPONSE: IFF does not apply to the OASIS contracts. The OASIS contracts are not GSA Schedule Contracts.
238	L.3, page 74	In section L.3, page 74, first paragraph, please clarify the statement regarding existing CTAs. In our experience, CTAs are formed to provide a total solution for a specific solicitation. 1) If a contractor has an existing CTA for a specific contract (not OASIS), can the contractor include the capabilities of CTA members in the OASIS proposal?
		RESPONSE: Only if the CTA itself is the Offeror.
239		2) May a contractor form a CTA for OASIS now (prior to release of the final OASIS solicitation) and include the capabilities of the VTA members in the OASIS proposal?
		RESPONSE: No.
240		3) If a CTA is contemplated for the OASIS proposal, how will the capabilities of the CTA members be evaluated?
		RESPONSE: Not applicable.
241	L.3, page 75	In section L.3, page 75, fourth paragraph, please provide the URL for the AAS Business Systems Portal.
		RESPONSE: The main portal entry page is at: http://portal.fas.gsa.gov The registration page is at: https://web.itss.gsa.gov/itss/gzareg.nsf

242	H.6.9; pg. 45	Though in the "encouraged to have" category, the implication of the EVMS description in this section is that to receive the 100 point credit on the scoring table in Section M.5, an offeror's EVMS must be ANSI/EIA Standard-748 certified by "...DCMA or other certified cognizant Government administrative office." Please clarify the following: can offerors either self-certify their EVMS or use a non-government third party to achieve the certification?
		RESPONSE: No.
243	L.5.3.1; pg. 85	A previous response from the GSA OASIS team stated "All work performed under a single contractual instrument such as a single contract or task order may only count as one project. Multiple, separate task orders under a single IDIQ contract may be counted as multiple projects." In one scenario we have multiple, separate task orders under a BPA that seem to fall into the "may be counted as multiple projects" category. The question is whether GSA is using any other criteria in it's definition of "distinct." For example, while in this scenario we have multiple task orders under a BPA with separate contract numbers, they are for the same client with generally the same scope of work.
		RESPONSE: Separate orders are separate projects even if awarded under the same contract and are similar.
244	L.5.4.1 and L.5.4.2; pgs. 86-87	Given the emphasis on relevant experience, past performance, and "what you have done, not what you can do," what is GSA's position if the appropriate government rep (e.g., COTR, etc.) has not fulfilled his/her obligation to complete CPARS ratings, and, given fluidity of the government workforce in recent years, there is not a government rep familiar enough with an offeror's work to credibly complete a Past Performance Rating Form?
		RESPONSE: We have no position on this scenario. If this is the case, we would likely recommend finding a different example.
245	L.5.4.3 ,Page 88	To validate the offeror's Socio-economic past performance, the solicitation requires the offeror to provide copies of the Individual Summary Reports (ISR) and Summary Subcontract Report (SSR) that was finalized in the eSRS system for each of the five (5) Relevant Exerience projects submitted under Section L.5.3.2. For those projects identified under aGSA Schedule, please confirm that the only document required to satisfy this requirement is a copy of the 'accepted' Summay Subcontract Report (SSR) for the period ending September 30th of the preceeding reporting period.
		RESPONSE: That is correct.
246	I.4.4 pg. 60 and M.5 pg. 100	Please further define what constitutes "multiple locations." Are two locations considered multiple? Do the locations have to be a certain distance apart (e.g., different street address in Metro DC area; different city, state, region, country, etc.)?
		RESPONSE: At least in 2 different metropolitan areas.
247	H.4.2.1/General	Please confirm offeror options based on the scenario that we are a \$45M company with 300 employees: (1) we can bid in all OASIS (unrestricted/full and open) pools if we chose to; (2) since OASIS small business is a set aside, and our 3-year average annual revenue is larger than \$35.5, we can only bid in pools 4-6 if we choose to; and (3) since an agency/task order CO selects the NAICS code based on the preponderance of the work, part of the decision point for bidding in OASIS small business is whether we perform the work represented by the NAICS codes in pools 4 - 6. Is our understanding correct on these three items?
		RESPONSE: You are exactly correct.
248	G.3.4 (33)	States regarding utilization of the CPARS, "The COCM shall respond promptly to past performance evaluations as documented by the OCO at the task order level and the OASIS SB CO for OASIS SB." Will there be CPAR evaluations at the base contract level as well as for each task order? How will evaluations be conducted at the OASIS SB level if the contractor has not yet won a task order?
		RESPONSE: Will CPAR evaluations be performed at the task order and contract level? Yes. There are compliance items that can be measured even if the Contractor has not won a task order.
249	H.3.1 (39)	States, "An OASIS SB task order solicitation may be a competitive set-aside for a specific socio-economic group when it is anticipated that offers will be obtained from at least three responsible small business concerns within a specific socio-economic group under the corresponding NAICS Pool (See Section H.4.2.1)." Why are three small businesses required rather than the more typical two?
		RESPONSE: Please see previous response to this question.
250	H.11.1 (53)	States that "In order to obtain a Lateral Pool Ramp, the Contractor must: 1. Have outgrown their Pool sized standard on the basis of natural growth, not on the basis of a merger, acquisition or novation agreement in recognition of a successor in interest when Contractor assets are transferred during the term of OASIS SB." What is the rationale for disqualifying a Contractor from participation as an OASIS prime contractor if that Contractor has been acquired or has merged with another small business? For example, if a small business is a prime Contractor in Pool 1 with annual revenues below \$14M, then merges with another small business, but the combined annual revenue of the company is below \$35.5M, why would the Contractor not be eligible to apply to Pool 2 or Pool 3?
		RESPONSE: Because that newly formed company did not compete for an OASIS SB award. We will not allow companies to purchase their way onto these contracts.
251	L.1 (73)	The URL http://acquisition.gov/ should be http://acquisition.gov/ (note the lack of a forward slash following "http://" in the first instance).
		RESPONSE: Thank you for the edit.

252	L.4 (75)	States, "Volume 6 shall be submitted in Microsoft Excel Version [TBD] as an .xls file." Is .xlsx also acceptable?
		RESPONSE: Yes.
253	L.5.1.7 (79)	States, "Offerors are strictly prohibited from forming a new CTA for the purposes of submitting an offer to meet the evaluation standards for OASIS SB under a Partnership or Joint Venture. This Section ONLY applies if an Offeror is proposing as an existing CTA Partnership or Joint Venture who has relevant experience, past performance, and systems, certifications, and resources from their existing CTA." First, does this mean that a JV or Partnership must already hold a contract of sufficient longevity to have meaningful past performance? Or does it mean only that the JV or Partnership must have previously bid on or won a contract? Second, does this requirement mean that only populated JVs (with "systems, certifications, and resources") are eligible (unpopulated JVs rely on the systems, certifications, and resources of their partnering companies)?
		RESPONSE: It means that whomever applies for an OASIS or OASIS SB award must fully qualify as the offering entity. At a minimum, this includes relevant experience examples, past performance, and accounting system.
254	L.5.1.7 (79-80)	Requires that JVs provide documents describing several aspects of the JV. Is the Operating Agreement sufficient? Or is other documentation required?
		RESPONSE: Documentation that provides the information described in L.5.1.7 will be sufficient.
255	L.5.1.7 (80)	Requires that JVs and Partners provide CTA documents that "address the duration of the CTA, including when it became effective, when it expires, and the basis for termination." Is there a minimum effective date (that is, must the CTA exist for a pre-determined length of time to qualify as "existing")?
		RESPONSE: No.
256	L.5.2.1 (80)	States, "To be determined responsible, a prospective Contractor must have adequate financial resources to perform the contract, or the ability to obtain them," then requires completion of GSA Form 527. If an unpopulated JV, does the Form pertain to the JV specifically or to each member of the JV?
		RESPONSE: The form would pertain to the offering entity.
257	M.2 (89)	States, "The Government intends to make 40 awards in each OASIS SB Pool resulting from this solicitation and may include additional awards for special socio-economic considerations as explained in Section M.3. In the event of a tie at the position of number 40, all Offerors tied for this position shall receive a contract award.... The Government intends to strictly enforce all of the proposal submission requirements outlined in Section L. Failure to comply with these requirements will result in an Offeror's proposal being rejected as being non-conforming to solicitation requirements." If fewer than 40 Offerors are eligible in one or more Pools, is there a minimum number of Contractor-holders the Government has determined is sufficient to provide the expertise and competition necessary for this contract?
		RESPONSE: We are confident that this will not be an issue. If we have fewer than 40 eligible Offerors, we will amend the solicitation.
258	GSA Form 527 (N/A)	Is GSA Form 527 relevant to unpopulated JVs? If so, does this mean that only populated JVs are eligible for award?
		RESPONSE: The GSA Form 527 is applicable to all Offerors. We cannot answer your second question as we do not understand your context of "unpopulated" JVs.
259	H.6, p. 42 and L.3, p. 75	Despite the changes made to the draft RFP (posted to the changes blog on 4/19/2013), Sections L.3 and H.6 still limit and/or prohibit competition for some large businesses structured using subsidiaries and legal entities. The requirement remains that all system approval letters must be at the bidding entity level. This prohibits companies for which accounting, purchasing and estimating systems are maintained at the parent company level or in a shared service environment to be used by its wholly-owned subsidiaries from bidding OASIS. Many companies perform contracts through the performance of their subsidiary companies, to include performing large, complex projects by integrating the resources of its subsidiaries and affiliates. However, at the same time, companies attempt to operate in a cost effective manner by having a single set of financial systems (i.e., accounting, estimating, etc.) at a parent level, or in a shared services affiliate, eliminating the need for redundant systems. As a result, the bidding entity in many companies may not "own" their systems, and therefore, the revised RFP language does not allow companies with the structure described above to either bid or be allowed to compete on a level playing field, when these companies could, in fact, be the more efficient companies in the market.

		<p>To not limit competition and to enable such companies to compete on OASIS, GSA should allow parent company documents to be submitted as proof of systems approvals/certifications for subsidiary companies that operate under the approved systems. In cases such as this, the bidding entity should receive the same points as companies who have systems at the bidding entity level. If GSA feels it is necessary, GSA can require the bidding entity and/or the parent company to provide a company certified (by an authorized company official) letter stating that the bidding entity uses the systems referenced in the approval letters for the systems in question (i.e., accounting, purchasing, estimating, etc.).</p> <p>Will GSA allow parent company documents to be submitted as proof of systems approvals/certifications for subsidiary companies that operate under the approved systems, and if so, will they be awarded at the specified point levels? If so, we suggest modification of items 2, 2a and 2b in the changes blog, posted on 4/19, to read: 2. Offeror Name/Affiliates/Divisions/Parent: We are editing the first paragraph of Section L.3 to remove the language about requiring the Parent Company to be the Offeror. We shall consider Affiliates or Parents for Relevant Experience examples and Systems subject to the following: a. There is a "meaningful relationship" between the affiliate, parent, division and/or subsidiary of the Offeror for purposes of performance under OASIS. b. The Offeror provides the Government a "commitment letter" from the affiliate, parent, division</p>
		<p>RESPONSE: The statement "The requirement remains that all system approval letters must be at the bidding entity level." is not accurate. We are allowing for affiliates with meaningful relationships to be utilized for relevant experience, past performance, and systems. The only thing that must still be in the specific name of the Offeror are certifications.</p>
260	Updated draft RFP language posted to changes blog dated 4/19/13, item 2d	<p>Please confirm that item 2 part D, "Note: Certifications must be in the name of the Offeror" refers to certifications such as ISO 9001:2008 and CMMI, as opposed to systems (e.g., accounting, purchasing and estimating) or facility clearances.</p>
		<p>RESPONSE: That is correct.</p>
261	L.5.3.1, No. 1 & 2, p. 85; C.2.1.5, p. 19; C.2.1.6, p. 20; and Q&A #139, 4/19/13.	<p>We have a follow-up question to item 139 on the "oasis_q_and_a_april_19_clarifications" file in which GSA clarified that program management service areas performed to support the contract that the offeror has with the Government will suffice for demonstrating performance of that discipline. Given that large complex integrated programs may also have complex financial management and logistics requirements to support the contract itself, please confirm that financial management and logistics services performed to support a relevant experience contract will suffice as well (vs. directly supporting a government financial management or logistics organization).</p>
		<p>RESPONSE: That is correct.</p>
262	Updated draft RFP language posted to changes blog dated 4/19/13, item 1	<p>In item 1 posted to the changes blog, does GSA really mean that an EPA audited system is worth less than a DCAA audited system (in points allocation)? Or is the distinction GSA intends to draw really between a private sector auditor vs. a government auditor?</p>
		<p>RESPONSE: The distinction is between private sector audit vs. government audit. Any Government agency can be a cognizant audit agency.</p>
263		<p>For situations where extensive Federal contract past performance has provided services that cross multiple core disciplines, but are not called out as such in the SOW, SOO, or WBS, are there other acceptable methods for an Offeror to provide evidence that a past performance example covers one or more core disciplines?</p>
		<p>RESPONSE: We will accept any official contract documentation as proof. This could include monthly status reports, invoices, etc.</p>
264		<p>Page 17, Section C, Paragraph C.2. Scope; Can you show the NACIS Pools aligned with this diagram?</p>
		<p>RESPONSE: The Pools are not aligned to scope.</p>
265		<p>Pages 18-20, Section C, Paragraphs C.2.1.1-6; If we (contractors) have to market this product to our potential customers, will the government provide the details that are under each numbered element within each paragraph. For example in C.2.1.1.1 Acquisition Support, what are the sub elements to this Service Area that defines Acquisition Support to ensure the customers requirement falls into this category and not another listed within the other sub-paragraphs .1-6?</p>
		<p>RESPONSE: Any work that fits the definition of each Core Discipline provided in Section C may be performed on OASIS unless otherwise prohibited. The list at C.2.1.1.1 is only a list of examples. Work performed under the OASIS contracts is not limited to these.</p>
266		<p>Page 40, Section H, Paragraph H.4.2.1. NAICS Pools; Will the government provide the cross walk between the NAICS Pools 1-6 and the diagram listed on page 17, Section C, Paragraph C.2. Scope and pages 18-20, Section C, Paragraphs C.2.1.1-6?</p>
		<p>RESPONSE: The Pools are not aligned to scope.</p>
267	H.4.2.1 pg 41	<p>Pools 5 and 6 include a NAICS code size standard for 1,000 or 1,500 employees. When does the OASIS SB program office actually envision set-asides under Pool 5 and Pool 6? When would the program office determine a set-aside under Pools 5 and 6, in lieu of an unrestricted procurement under OASIS SB? Since our company meets the size standard but is not engaged in aircraft or space vehicle work, how does the OASIS SB program office envision that we might accomplish five Task Orders prior to Option 1?</p>

		RESPONSE: If your company does not engage in that kind of work, we assume that you would not request to be considered for those Pools. We don't determine how or when OCOs and client agencies decide to conduct set-asides. If you don't do Research and Development work or don't foresee it in your company's future, then please refrain from applying for Pools 4-6.
268	B.3.4 Labor OCONUS, pg 14	Do the rates contained in the OASIS SB labor categories in Section J.1 apply OCONUS, notwithstanding the DSSR? How does OASIS SB plan on handling extraordinary contractor cost in OCONUS locations such as Hawaii, Germany, or hazard areas such as Afghanistan?
		RESPONSE: The rates do not apply to OCONUS requirements.
269	B.3.6 Materials and Equipment, pg 15	Does the OASIS SB program office envision limitations on material and equipment purchases or the pass-through rates associated with their inclusion?
		RESPONSE: Any restrictions or limitations will be established at the task order level. This is a reason that purchasing systems are so valuable.
270	C.2.1.4 Engineering Services, pg 19	When does the OASIS SB program office envision that the engineering services shown at subparagraphs 9 and 10 would not be covered by the Brooks Act?
		RESPONSE: Determinations of this sort can only be done on a case by case basis.
271	F.3 Period of Performance Term, pg 23	What is the maximum term of OASIS SB? 10 years or 15 years?
		RESPONSE: The contract lasts for 10 years. Task orders may be placed up until the final day of the life of the contract and last for up to 5 years. So theoretically, the contract may only last 10 years, but work performed under the contract may go on for up to 15 years.
272	G.3.11 Post-Award SB Program, pg 25	If a small business concern recertifies its business size at the execution of Option 1, what Pools will he become eligible for?
		RESPONSE: That vendor would stay in the Pool they were originally awarded if we understand your question correctly.
273	G.2.6 COPM/COCM, pg 25	How does the OASIS SB program office intend to objectively evaluate qualifications?
		RESPONSE: The evaluation criteria is very black and white. Offerors either have the relevant experience, past performance, and systems, certifications, and resources, or they do not. This will be a very, very objective evaluation process. We are basically verifying that Offerors have what they claim to have.
274	G.2.4 Industrial Operations Analyst, pg 27	How will the IOA interface with DCMA? Should contractors expect multiple oversight audits under OASIS SB?
		RESPONSE: No. IOAs function is to ensure that Contractors are providing GSA with CAF payments appropriately. They will have no interface with DCMA.
275	H.3.1 Set-Asides Based on Socio-Economic Group, pg 39	We believe that when set-asides are determined to be SDVOSB that the current statutory requirement is for a "rule of two" as opposed to GSA's condition of a "rule of three."
		RESPONSE: Please provide the statute you are referring to. So far as we know, the requirement for setting aside to a SDVOSB is described at 19.1405(b)(1) and states "Offers will be received from two or more service-disabled veteran-owned small business concerns". In order to provide OCOs with a better hope that they might receive 2 proposals, we required at least 3 Contractors.
276	H.6.2 Acceptable Estimating System, pg 43	Normally DCMA will conduct an audit on a contractor's estimating and purchasing systems only when requested as a part of a pre-award survey associated with a cost-reimbursement contract requirement. How will OASIS SB, without the benefit of a cost-reimbursement prime contract, request the appropriate approvals or acceptability by DCMA?
		RESPONSE: We do not understand the question, please rephrase.
277	H.6.4 Forward Pricing Rate Agreements, pg 43	What is the relationship between approved billing rates under a Forward Pricing Rate Agreement and the OASIS SB labor rates in attachment J.1?
		RESPONSE: Approved indirect rates that could be used in creating the fully loaded OASIS SB labor rates.
278	H.6.5 Approved Purchasing System, pg 44	Why is the OASIS SB program office giving evaluation credit for an approved estimating system and an approved purchasing system when both require a cost-reimbursement prime contract?
		RESPONSE: Cost reimbursement task orders will be issued under the OASIS SB contract.
279	H.6.7 AS9100 Certification, pg 44	Why is the OASIS SB program office giving evaluation credit for those small business Pools which have no NAICS codes associated with the aerospace industry?
		RESPONSE: We do not understand the question, please rephrase.
280	H.6.8 CMMI Maturity Level, pg 44	Why is the OASIS SB program office giving evaluation credit for CMMI maturity level higher than 3 when the contract is not for Information Technology services? IT services are incidental and ancillary support functions under OASIS SB.
		RESPONSE: Please see previous response to this question.
281	H.6.10.1 Facility Clearance Level, pg 46	Why is the OASIS SB program office giving additional evaluation credit for facility clearances at the Top Secret level when Top Secret clearances are given as a requirement of contract performance rather than an evaluation factor?
		RESPONSE: Because having facilities clearances is of potential value to our clients.
282	H.7 Partnering, pg 48	Would you please explain the purpose of paragraph H.7 in the OASIS SB solicitation?
		RESPONSE: Please see previous response to this question.
283	H.7.4 Marketing, pg 49	How does the government intend to monitor the contractor's marketing materials?

		RESPONSE: The Contractor will provide us a sample of the marketing material and we will approve or disapprove.
284	H.8 Training and Permits, pg 50	Under what circumstance does the OASIS SB program office envision that foreign work permits, authorizations, and/or visas in connection with the performance of work would not be cost-reimbursable?
		RESPONSE: This will depend on the task order. We have no pre-conceived notions of when or why OCOs select the contract types that they do. That is up to their judgement.
285	H.11.2 Vertical Pool Ramping, pg 54	We do not understand the scoring mechanism associated with how an OASIS SB under Pool 1 can move from the SB contract to the Unrestricted contract. Please explain.
		RESPONSE: If an OASIS SB Contractor in Pool 1 outgrows their size status, they can be on-ramped to the OASIS Contract in Pool 1 if they meet all the pass/fail requirements of the OASIS contract and score at least as high as the lowest scored Offeror in that Pool.
286	L.5.3.1 Relevant Experience, pg 81	L.5.3.1 requires offerors to demonstrate past performance as a prime contractor only, yet the evaluation criteria request that information from non-Federal projects be included in Relevant Experience. How are we to treat a commercial contract with a prime contractor whose value is greater than \$2 million per year?
		RESPONSE: We do not understand the question, please rephrase.
287	L.5.3.1 Relevant Experience, pg 81	Paragraph 5. Requires that At least One (1) project must be for work performed under a Cost-Reimbursement contract type.... While I understand that Contractors must have an Acceptable Accounting System, I do not understand the requirement for past performance under a cost reimbursement prime contract. We have annual sales in excess of \$50 M, but we have never performed work under a cost-reimbursement prime contract, nor would I guess many other Small Business Concerns. This requirement seems overly restrictive under the Set Aside procurement.
		RESPONSE: We have eliminated that requirement.
288	L.5.4.1 Past Performance, pg 82	As far as we know, only one of our past performances is currently being reported within CPARS even though others have an annual value in excess of \$35 million. How will the government evaluate past performance if ratings are not available in PPIRS or CPARS? We do currently have independent ratings available through Dun and Bradstreet.
		RESPONSE: If Past Performance is not present in CPARS, then Offerors are instructed to use Attachment J.6.
289	L.5.5.3 Acceptable Estimating System, pg 83	Once again, we object to an evaluation criteria for an Acceptable Estimating System for small business concerns who have no cost-reimbursement prime contracts.
		RESPONSE: We do not understand the question, please rephrase.
290	L.5.5.5 Approved Purchasing System, pg 83	Once again, we object to an evaluation criteria for an Approved Purchasing System for small business concerns who have no cost-reimbursement prime contracts.
		RESPONSE: We do not understand the question, please rephrase.
291	M.5. Scoring System, pg 94	How will the government evaluate 4/6 or 5/6 core disciplines within each project? How does the contractor demonstrate the operation of a core discipline?
		RESPONSE: By directing the evaluators to where the core discipline is articulated in the contract documents of the example being provided.
292	L.5.4 Past Performance, pg 94	Please explain the definition of "Non-Federal Projects." Are subcontracts in support of Federal activities Federal or Non-Federal projects?
		RESPONSE: Non-federal projects are those projects not performed for the Federal Government. Subcontracts are not acceptable regardless of who they are performed for.
293	L.6.2 Indirect Rates/Profit, pg 88	Is it the OASIS SB program office's intent to stipulate profit (measure risk) under this provision?
		RESPONSE: No. We shall, however, provide the basis of what we feel is fair and reasonable.
294		In response to Q&A General Category, Question 20, referencing Section L.5.3.2, GSA stated - As there is no work performed at the IDIQ level, relevant experience should reference a specific task order or contract where work was actually performed. Therefore, it is our understanding that only Tasks Awarded under an IDIQ contract would be considered for past performance rather than the base IDIQ contract.
		RESPONSE: That is correct.
295		In addition, Section H.7.5 of the DRFP states the Contractor must attain a minimum of 3 task order awards prior to the exercise of Option I.
		RESPONSE: That is correct.
296	H.4.2.1, Pages 40 &41	Needs Additional Clarification Of NAICS Pool Opt-in Requirements
		RESPONSE: We do not understand the question, please rephrase.
297	M.2, Page 89	Needs additional clarification scoring ties. Are ties at positions below 40th awarded at the same level, thus creating multiple awards for 1st through 39th positions as well as the 40th?
		RESPONSE: The top 40 Offerors will receive awards and anyone tied for the 40th position.
298	L.5.5.9, Page 85	If an agency contracting officer has approved the offeror's EVMS system being used on a current contract, can a letter from that CO on agency letterhead be used as an acceptable form of verification?
		RESPONSE: No.
299	K.1.4, M.2, Pages 68 and 89	The pools as defined in Section K are broken out by NAICS codes and it is defined that there will be 40 awards per pool. Can you please explain how companies will be evaluated by pool? How will GSA validate how an offeror is qualified for a specific pool?

		RESPONSE: Offerors shall indicate which pools they wish to be evaluated for. Proposals will be scored and all Offerors that wished to be considered for Pool 1 shall be sorted based upon highest score. The top 40 Offerors will receive awards. Then Offerors that wished to be considered for Pool 2 shall be sorted based upon highest score. This will be repeated for each Pool.
300	H.12, Page 54	If a contractor is placed on dormant status, how long can the dormant status last. Also that would have a specific impact on the contractor's ability to meet the five task order minimum to be eligible for the option period. What allowances will be made here?
		RESPONSE: Dormant status may last as long as the underlying cause is present. Option period exercise requirements are being edited, but having done something that resulted in Dormant Status would probably be a far greater concern than number of awards in the determination of Option exercise.
301	H.3, Page 38	2nd to last line in first paragraph is missing a word
		RESPONSE: Thank you for the edit.
302	L.5.2.1, Page 80	The offeror must have adequate financial resources. Please provide the definition of adequate financial resources.
		RESPONSE: Answer pending.
303	M.3, Pages 90 - 91	If there are socio-economic companies that qualify for more than one socio-economic sub-group will they count toward the "3" for each sub-group?
		RESPONSE: Yes.
304	Section H.6.8.	CMMI Maturity Level mentions the three CMMI models (CMMI for Development, CMMI for Services and CMMI for Acquisition). Therefore, the scoring for L5.5.8 category has a potential of 9 categories (three for each model). Our assumption is that the pertinent relevant certification is CMMI for Development.
		RESPONSE: We will provide credit for any of them.
305	Section L.3 (page 75)	The draft RFP states that "for Systems, Certifications, and Resources, the proposal submission must be in the official legal bidding entities name as identified on the SF 33." We are unclear to what "proposal submittal" and "SF33" refers. Is it the OASIS proposal or the OASIS SF33? In response to section L.5.5, offeror's are required to provide "verification" of systems and certifications. In many cases, this verification is not associated with a legal bidding entity, but with an accounting segment instead. We believe the GSA intent is that offerors provide verification for the specific systems, certifications and resources being proposed for OASIS, consistent with the legal bidding entity identified on the OASIS SF33. Please confirm this interpretation.
		RESPONSE: That is correct.
306	Section B.2.5.1 (page 13)	The draft RFP makes it very clear that the OASIS ceiling rates are only applicable to T&M/LH Task Orders, and even then only under very specific circumstances. Does the GSA intend to include anything in the OASIS contract that would preclude an Ordering Contracting Officer (OCO) from applying these rates in other circumstances? We are concerned that an OCO might find it convenient to use the OASIS ceiling rates to define cost reasonableness or set a maximum billing rate on cost reimbursable Task Orders, or when there is adequate competition.
		RESPONSE: This is a great question. Our OCO training products will address this, but we cannot control contracting office policies. We will advise them that doing the things you mention are unwise and not recommended. Direction to OCOs would not be addressed in the contract, but rather in ordering guides and training products. The contract is direction from Government to contractor.
307	Table in Section L.4 (page 78)	The paragraph references for the key personnel resumes appear to be incorrect.
		RESPONSE: Thank you for the edit.
308	Section L.5.3.2.3 (page 86)	The draft RFP requires offerors to provide "The Labor Categories listed in the contract document, or if none listed in the actual award document itself, the Contractor's proposal that specifies the Offeror's labor category response to the contract solicitation". Is the GSA requesting the listing of labor categories used, or the definition of the labor categories as well? Please confirm that the GSA is NOT requesting the proposed cost or price per hour for each labor category.
		RESPONSE: We have no interest in the cost or price for these labor categories. These submissions are to help support relevant experience of core disciplines. We are asking for documentation to support claims of work on core disciplines. Labor categories could be of assistance in that regard.
309	Section L.5.3.2.3 (page 86)	Section L.5.3.2.3 requires that offerors provide "Contract Award Form identifying the Contract/Order Number and Offeror's name as the Prime Contract Awardee". There are circumstances where the OASIS offeror's name may not match the contract award form. Specifically, section L.3 (page 75) states that GSA will consider affiliates, internal divisions, and subsidiaries of an Offeror, if the Parent Company is the official legal bidding entity on the SF 33. In this circumstance, the offeror name and the name on the relevant experience contract award form would not match. Similarly, the name may not match if a company was acquired, divested, or a contract was novated. Please confirm that offerors may include relevant experience in these circumstances, provided an adequate explanation is also included.

		RESPONSE: Yes.
310	Section L.5.4.3 (page 87)	Please confirm that evaluation of socio-economic past performance is a comparison of the offeror's performance against the cited contract's socio-economic goals, whatever they may have been. GSA does not intend to evaluate offeror's past performance against the stated socio-economic goals for OASIS.
		RESPONSE: That is correct.
311	Section L.6.1 (page 93)	The limitations of our approved estimating process for Direct Labor may produce the circumstance where the majority of labor rates are within the Government provided range, but with a few exceptions that are outside the range. Based on the RFP, if even one rate is outside the range by only a few cents, we must provide supporting rationale, and this rationale must be acceptable to GSA or we would not be considered for award. Can the GSA define or provide examples of what they would consider to be "clear and convincing rationale"?
		RESPONSE: Please refer to FAR 15.404-1(b) for various price analysis techniques that Contracting Officer may employ. Clear and convincing rationale should firmly address one of those techniques.
312	Section L.6.1 (page 93)	In reviewing the BLS data on line, it appears that the compensation data by SOC is not further broken down by years of experience or education. Can the GSA please provide the methodology they used to develop the rate ranges for each level of a SOC (i.e. Junior, Journeyman, Senior)?
		RESPONSE: This will be posted as a blog in the coming week.
313	Section L.6 (page 92)	Can offerors use pricing from other divisions of the prime in response to the OASIS RFP, provided the same level of detail and supporting information is included.
		RESPONSE: Yes.
314	H.4.2 Page 40	OCOs will determine the appropriate NAICS code which determines which pool of contractors are allowed to propose. What is the process of challenging a OCO on their NAICS code determination?
		RESPONSE: See CFR 121.1103.
315	H.12 Page 54	Contractors placed on dormant status are not eligible to compete for task orders. How is this going to be enforced and for how long?
		RESPONSE: This will be enforced through our web site and will last as long as the underlying condition that caused it persists.
316	Attachment J.8 - Cost Template	We understand that attachment J.8 will become part of the awarded OASIS contract, and will only be applied to T&M Task Orders. However, the template includes data on direct labor rates and indirect burdens. To prevent misuse of this data when awarding cost reimbursable Task Orders, would the GSA consider changing attachment 8 to only include the fully loaded (T&M) labor rates, and require the labor rate buildup on a different form?
		RESPONSE: We will only provide fully loaded ceiling rates to OCOs.
317		Section L.5.3.1, Relevant Experience Minimum Requirements, lists past performance requirements that will prevent many small businesses with excellent service delivery track records from bidding. Would the government consider making the requirements less restrictive?
		RESPONSE: While we do not know specifically what you are referring to, we have relaxed the requirements.
318	Section L.5.4.2 Past Performance and Section M.5 Scoring System	Will the Government allow the use of English-language Canadian federal and provincial government past performance references? Would those references be assigned the same point values as U.S. Federal Government past performance references given that the evaluations were provided by Canadian federal or provincial government personnel?
		RESPONSE: Answer pending.
319	Section H, H.4.2.1, Page Number 41 & 42	In reference to H.4.2 and the NAICS codes only defining small business size standards, what are the purposes of the six pools for the unrestricted OASIS? Is Pool 6 for example only for Aircraft work?
		RESPONSE: Please see previous response to your first question. Pool 6 is for Research and Development pertaining to aircraft.
320	L.5.5.11.2 Corporate OASIS Contract Manager (COCM)	Is there an equivalent number of years of experience in contract management that can be substituted for the requirement to have a professional acquisition certification from the NCMA?
		RESPONSE: No.
321	M.5, page 94	Please clarify how you will score Past Performance ratings that do not average whole numbers (i.e. will a 4.6 round up to a 5)?
		RESPONSE: We will use a standard rounding approach. 4.50 and higher will be considered a 5. 3.50 - 4.49 will be considered a 4. 2.50 - 3.49 will be considered a 3.
322	L.5.4.2, page 82	We have all federal government past performances to submit, but some do not have CPARS for them as a matter of practice for the agency/customer associated with the contract(s) these projects were accomplished on. Please confirm that we should submit the Past Performance Rating form (J.5) for federal projects that have not/will not complete a CPARS.
		RESPONSE: That is correct.

323	M.5, page 94, L.5.3.1 scoring	Please clarify how "Projects performed in multiple locations" will be scored. We have multiple offices, with projects performed at each. Would we receive 100 points per project for demonstrating: Project A performed at Office A, Project B performed at Office B, and so on? We believe this demonstrates our ability to staff at multiple CONUS/OCONUS locations.
		RESPONSE: If "Office A" and "Office B" are in different metropolitan areas, you can claim the associated points.
324	M.5, page 94, L.5.3.1 scoring	Please clarify how "Projects performed in multiple locations" will be scored. Does this criteria require an individual project to be performed across multiple locations offices? For example, Project A performed at Offices A, B and C? Please also confirm if performance at multiple locations include oversight and management of subcontractors at additional locations?
		RESPONSE: Multiple locations will be determined by contract documents. For example, if your requirement calls for performance to take place in Washington DC and Baton Rouge, LA, then that would be considered "multiple locations" for scoring purposes regardless if the prime or a sub performed the work. If your requirement calls for performance to take place in Washington DC, but you have a subcontractor working virtually in Baton Rouge, LA, that would not qualify as "multiple locations".
325	Pg 53, 54`	Please clarify what the GSA OASIS vehicle options are for SB business who do grow out of their size status due to merger/acquisition during the initial 5 years? The draft indicates that there are lateral and vertical options for <u>organic</u> growth, but does not specify what options are available for other scenarios. We request that companies in this situation have an option for vertical movement to the unrestricted track so as to not be penalized for growth of any format. That vertical movement could take the form of a recompete or be limited to companies that have been awarded at least 3 TOs.
		RESPONSE: We will not allow companies to purchase their way onto the OASIS contracts. Simply stated, the only OASIS vehicle option would be a Full and Open on-ramp.
326	M.5, page 95	Because OASIS SB is not an IT contract, will the govt accept CMMI Level 2 as an indicator of company strength and add to the scored rating form for points?
		RESPONSE: No.
327	Attachment J.5 Relevant Experience Template	Please confirm on the J.5 Relevant Experience form that Annual Dollar Value = <u>Average</u> Annual Dollar Value? This would align to form J.4 SECTION L.5.3. (VOLUME 3 - RELEVANT EXPERIENCE) Question 2.
		RESPONSE: Yes.
328	L.5.3.2.3, page 81	Regarding draft instructions "1. Contract award form identifying the contract/order number and Offeror's name as the Prime/Contract Awardee." Please clarify where we should notate the Offeror's relationship on a project that was previously awarded to a company that has since been merged/acquired/novated to the Offeror, and is now being performed by the Offeror? The original contract award document will list the ormer company, although the Offeror is performing the work.
		RESPONSE: Thank you for bringing this to our attention. We will edit the language to account for that.
329	M.4.4.1, page 93	Please confirm if we may submit a Past Performance Rating form (J.6) for a distinct project that is part of a larger project/contract vehicle that has a CPARS, but the specific project did not receive a CPARS?
		RESPONSE: If by "distinct", you mean a separate contract award like a task order under a contract, then yes.
330	F.4.1, page 24	Table reference to G.3.4.1., should the CPARS be due 30 days after receipt from CO SB versus the close of each reporting period?
		RESPONSE: Yes. We will edit.
331	M.5, page 94, scoring for L.5.5.11.1 and L.5.5.11.2 (COPM and COCM)	Key personnel. Would you be willing to substitute years of experience for the Master's degree requirements for points. For example, as we have used on our GSA PES Schedule, 6 years of experience can be substituted for a Master's degree.
		RESPONSE: No.
332	G.2.6.2 page 29 (COCM)	Would a law degree be accepted as substitute for the Master's degree for COCM?
		RESPONSE: Yes.
333	L.5.5.6 - L.5.5.9, page 84-85. ISO 9001:2008, AS9100, CMMI, and EVMS	Taking into account the long timeframe for certifications in these areas, would the government award points/partial points for certifications that can be demonstrated to be in-process, with estimated certification award dates within 12 months of submission? We have certifications in process, that due to the schedule of the certifying agencies, may not be finalized until after submission.
		RESPONSE: No.
334	M.5, page 94	Will you accept a PWS/SOW requirement for "the contractor to perform services at US Government facilities within the Continental US (CONUS) or outside the Continental US (OCONUS) during TDY" acceptable documentation as projects having included OCONUS work and performed at multiple locations?
		RESPONSE: No.
335	M.5., p. 100	Please confirm that the Average ratings assigned under Past Performance are based on standard arithmetic rounding, e.g., a 3.5 average is scored as an Average rating of "4."
		RESPONSE: Yes. Please see previous response.

336	L.5.5.1.; page 82 (this section is an assumption since the paragraph is changing per the "Changes to the OASIS SB Draft Solicitation" blog entry posted 19 Apr 2013; 1737.)	Per the cited blog entry, you will be removing the requirement for federal agency verification of an offeror's accounting system, however, you have stated that you believe, based on historic data, that the majority of tasks awarded under OASIS will be issued as Cost Reimbursement type contracts. If you have OASIS awardees who do not have this verification, they will be ineligible to compete for the Cost Reimbursement tasks. How will you handle the fact that some Pool members cannot bid on what may be the majority of the tasks? What if an entire Pool has ONLY members whose accounting systems are not verified, thereby making no OASIS awardee in that Pool eligible to bid on a task?
		RESPONSE: Acceptable Accounting Systems are still required. We edited the requirement through collaboration with DCAA. Offerors meeting the requirement will be able to perform cost-reimbursable requirements.
337	M.5. Scoring System, page 94	With reduction in minimum dollar value to qualify, what will the new thresholds be to obtain the additional points?
		RESPONSE: For OASIS SB, we anticipate the new point thresholds will be \$2M, \$4M, and \$6M.
338	M.5 Scoring System, page 94	You stated in the "Changes to the OASIS SB Draft Solicitation" blog entry posted 19 Apr 2013; 1737 that "Recognition of already having a DCAA audited accounting system is now present in the scoring system as a significant factor." What will the point value be for a DCAA audited accounting system?
		RESPONSE: We are deciding upon this currently.
339	M.4.4.1. Past Performance	1) ISSUE: We understand that the OASIS is a professional services contract and not an IT services contract. However, there are many IT contracts that contain professional services in the 6 specific Core Disciplines covered by OASIS QUESTION: Relative to past performance, is it acceptable for bidders to use past performance references that cover multiple OASIS core disciplines if the past performance is IT or IT PMO related?
		RESPONSE: Offerors may not use a past performance reference that applies to a requirement that could not have been performed under OASIS.
340	H.4.2.1. NAICs Pools	2) ISSUE: We understand that the purposed of the NAICS codes are used for size determination only and the core disciplines are not related to the pools. The government further states in question 59 of the April 29th, Clarifications: "Past performance and relevant experience is not Pool specific. Pools have absolutely nothing to do with the relevant experience and past performance examples. We aren't even asking for the NAICS codes that were reported for these examples. Pools only reflect size standards and nothing more". QUESTION: Will it be necessary for contactors to have the appropriate NAICS code registered in the System for Award Management (SAM)? For example, if a company wants to submit a proposal for POOL 3 (\$35.5M Business Size Standard), do they have to have NAICS code 541330 registered in SAM at the time of OASIS proposal submission?
		RESPONSE: "Will it be necessary for contactors to have the appropriate NAICS code registered in the System for Award Management (SAM)?" No.
341	Hypothetical Example 4 Provided on GSA OASIS Web Site	3) ISSUE: GSA provided the following example in one of the OASIS communications: Example 4: Company D with \$100M in annual revenues (and 3,000 employees) meets the pass/fails of OASIS. The company indicates that they would like to compete for all 6 OASIS Pools. Evaluations are conducted and the company scores 5,700. This score results in the following rankings within each Pool: Pool 1: 25th; Pool 2: 26th; Pool 3: 33rd; Pool 4: 34th; Pool 5: 35th; Pool 6: 36th. In this example, Company D would receive an award on OASIS and be able to compete for all competitions that take place in Pools 1 - 6. QUESTION: Even if they are competing in the unrestricted space, how can Company D (a large business), with \$100M in annual revenues and 3,000 employees qualify for Pools 1 – 5, which are under 1000 employees and/or less than \$35.5M in revenue?
		RESPONSE: We feel that perhaps you are confusing OASIS and OASIS SB. OASIS is an unrestricted contract. Full and open competition. Accordingly, any company of any size may apply for OASIS awards.
342	L.5.3.1. Relevant Experience Minimum Requirements, p.80 - 81	Is it possible to include as Relevant Experience, Projects that are under another prime contractor, but satisfy all other GSA OASIS experience requirements? We are a subcontractor in support of a 10 year \$550 m IDIQ contract and have full responsibility for several very large projects - including the management, execution, reporting, budgeting, scheduling and EVMS performance. We have excellent customer references and would like to include these, as well as our Prime Contract Past Performance Project references in our proposal.
		RESPONSE: No.

343	L.5.3.2.3. Contractual and Proposal Documents for Relevant Experience Projects	Please provide guidance on what the Government defines as a "Project" and what size / dollar value evidence should be provided for at the Project or Contract level. For example, we have multiple projects under a contract with a Government customer that includes base/option years. The size/dollar value of the Projects may not be clearly defined or evident in the prime contract documents.
		RESPONSE: Without more specifics, it is difficult to accurately answer this question. Contract award documents have to identify the value of the award. We have never seen an exception to this.
344	B.1.5 page 11	Contract Access Fee (CAF): Is it GSA's intention to Cap the CAF similar to the Cap on Alliant?
		RESPONSE: No. We are currently exploring a CAF solution for the OASIS contracts and will communicate that solution once vetted and approved.
345	B.3.5 page 15	Travel: This paragraph does not address the allowability of profit on travel costs. Since there is no exclusion of profit on travel noted, it is assumed that profit would be allowable on all order types--with the exception of T&M. Please confirm.
		RESPONSE: Offerors shall bill consistent with the rules of their accounting system unless a task order solicitation establishes specific requirements in this area.
346	F.3 page 23	Period of Performance Term: The second paragraph indicates that if the 6 month option to extend is exercised, the ceiling rates utilized will be those in the immediately preceding contract period of OASIS. It is assumed that this refers to utilizing Year 10 rates for all task orders awarded in that 6 month period. Since rates will be established for Years 11 - 15, it would appear that Year 11 rates would be appropriate to utilize for all efforts awarded in that 6 month period after the original 10 year term. Please clarify.
		RESPONSE: The year 11 rates would apply. We'll edit the language to make this clearer. The clause, if exercised, requires that the terms and conditions, including pricing, continue through the extension.
347	L.3 (8th paragraph) page 76	Instructions: The Draft states,"The Offeror's proposal shall be formatted in six (6) separate electronic folders that correspond to the Volumes identified in Section L.4. Offerors shall upload each proposal folder into the AAS Business Systems Portal (formerly known as ITSS). Offerors are hereby instructed to register in the AAS Business Systems Portal at least one month prior to submitting proposal documents." We have much experience with ITSS and are unaware of how to upload folders within the system. It seems to only accept individual files. The ITSS Help Desk is unaware of how to upload folders also. Would GSA please clarify?
		RESPONSE: Thank you for bringing this to our attention. We will explore the matter and provide further clarification or change the language.
348	L.5.3.1 page 85	Relevant Experience Minimum Requirements: The first minimum requirement states that "The primary scope of work must be one of the Six OASIS Core Disciplines." All task orders awarded under GWAC contracts (ANSWER, Millennia, Alliant, CIO-SP2, etc.) and IT focused IDIQ contracts (EAGLE, ITES-2S, TIPPS-2, etc.) by definition have an IT related primary scope. Given the first minimum requirement, is it correct to assume that the OASIS evaluators will not accept as a relevant experience project work that was performed on task orders under GWAC or IT focused IDIQ contracts?
		RESPONSE: That is correct. Relevant experience examples must be on a requirement that could have been performed on the OASIS contracts.
349	L.6 page 92	Escalation Factor: The RFI states the government will apply an escalation factor for the years 2-15. Will that rate be disclosed in the final RFP and what if the contractor does not agree with the escalation rate assigned? Is that negotiable?
		RESPONSE: The rate will be disclosed in the final RFP. Currently, it would be 2.23%. This is not negotiable.
350	M.5 page 100	Adequate Accounting System: L.5.5.1 requires offers to provide verification of an adequate accounting system in the form of an official audit report and/or official letterhead from DCAA, DCMA, or any Federal Civilian Audit Agency verifying the adequacy of the accounting system. The recent blog stated that OASIS is "removing the requirement to have a DCAA audited accounting system as a Pass/Fail element", and that "recognition of already having a DCAA audited accounting system is now present in the scoring system as a significant factor". If an offeror provides a letter from DCAA verifying the adequacy of their accounting system will they receive maximum points in the M.5 scoring system?
		RESPONSE: Yes.
351	L.3	The instructions direct us to register at the GSA AAS Business Systems Portal. The instructions also say that this system was formerly known as ITSS. On the AAS Registration site, you must choose between registering for either a "TOS" or "ITSS". Is ITSS the appropriate selection to register for OASIS? If not, can you provide the link to the AAS registration site?
		RESPONSE: ITSS is the appropriate selection.
352	M.5. Scoring System, page 94 Section L.5.4. VOLUME 4 - PAST PERFORMANCE	The scoring is based on an "average" rating. How will the decimal points of an average be handled? In other words what is the breaking point of rounding up versus rounding down, or will all be rounded down so that a 4.96 is only a 4?
		RESPONSE: Please see the earlier responses to this.
353	Table, page 77, L.5.11.1. and L.5.11.2. File Name Column	Resume file names for COCM and COPM have been transposed.

		RESPONSE: Thank you for bringing this to our attention.
		End of Questions for this Week