

POLARIS GWAC
QUESTION AND RESPONSE DOCUMENT #4

Consistent with the previous Question & Response Documents, in addressing questions, it is the Government's position that if the solicitation's position is self-evident, the response to a question may simply be that the solicitation already addresses the matter in the manner the Government intended for it to be addressed.

While the Government may include one or more specific solicitation passages in a response to a question, interested parties are reminded that section L.3 of the solicitation states, "Offerors are instructed to read the entire solicitation document, including all attachments in Section J, prior to submitting questions and/or preparing a proposal. Omission of any information from the proposal submission requirements may result in rejection of the offer."

Questions were not extensively edited for grammar, punctuation or spelling. Not every question is shown. Only those questions, or portions of questions, that were deemed frequently asked and/or those that were deemed to benefit the procurement process are shown.

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

- General
- Past Performance
- Polaris Submission Portal (PSP)
- Relevant Experience
- Responsibility
- Teaming
- Specific to WOSB Solicitation

This is the fourth Question and Response Document (Q&R #4) starting with Q&R #271. Interested parties should also review the previously shared Question and Response Documents (Q&R #1, Q&R #2 and Q&R #3), containing Q&R #1-270. Any additional Question and Response Documents will be posted to SAM.gov. It is the responsibility of the Offerors to periodically check the solicitation on SAM.gov for more information.

General		
Q&R #	Question	Response
271	Where in block 15A of the SF33 should the UEI be included?	Per L.5.1.1, the Offeror must include their UEI (SAM) within Block 15A on the SF33. The UEI can be included in the same text field as the offeror's address.
272	Our address recently changed but this is not yet reflected in our SAM account as it is pending validation. Can we submit supporting documents to explain the difference in the address on our SF33 compared to SAM?	Yes. If the address in SAM differs from the address included on the SF33, attach a cover letter indicating the reason for this discrepancy. No additional documents are necessary to demonstrate the current address beyond the cover letter.
Past Performance		
Q&R #	Question	Response
273	The score sheet shows the past performance to be 1 for 20,000? Is this accurate?	As noted in M.5.2.2, a total of 20,000 points are designated to this Past Performance evaluation factor, regardless of the number of past performance assessments received. The points available per assessment is dependent upon the number of assessments received.
274	Section M.5.2.1 Evaluation Ratings for Past Performance Submissions states projects will be evaluated as positive or negative based on their ratings "for the majority of rating elements on a Project." In CPARS reports, it's quite common for the government to select "N/A" for one or more rating elements. Please confirm "N/A" categories will not be factored in when tallying the scores for the "majority of rating elements".	Correct. Categories without a rating or noted as "N/A" will not be included in the assessment in determining whether a majority of the rating elements received a satisfactory or greater rating.

275	For Past Performance (M.5.2) if the bidder submits 5 Relevant Projects, do we have to submit a combination of 5 CPARS and Past Performance Rating Forms or could we score 20,000 points in that scenario if just 4 were received? Our assumption is that the government expects 5 CPARS and Past Performance Rating Forms in this scenario and if only 4 were submitted then only 16,000 points could be scored.	As noted in M.5.2.2, a total of 20,000 points are designated to this Past Performance evaluation factor, regardless of the number of past performance assessments received. The points available per assessment is dependent upon the number of assessments received. Also reference L.5.3.2, if an offeror is unable to obtain a record of past performance (either CPARS or a completed Attachment J.P-4, Past Performance Rating Form) for any Primary Relevant Experience Project, the offeror must submit a document stating the inability to obtain a completed Attachment J.P-4 along with contact information for the appropriate Contracting Officer, Contracting Officer's Representative, Contracting Officer's Technical Representative or Corporate Officer/Official of the customer with cognizance over the Project.
-----	--	--

Polaris Submission Portal (PSP)

Q&R #	Question	Response
276	Does the reference to submitting PSP tickets at least 36 hours in advance refer to 36 actual hours or 36 business hours?	The reference in L.3.5 is 36 actual hours.
277	Where does the offeror's Polaris Team subcontractor's J.P-1 from section K and SAM reps and certs files get uploaded in PSP?	Please upload the SAM Reps and Certs to the Team Member's Business Factors, and the J.P-1 goes inside the team members documents upload.

Relevant Experience

Q&R #	Question	Response
278	Is scoring available for L.5.2.2.5 for a multiple award BOA?	Yes, see L.2.2.5 Amendment 0004 and Amendment 0005. Verification must be provided as required by L.5.2.2.5.

279	Can offerors provide narrative statements justifying why a certain phrase in the statement of work does indeed justify awarding points for an emerging technology, NAICS code, or cybersecurity?	Tags should be used within documents to identify the specific location of supporting information. Further elaboration/explanation should not be provided and will not be considered.
280	Please confirm our assumption that projects based on a single U.S. government federal grant are acceptable to use as relevant experience projects.	Yes, see Amendment 0005, section L.5.2.1.
281	Regarding L.5.2.1, what documentation is required to show that performance was through the IDIQ itself and not under task orders?	<p>As noted in L.5.2.1, an indefinite delivery, indefinite quantity contract may not be claimed as a project unless performance is evident through funding at the contract level.</p> <p>This could be demonstrated through obligations in the FPDS-NG Report or the contract award form.</p>
282	Do offerors need to provide the full FPDS-NG report or only the fields required for verification?	When submitted for verification, the complete FPDS-NG Report should be provided. As noted in L.5.2.2.1.1, when multiple FPDS-NG Reports are available, the most recent report must be submitted as well as any previous reports necessary for verification of claimed scoring elements.
283	Can offerors provide either an FPDS-NG Report or a contract/task order cover page as acceptable documentation of a project's NAICS code?	See L.5.2.2.1.1. If the FPDS-NG Report is not available or the FPDS-NG Report does not substantiate all claimed scoring elements, the identified documents must be submitted for verification. That includes the Project Verification Form, contract award document, and Statement of Work.

284	For ongoing federal Projects that prove values using FPDS, kindly confirm the FPDS figure is the total column for the field labeled as "Base And Exercised Options Value:"	Project value for completed federal Projects is determined by the total obligated dollars. Project value for ongoing federal Projects is determined based on the total estimated value (inclusive of all option periods). Project value for non-federal contracts is determined based on the contract value listed on the Non-Government Award Form. As noted in J.P-3, for ongoing projects this would be demonstrated by the Total "Base and All Options Value (Total Contract Value)"
285	If a non-Federal award or contract does not identify the total value—or identifies only an initial value that actual performance has superseded—may Offerors submit other means of verification, such as invoices, to reflect actual value?	Yes, as noted in L.5.2.2.1.2 of Amendment 0004, total contract value must be clearly indicated on the award form or additional contract documentation must be submitted to validate contract value.
286	When entering a project performed as a subcontractor, is this considered commercial / non-federal experience even if the work was done for DoD?	Correct, for a project performed as a subcontractor, this would be considered a non-federal project. Within the PSP, the project type would be State/International/Non US Fed Government/Commercial Project.
287	When claiming credit for cybersecurity services under L.5.2.2.7 Relevant Experience Project Providing Cybersecurity Services, please confirm offerors only need to submit the contract SOW with tags on the relevant cybersecurity-related passages and that a signed Attachment J.P-6 is not required.	No, all documents required by L.5.2.2.1.1(2) or L.5.2.2.1.2 must be submitted for verification. As stated in L.5.2.2.7, the Offeror must provide documentation to verify the provided cybersecurity services in accordance with L.5.2.2.1.1(2) or L.5.2.2.1.2. The Offeror must tag the specific written passages in the SOW or contract documentation that support the claim of the Project providing cybersecurity services.

288	Our firm has been a sub-contractor to other prime contracting companies on multiple federal contracts. Since we were a subcontractor not working directly with the Federal Agency, please confirm whether a Corporate Officer from our prime contractor can be the “Signature of Rater” on Attachment J.P-4 and Project Contact on parts II and III on J.P-6, and qualify as a federal project for our Polaris submission.	A corporate official from the prime contractor could be the Rater on those attachments, however, those contracts would not qualify as federal projects. IAW L.5.2.2.1.2, Verification of Primary Relevant Experience Submission (Non-Federal Contracts and Federal Government Subcontracts), this verification method should be used when relevant experience was performed as a subcontractor, EVEN if the subcontract was to a Prime Contractor performing a federal government contract.
-----	--	---

Responsibility

Q&R #	Question	Response
289	The RFP as well as the response to question 125 in the Polaris Question and Response state for bidders to provide financial statements (for JV members each member must submit) in lieu of populating the GSA Form 527 for financial information. Please confirm that this only applies to page 2 of the form and all other pages of this document should be populated to the best of our ability.	Correct. This applies to the GSA 527, Section III - Financial Statements and Section IV - Income Statement.
290	Please confirm that the salary information provided for the Professional Employee Compensation Plan will be evaluated for reasonableness as opposed to calculating a total cost.	As noted in 52.222-46, the Government will evaluate the plan to assure that it reflects a sound management approach and understanding of the contract requirements. No assessment of pricing or total cost will be part of this evaluation.
291	For our Professional Employee Compensation Plan, which geographical location should be used?	For the Professional Employee Compensation Plan, the RFP provides no specific location. Offerors may specify a locality as appropriate.

Teaming		
Q&R #	Question	Response
292	<p>We request the Government consider a situation in which a small business with an existing Mentor Protégé Joint Venture approved in October 2021, has a situation in which the large business has been acquired by another company.</p> <p>Will the Government please allow the acquiring company (who already had another Mentor-Protege Joint Venture in place and intends to bid on the Small Business Pool) to participate in multiple proposals as long as no projects are used more than in one proposal under the Solicitation Pool?</p>	<p>Please refer to SBA Regulations at 13 CFR 125.9(b)(3)(i), a mentor that has more than one protégé cannot submit competing offers in response to a solicitation for a specific procurement through separate joint ventures with different protégés.</p>
293	<p>Per L.5.1.3.1, please confirm if company X can form a JV A with an existing JV B and use a past performance that is in the name of JV B?</p>	<p>In this situation, yes, the experience and past performance of JV B may be utilized as they are a member of the offering joint venture. Per L.5.1.3.1, Relevant Experience Projects may be from the joint venture or an individual member of the joint venture.</p>
294	<p>Per L.5.1.3.1, please confirm if company X can form a JV A with an existing JV B and use the facility clearance from one of the members of JV B?</p>	<p>In this situation, no, the facility clearance of a member of JV B would not be acceptable for scoring. Per L.5.1.3.1, any claimed system, certification, or clearance in the name of the joint venture itself or in the name of a member of the joint venture. In this instance, a clearance from Company X, JV A, or JV B would be acceptable for scoring.</p>
295	<p>For L.5.1.4, must each member of a JV submit a MRCL?</p>	<p>No, the requirements for an offer from a joint venture are specified in L.5.1.3.1, the use of a MRCL is specific to the situations detailed in L.5.1.4.</p>

296	<p>In a Prime/Subcontractor relationship, it appears that PSP requires the team member (subcontractor) to upload Business Factor information (e.g., Systems, Certs, Clearance). Will the government clarify which, if any, Business Factor information is required by the team member (subcontractor) in a Prime/Subcontractor relationship?</p>	<p>Reference L.5.1.3.2 for information regarding proposed subcontracts. Within the subcontractor's Business Factors section, the representations and certifications for the proposed subcontractor must be attached.</p>
297	<p>For JVs, should each member of the JV upload the print out that confirms their electronic SAM.gov reps and certs or is the Government strictly relying on the electronic information within SAM.gov for each Team Member entity that is not the offeror in addition to the completed and uploaded J.P-1 Representations and Certifications information for their evaluation?</p>	<p>As stated in L.5.1.3.1, the joint venture must submit both their annual representations and certifications completed electronically within SAM.gov as well as Attachment J.P-1 Representations and Certifications from Section K. Each member of the joint venture must also submit both their individual annual representations and certifications completed electronically within SAM.gov as well as Attachment J.P-1 Representations and Certifications from Section K.</p> <p>The representations and certifications from SAM.gov, as well as J.P-1, must be attached for both the JV and each member.</p>
298	<p>In reference to Question 107: Can the government clarify this statement further? "Experience must be directly from the proposed subcontractor (not individual members or affiliates)." Should we understand this to mean that any Relevant Experience Project from a JV subcontractor must be from the named JV and not any individual member of the JV?</p>	<p>Yes, per L.5.1.3.2, Relevant Experience Projects may be from the Offeror or any proposed subcontractor. If a joint venture is included as a proposed subcontractor, experience may be submitted for the joint venture but not individual members.</p>

299	Would the government please clarify whether a WOSB, SB, or HUBZone company can partner with a Large business as a Subcontractor?	See L.5.1.3.2, the Offeror and all proposed subcontractors must represent as small businesses for North American Industry Classification System (NAICS) 541512 within SAM.gov.
Specific to WOSB Solicitation		
Q&R #	Question	Response
300	Can the government please confirm that for the WOSB track, ALL members of a JV (NOT a mentor-protégé) MUST be WOSB?	For joint venture requirements for the WOSB pool, See L.5.1.3.1 Joint Venture and SBA regulations at 13 C.F.R. 127.506.