

Comment Id	Original Comment	Published Response
1659	<p>In section A.1.3.5, it states that offerors must have a letter of commitment from NIB or SourceAmerica. That section also references an Attachment H. Does the Government have a format for the Letter or Commitment or is that Attachment H. Attachment H is not shown as an attachment, could the government provide?</p>	<p>The AbilityOne Formal Agreement is Attachment H. Attachment H is to be provided by the contractor in coordination with Source America/National Industries for the Blind. Reference Solicitation A.1.35 AbilityOne Subcontracting for guidance. Attachment I- Commercial Small Business Subcontracting Plan (Other than Small Businesses) is to be provided by the contractor and what is provided will be incorporated into the contract as Attachment I. For guidance on Attachment I- Commercial Small Business Subcontracting Plan (Other than Small Businesses) reference FAR 52.219-9(g).</p>
1665	<p>RFP Section A.3.7.3 Mission Suitability Volume (a) Technical Approach seems to have 2 redundant requirements:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. The offeror shall describe their ITC/AV-based solutions and/or services and how the proposed features provide technological leadership in allowing for the next generation of technology in terms of both solutions and services. 3. The offeror shall describe their ITC/AV-based solutions and services and how the proposed architectural features provide technological leadership in allowing for the next generation of technology. <p>Could you please either consolidate these requirements into one, or explain the difference between the two?</p>	<p>See Comment 1808.</p>

sewp6_rfp_all_comments

1671	<p>We've noticed the solicitation now restricts Relevant Experience Projects to specific NAICS codes, a change that was introduced only in the final version. Our company has identified four highly relevant projects for Category B that align with the RFP's technical requirements; however, they fall under NAICS 541715, which is not among the codes now listed in the updated solicitation.</p> <p>We believe that the inclusion of NAICS 541715 (and its predecessor 541712) would allow contractors to showcase our directly relevant experience and capabilities, ultimately benefiting the NASA SEWP VI program by providing a more comprehensive pool of qualified contractors. The Air Force & now Space Force has a long history of utilizing 541715 (formerly 541712) for enterprise-wide cyber, data analytics, IT, infrastructure support, and technology development.</p> <p>We appreciate your consideration of this request and the opportunity to compete based on our relevant experience and expertise.</p>	The Solicitation has been updated in an Amendment prior to Amendment 7.
1675	There are contradictions on when the Climate Change Risk Management is due. Within 12 months of contract award (a.1.51) or at proposal submission (TBS section A.2.1)? Would the government also please define "To Be Submitted"? Does it mean at time of proposal submission or at a later submission date?	The noted Attachments for Diversity, Equity, Inclusion, and Accessibility (DEIA) Plan, SEWP C-SCRM Annual Plan and Climate Change Risk Management, (G, J and L) are post award documents. They are not required as part of the Offeror's proposal. The Government will work with Contract Holders post-award to ensure all post-award forms are fully functional and provide guidance on their usage, submission process and submission dates.
1681	Category A; Mandatory Experience; Letter of Authorization: If an offeror is offering more than 1 OEMs for each technical area, is there a limit for maximum number of LOAs (from different OEMs) submitted for each mandatory area?	See Comment 1874.
1682	Exhibit 1- Relevant Experience Project Table, form did not change from draft to final RFP, the Part III Project Description still has that oddity where the font decreases dramatically as you add more content	The Solicitation has been updated in an Amendment prior to Amendment 7.
1685	On the Category B and C Exhibit 3 forms, where to obtain the list of expected NASA Contract Line Item Number (CLIN) to include?	See Comment 2214.
1687	If a proposal is submitted under a particular socioeconomic category, such as SDB, will it automatically be considered under Small Business?	See Comment 1881.

sewp6_rfp_all_comments

1697	page 109, 'Offerors identified as HUBZone, SDVOSB, EDWOSB, 8a in Category B and C...' should this also include VOSB and WOSB offerors?	The Solicitation has been updated in an Amendment prior to Amendment 7 to include VOSB and WOSB.
1706	Regarding the requirement that "The Mission Suitability Proposal must specifically state for which group the offeror is proposing." Please clarify if "group" means the Category (A, B, or C)?	The Solicitation has been updated in an Amendment prior to Amendment 7.
1709	Please confirm the average annual cost/fee incurred for Small Businesses in Category A should be \$150,000 in accordance with A.3.7.2.a.	The Solicitation has been updated to the correct value of \$150,000.
1714	Mandatory Experience Letter of Authorizations page limit is 3; however, offerors can provide a max of 4 LOAs. Can this page limit be updated to reflect 4 pages, as LOAs from OEMs are typically 1 page?	The Solicitation has been updated in an Amendment prior to Amendment 7.
1736	Attachment J does not allow editing in the PDF form.	See Comment 1675.
1747	A.3.6(B)(7) "Any proposal found to be a duplication or replica of another (company) or have a section that is a duplication or replica of another offeror (company), that is not part of a JV or CTA, will lead to all identified offerors being ineligible for award...PROOF OF CERTIFICATION WILL NOT BE CONSIDERED AS DUPLICATION..." There are only a handful of ISO & CMMI certification companies specializing in Government Contracting. For small businesses who providing letters from their certifying bodies as proof that the certification approval is in process in lieu of proof of complete certification, these certifying bodies have indicated they will provide a "form letter" to all clients that will look highly similar. Please confirm that these letters are included in the "proof of certification" exemption and will be EXEMPT from the "duplication/replica" language in the RFP.	Yes, these letters are exempt from the "duplication/replica" language in the RFP.
1759	For Category B Large/Unrestricted - Would the government consider requiring offeror to show proof of CMMI Level II certification at Award, instead of Proposal? The Industry Day indicated mandatory experience for Category B would be ISO9001 OR CMMI, so our focus was not on the CMMI compliance piece. We, along with many other prospective companies, are now moving out on CMMI certification but it's unlikely to be completed by 11 July based on audit timelines.	The Solicitation has been updated in an Amendment prior to Amendment 7.
1762	Exhibit 5: C-SCRM Attestation Form and Attachment J: C-SCRM Attestation Form are both titled the same. There are no instructions for Attachment J at this time in the RFQ. Is the offeror supposed to complete Attachment J and provide in proposal? If so, where? Also, Attachment J is not fillable as you are only able to select one Vendor Response. Once you move to the next section the previous radio buttons disappear.	See Comment 1675.

1769	<p>Reference: A.1.38 NFS 1852.239-74 (JAN 2020) (Deviation 15-03D)</p> <p>This clause is not found on Acq.gov or in the NFS supplement located on HQ.NASA.gov.</p> <p>(d) The Contracting Officer (CO) will provide the information referenced in paragraph I of this section, in addition to the reporting requirements submitted by the contractor in accordance with paragraph (d) of the clause at 52.204-25, Prohibition on Contracting for Certain Telecommunications and Video Surveillance Services or Equipment (if applicable), to the NASA</p> <p>The Contractor shall insert the substance of this clause, including this paragraph I, in all subcontracts involving the development or delivery of any IT system, or components thereof, or covered telecommunications equipment or service.</p> <p>Question: What or where is paragraph I?</p>	The Solicitation has been updated in an Amendment prior to Amendment 7.
1770	<p>Reference: A.3.1 NFS 1852.239-73 Review of the Offeror's Information Technology Systems Supply Chain (Provision) (pg 91)</p> <p>Similar to comment above. This provision is not found on Acq.gov or in the NFS.</p> <p>(d) The Contracting Officer (CO) will provide the information referenced in paragraph I of this section and the affirmative representation made by the Offeror in accordance with FAR 52.204-24 (if applicable)]</p> <p>Question: What or where is paragraph I?</p>	The Solicitation has been updated in an Amendment prior to Amendment 7.
1771	<p>Reference: A.1.35 Ability One Subcontracting Background/Context:</p> <p>Para 2 states that Attachment H is applicable at the order level but there is no description here of Attachment H. Para 3 states that Attachment I is for the established formal agreement with Ability One as proof of commitment to meeting the mandatory requirement, which will be incorporated as Attachment I.</p> <p>According to A.2.1 List of Attachments, Attachment H is the AbilityOne Formal Agreement and Attachment I is Small Business Subcontracting Plan for other than Small Businesses.</p> <p>Questions: Please clarify that the commitment letter is part of proposal but not part of contract. Additionally, please clarify whether Attachment I encompasses the Formal AbilityOne agreement or the subcontracting plan, or both?</p>	The commitment letter is to be submitted as part of the proposal and will be incorporated into the contract as Attachment H. Attachment I refers to the Small Business Subcontracting Plan.
1777	<p>(c) Offeror NAICS Size Standard Crosswalk (Exhibit 4) and A.1.34 NORTH AMERICAN INDUSTRY CLASSIFICATION SYSTEM (NAICS) & NAICS CODES WITHIN SCOPE (Pg 61) include NAICS Code 519190 under Category B and C. This NAICS is indicated as "not a valid 2022 NAICS code" on naics.com and census.gov. Can the Government please indicate whether this NAICS was added in error and, if so, is there a different NAICS which should replace this NAICS?</p>	Exhibit 4 was updated in Amendment 3 to reflect NAICS code 519290.
1779	<p>Would the Government please provide an updated final RFP in which pages 23, 95, 96, 120, 129, 130, 131, 132, 133 are in searchable PDF format? These specific pages are scanned image files.</p>	The Solicitation has been updated in an Amendment prior to Amendment 7.

1782	Can the Government please confirm that Mandatory Experience Letter of Authorization (LOA) only applies to Category A?	The Mandatory Experience Letter of Authorization (LOA) only applies to Category A proposals.
1784	<p>The RFP timeline (May 23 – July 11) includes three Federal holidays – Memorial Day (May 27), Juneteenth National Independence Day (June 19), and Independence Day (July 4). Considering the holidays, the current deadline (July 11) creates a timeline containing 32 workdays including the day of release, or 49 calendar days.</p> <p>A.3.2 COMMUNICATIONS REGARDING THIS SOLICITATION (Pg 91) provides additional guidance stating proposals should be submitted 72 hours in advance of the deadline, indicating a true deadline of July 8 and further reducing the timeline to 29 workdays including the day of release.</p> <p>Industry expectation for an acquisition of this magnitude is 60 calendar days for development of this proposal response, the standard for implementing review cycles in the proposal development process. A typical 60-day acquisition timeline contains 44 workdays. The current timeline is reduced to almost half the expected working days for an acquisition of this size and complexity.</p> <p>Would the Government please consider extending the deadline to July 29 to provide the standard 44 workdays and ensure higher quality submissions from industry?</p>	The Comment is out of date.
1787	Exhibit 2 contains a section to provide the role of the Offer on the contract "Prime Contractor", "Significant Subcontractor" and/or "Team Member". However, the checkboxes provided are not functioning properly. It is not possible to select only "Prime Contractor". Can the government please provide a corrected Exhibit 2?	See Comment 1804.
1794	Exhibit 3a - Category A Solutions Spreadsheet - Technical Area Tabs – Page 102: By providing the required products on Exhibit 3a, please confirm that this does not restrict/limit an awardee to only those products, and that additional products can be added to contract post award (similar to the current Technology Refresh process in place for SEWP V.)	See Comment 5061.
1799	VOL I: OFFER - In A.3.7.1 (b) (p. 101), the RFP states "While the exact wording and format of the LOA can vary, the Point of Contact (POC) signing the LOA must include the name of the offeror, a reference to SEWP VI, and the POC's position in the company." Many prime providers (OEMs) issue a standard format for their LOAs and do not issue contract-specific letters. Are LOAs without the reference for SEWP VI and without phone numbers acceptable?	As mentioned in Section A.3.7.1 (b) the LOAs must include the name of the offeror, a reference to SEWP VI, and the POC's position in the company. The Government will not remove the requirement that LOAs include "a reference to SEWP VI". Offerors are instructed to work with their providers to include the verbiage.

<p>1802</p>	<p>OFFER - SEWP Post No. 310286 / RFQ N0042124Q0249</p> <p>Scope of Work:</p> <p>Our proposal covers the supply and delivery of the following computer equipment:</p> <p>PowerEdge Server, Components, and Support (Page. 4-7 of original attachment)</p> <p>Special Terms and Conditions:</p> <p>We understand there maybe budgetary constraints and are committed to offering competitive pricing without compromising on quality. Our proposed cost for the entire order is \$1,127,327.78 This pricing includes the cost of equipment, delivery, and any associated fees.</p> <p>Upon acceptance of our proposal, we will coordinate with NAWCAD Procurement Group, to establish a delivery schedule that aligns with their operational needs of the Dahlgren Risk Reduction Team. Our goal is to ensure timely delivery and installation of the equipment to minimize any disruptions.</p> <p>Conclusion:</p> <p>We are confident that our proposal meets the requirements outlined in the bid and offers the best value proposition for NAWCAD. Our company is dedicated to providing exceptional products and services, and we look forward to the opportunity to support the critical operations at 22347 Cedar Point Road, Building 2185 Suite 2A80, Patuxent River, MD 20670.</p> <p>Thank you</p>	<p>The Comment is not related to the SEWP VI solicitation.</p>
<p>1803</p>	<p>Under Category C (page 104), is the Government missing "11. PROGRAM MANAGEMENT/ANCILLARY SERVICES" as mentioned "Technical Area 11c: PROGRAM MANAGEMENT/ANCILLARY SERVICES" on page 38 (A.1.2)?</p>	<p>See Comment 4778.</p>
<p>1804</p>	<p>Selecting "prime Contractor" on Exhibit 2 fills in all three options. Please issue a corrected form as soon as possible.</p>	<p>Exhibit 2 has been updated to fix noted formatting issues.</p>
<p>1805</p>	<p>Much federal agency IT services work is categorized under NAICS 517110, Wired Telecommunications Carriers. The work performed under this NAICS falls in many of the Category B Service Areas, including Enterprise Network Services, Enterprise Cloud Services and Enterprise Cybersecurity Services. Please add this NAICS code to the lists for Category B and Category C in A.1.34</p>	<p>See Comment 2949.</p>

sewp6_rfp_all_comments

1806	<p>NAICS 541611 is not listed in Category B and Category C in A.1.34, but its equivalent SEWP VI UNSPSC is series 80000000 Management and Business Professionals Administrative Services. Much of the federal work performed under this NAICS falls in many of the Category B and C Service Areas, including cloud services, information and data analytics, digital multimedia and technical communications services, among others.</p> <p>Please add this NAICS code to the lists for Category B and Category C in A.1.34</p>	See Comment 2669.
1808	<p>The RFP says, "2. The offeror shall describe their ITC/AV-based solutions and/or services and how the proposed features provide technological leadership in allowing for the next generation of technology in terms of both solutions and services.</p> <p>3. The offeror shall describe their ITC/AV-based solutions and services and how the proposed architectural features provide technological leadership in allowing for the next generation of technology." These two requirements are virtually identical (differing only by the word "Architectural") and, according to the evaluation criteria, constitute two-thirds of the content. We highly recommend combining them into a single requirement or changing the requirements.</p>	The Solicitation has been updated to remove point 3 in the section. The word "architectural" is no longer a part of the solicitation.
1816	<p>The evaluator fiells on Exhibit 2 also malfunction when putting in info. If i put John doe in the name field it populates all the fields. Please issue a corrected form as soon as possible.</p>	See Comment 1804.
1818	<p>In its instruction on page 111, requiring offerors to "provide a summary description of their offerings and capabilities...", the Government requests information in three (3) enumerated areas. But elements 2 and 3 from this list appear to be the same request for offerors to "describe their ITC/AV-based solutions and/or services and how the proposed features provide technological leadership in allowing for the next generation of technology." If the Government is requesting differing information in response to these two items, we ask the Government to provide further clarification.</p>	See Comment 1808.
1819	<p>In Exhibit 2, Section 2, the Past Performance Questionnaire, there are several malfunctioning elements of the form: 1) When asked to specify whether the offeror was the Prime Contractor, Significant Subcontractor, or Team Member, when an offeror selects "Prime Contractor" all check boxes are automatically selected, not just the Prime Contractor box; 2) When one enters a text value in any of the Evaluator Information fields, all those fields automatically fill in with that same information; 3) When one enters the contract value, the Fee and Total Value fields automatically update with that same value, and cannot be changed to different values.</p> <p>Similarly, when one enters the Current Value for Estimated Cost, the Initial Value for Estimated Cost automatically updates with the same value; 4) When one enters an explanation of a cost overrun, the same data is automatically repeated in the subsequent four (4) data entry fields.</p>	See Comment 1804.
1820	<p>For Exhibit 3a - Information Tab: Should the offeror provide brief descriptions for all Technical areas or just the 4 proposed technical areas + Tech Area 9? RFQ instructions are not clear.</p>	See Comment 2506.

sewp6_rfp_all_comments

1821	<p>On page 104 - Category C- Mandatory Experience Sub-areas listed do not align with those listed in Category C ITC/AV Mission-Based (Information Technology Communication (ITC) and Audio Visual (AV)) Services – NAICS 541512 (pages 35-38). Example: Network Services is #1 here but it is listed as Technical Area 8c on Page 37 of the RFP. Also you do not have Technical Area 11c listed here, but it is listed on page 38. Moving Network Services to 8 and moving all others back a number and adding Program Management as 11 would make it align with pages 35-38.</p>	<p>The Solicitation has been updated in an Amendment prior to Amendment 7.</p>
1825	<p>We would like a revision to the CMMI requirement for "Other than Small" businesses. Please consider revising the CMMI requirement for "Other than Small" businesses to match the current requirement for "Small Business" offerors. Specifically, we request that it be acceptable to provide proof that the certification approval is in process at the time of proposal submission, rather than requiring proof of certification at the time of proposal submission.</p>	<p>The Solicitation has been updated in an Amendment prior to Amendment 7.</p>
1826	<p>Our work on the NetCents II contract vehicle is categorized under NAICS 517110, Wired Telecommunications Carriers. The work we are performing falls in many of the Category B Service Areas, including Enterprise Network Services, Enterprise Cloud Services and Enterprise Cybersecurity Services. More than \$2.2 billion in federal work that is in scope for SEWP VI has been awarded in that NAICS in the past five years. Please add this NAICS code to the lists for Category B and Category C in A.1.34</p>	<p>If work has been performed under a now non-existent NAICS code, such as NAICS 517110, then the Offeror should submit their proposal under a current NAICS code most closely aligned with the previous NAICS - in this case 517111. A brief explanation should be included in the Offerors proposal identifying the relationship between the current NAICS code and the previous code.</p>
1827	<p>We acknowledge that other vendors have raised similar concerns. The final version of the solicitation now limits Relevant Experience Projects to certain NAICS codes, a change not present in earlier drafts. Our company has identified at least 3 significant projects for Categories B and C that meet the RFP's relevance criteria; however, they fall under NAICS 541715 (formerly 541712), which is not included in the updated list of acceptable codes.</p> <p>Including NAICS 541715 would enable contractors to present their relevant experience and capabilities more accurately, ultimately enhancing the NASA SEWP VI program by offering a broader pool of qualified contractors. The Department of Defense and other agencies have a long history of utilizing NAICS 541715 (formerly 541712) to provide more modern frameworks to provide support for IT services, infrastructure support, and technology development.</p>	<p>See Comment 1671.</p>

sewp6_rfp_all_comments

1830	<p>We believe the Exhibit 2 Past Performance Questionnaire attachment is not working as intended. Some examples are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - It will not allow you to select more than one of the 4 radial buttons in the Basis of Selection area - Checking the Prime Contractor, Significant Subcontractor, or Team Member box automatically checks all 3 no matter which you choose. - If you fill out the name field on page 3 it auto-populates other fields with that same info. - If you fill in either "Perform" or "Did Not Perform" for any of the questions in Section 4, it copies that information to the adjacent field automatically with no way to remove it. <p>Recommendation: Please fix this form as soon as possible and send out an amendment to industry with a working form.</p>	See Comment 1804.
1833	In the instructions on Exhibit 2, missing the word "evaluator" at the end of the last sentence. Please correct.	See Comment 1804.
1835	Page 106, Category A (Past performance volume), "the past performance provided shall be for similar scope efforts with a minimum average annual cost incurred of \$150,000 for size to be rated relevant". However at page 116 (Evaluation), "In Category A and C, shall furnish the past performance for similar scope efforts with an average annual cost/fee incurred of \$500,000". Please confirm that the minimum average annual cost incurred for Small Business in Category A (only) is \$150,000 and for Category A and C (both) is \$500,000.	The Solicitation has been updated to the correct value of \$150,000.
1838	Can Attachment G - the DEIA Plan, Attachment H - AbilityOne Formal Agreement, Attachment J - SEWP C-SCRM Annual Plan (C-SCRM Attestation Form or Open Trusted Technology Provider TM Standard (O-TTPS) Certification), and Attachment L - Climate Change Risk Management Plan be submitted post award? Is that the significance of the "*"?	See Comment 1659 and 1675.
1840	Since the Government's Exhibit 2 Past Performance Questionnaire has malfunctioning fields, offerors will be delayed in their ability to provide questionnaires to reference customers. As such, we ask the Government to extend the proposal submission deadline by the same number of days as the Government is delayed in releasing a corrected Exhibit 2, since the RFP release date. This will ensure that offerors and reference customers have sufficient time to complete, sign, and return Exhibit 1 questionnaires.	The Comment is out of date.
1843	The Proposal Submission Table on page 96 identifies a page limitation of three (3) pages for the Mandatory Experience Letter of Authorization (LOA). For Category A, Offerors are required to provide a LOA from a designated provider (OEM) for each of the four (4) Technical Areas. Will the Government increase the LOA page limitation to four pages to allow for the four LOAs?	See Comment 1957.

1844	RFP section A.3.7.3 (a), subsections 2 and 3 state the following: 2. The offeror shall describe their ITC/AV-based solutions and/or services and how the proposed features provide technological leadership in allowing for the next generation of technology in terms of both solutions and services. 3. The offeror shall describe their ITC/AV-based solutions and services and how the proposed architectural features provide technological leadership in allowing for the next generation of technology. Can the Government clarify the response requirements in these subsections? Other than the word "architectural" in subsection 3, the requirements appear to be identical.	See Comment 1808.
1848	There is a discrepancy between the RFP and Exhibit 2-POastPerfQues-SEWP VI. In the RFP, Technical Area 7c is titled "IT OPERATIONS AND MAINTENANCE/HELP DESK/CALL CENTER SUPPORT". In Exhibit 2-PastPerfQues-SEWP VI titles 8c as "IT Operations and Maintenance/Help Desk/Call Center Support". Will you please provide clarification, or issue a Amendment with a revised either RFP or a revised Exhibit 2? Thank you.	See Comment 1804.
1856	Section A.3.7.2, page 109 and A.4.3 page 116 In A.3.7.2 the RFP states "Offerors identified as HUBZone, SDVOSB, EDWOSB, 8a in Category B and C shall provide past performance references showcasing relevant work in at least two (2) content representative areas for content to be rated relevant (pertinent)." Similarly, in A.4.3 the RFP states "HUBZone, SDVOSB, EDWOSB, 8a shall provide past performance references showcasing at least 2 content representative areas." VOSB and WOSB socio-economic categories appear to have been excluded from these lists. This is inconsistent with the instructions in A.3.7.1 which include these two socio-economic categories. Will NASA include VOSB and WOSB categories in the past performance volume instructions and evaluation criteria?	See Comment 1697.
1857	Section A.4.3 page 116 In A.3.7.2 the RFP states "Offerors identified as HUBZone, SDVOSB, EDWOSB, 8a in Category B and C shall provide past performance references showcasing relevant work in at least two (2) content representative areas for content to be rated relevant (pertinent)." Similarly, in A.4.3 the RFP states "HUBZone, SDVOSB, EDWOSB, 8a shall provide past performance references showcasing at least 2 content representative areas." VOSB and WOSB socio-economic categories appear to have been excluded from these lists. This is inconsistent with the instructions in A.3.7.1 which include these two socio-economic categories. Will NASA include VOSB and WOSB categories in the past performance volume instructions and evaluation criteria?	The Solicitation has been updated in an Amendment prior to Amendment 7.
1862	Section A.1.3 Reports of Work: Is the Monthly Progress Report applicable to Category A task orders which will consist primarily of COTS equipment sales? This seems like it is more appropriate for Category B and C with primarily services-based task orders.	Yes. Category A reports are part of the Delivery Status reporting process as described in Section SEWP Order Process in ATTACHMENT C- SEWP Contractor Holder User Manual.
1868	Please consider an annual On-Ramp and Off-Ramp rather than implemented as needed.	The Solicitation will remain as stated.

sewp6_rfp_all_comments

1869	Section A.2.1: what does the asterisk indicate in the "Date" column?	The solicitation has been updated to remove the asterisks from the A.2.1 List of Attachments.
1873	The List of Attachments in RFP Section A.2.1 identifies an Attachment G-Diversity, Equity, Inclusion, and Accessibility (DEIA) Plan-Applicable for Categories B & C. There is no such document found on SAM.gov, or the SEWP Website. Will you please provide guidance on where Offerors can locate this form? Thank you.	See Comment 1675.
1874	Page 101, Category A – Letter of Authorization states, "There shall be an LOA for each different designated provider for a maximum of four (4) LOAs." And page 102, Point of Contact (POC) Tab states, "For each of the four (4) proposed Technical Areas, a minimum of one (1) additional provider must be proposed with relevant offerings in each of the proposed four Technical Area." Are offerors required to submit an LOA for the "additional provider" that is required, which would be a maximum of eight (8) LOAs?	Offerors are only required to submit LOAs from designated providers (OEMs) for only the four (4) Technical Areas proposed. Offerors can not submit LOAs for the secondary providers or for any other additional providers beyond the 1 to 4 required LOAs (4 LOAs if a different designated provider is used for the 4 Technical Areas; Less than 4 if the same designated provider is used in more than one Technical Area with a total of 1 LOA if the same designated provider is used in all 4 Technical Areas).
1881	Will Small Businesses be able to see Full and Open solicitations posted to SEWP VI?	All Contract holders within that RFQ's category that meet the NAICs code and set-aside (or unrestricted) status and any other requirements of an Issuing Agency will be eligible to see the Issuing Agency's RFQ.
1882	Will Small Businesses be able to see Full and Open solicitations posted to SEWP VI?	See Comment 1881.

1884	<p>Reference: A.3.7.1 (b)</p> <p>The Government provides that for Other than Small Businesses four (4) different REPs from different mandatory experience technical areas shall be submitted, with each Project having a minimum of \$30M in total value size.</p> <p>Question: As the competitive NAICS for Categories B and C have relatively low revenue thresholds (largest competitive NAICS is \$40M), many larger Small Businesses (mid-size) are now considered Other Than Small Businesses (OTSBs); however, these traditionally qualifying larger small businesses must be able to produce four (4) relevant projects that each have \$30M in value. Has the Government considered that the SEWP VI RFP as currently structured excludes many larger small businesses/mid-size from participating? May a midsize company (OTSB by way of SEWP VI RFP) utilize CTAs to achieve the four (4) relevant projects of \$30M in value (utilizing CTA teammate experience/first-tier subcontractor experience)? Will the Government consider adding NAICS Codes with a higher revenue threshold (e.g. 541330, exception with \$47M threshold), which would allow these midsize companies to compete?</p>	The Solicitation has been updated in an Amendment prior to Amendment 7 to add NAICS 541330.
1886	80TECH24R0001 SEWP VI Final RFP/Section A.3.7.1/Pg 98 - The offeror must provide relevant experience as it relates to the NAICS code being used for competition. - Will the government please confirm that relevant experience, as it relates to the NAICS code, is inclusive of all SEWP VI NAICS codes in Categories A, B, and C? For example: Can offeror bidding Category C use the NAICS code 517111 that is listed under Category A?	REPs are inclusive of the NAICS Codes listed in Attachment 4 for Category B and C.
1887	80TECH24R0001 SEWP VI Final RFP/A.3.7.1 (c)/Exhibit 4 NAICS Size Standard Crosswalk/Pg 105 - NAICS Size Standard Crosswalk - Would NASA include NAICS 517111 since it was a large services NAICS under USAF Network-Centric Solutions-2 (NETCENTS-2) and current USAF Base Infrastructure Modernization (BIM) which is currently under evaluation?	See Comment 2949.
1891	A.3.7.2PAST PERFORMANCE VOLUME, Table 1, Sample Past Performance Matrix- Category A. Table 1 contains the headers from the Draft RFP. Should offerors update the table to reflect the correct headers?	The Solicitation has been updated in an Amendment prior to Amendment 7.
1900	<p>The RFP states:</p> <p>"Offerors proposing to Category A and Category C are not required to have a CMMI certification." Our organization is a HUBZone small business, is an ISO 9001 or CMMI certification required if we are only providing a proposal for Category C?</p>	See Comment 3493.
1902	Please complete the statement around whom is responsible for the completion of Sections 5 and 6 of the questionnaires. Currently, the instruction states "Sections 5 and 6 are completed by the"	The Solicitation has been updated in an Amendment prior to Amendment 7.
1908	Exhibit 3b and Exhibit 3c spreadsheets are requesting labor category rates. How should offerors accommodate rate escalation over the potential 15-year period of performance?	See Comment 5061.

sewp6_rfp_all_comments

1909	Under A.1.30.2, C-SCRM Incident Report, the solicitation states, "In accordance with DRD #3, a C-SCRM Plan must be submitted to the SEWP Program Management Office annually and no later than 60 calendar days prior to the Contract award date and will be incorporated into the contract as Attachment J." The due date associated with the C-SCRM Plan, which is prior to contract award, seems atypical; therefore, would the Government consider revising the due date to x days after award, for example?	See Comment 1675.
1910	When the box for Prime Contractor is checked, the form puts a check in all 3 boxes. Request the Government provide a corrected version. In order to work with our customers, we request the Government expedite the corrected Questionnaire.	The Solicitation has been updated in an Amendment prior to Amendment 7.
1911	When the name for the evaluator is entered, the form puts that name in all the fields. Request the Government provide a corrected version. In order to work with our customers, we request the Government expedite the corrected Questionnaire.	The Solicitation has been updated in an Amendment prior to Amendment 7.
1912	When an X is placed in either the Performed, or Did not perform box, the form puts an X in both boxes. Request the Government provide a corrected version. In order to work with our customers, we request the Government expedite the corrected Questionnaire.	The Solicitation has been updated in an Amendment prior to Amendment 7.
1913	When a value is entered in the initial value block, the form puts that value in both initial and current. Request the Government provide a corrected version. In order to work with our customers, we request the Government expedite the corrected Questionnaire.	The Solicitation has been updated in an Amendment prior to Amendment 7.
1914	When text is entered into the fields after the cost overrun question, the form puts that entry in all 5 fields. Request the Government provide a corrected version. In order to work with our customers, we request the Government expedite the corrected Questionnaire.	The Solicitation has been updated in an Amendment prior to Amendment 7.
1917	The SOW lists Technical Content Area 1 as Enterprise-Wide Network Services, and Area 2 as IT Managed Services. This order is consistent with the Mandatory Experience listing and the PPQ. The Past Performance instructions list lists Area 1 as IT Managed Services, and Area 2 as Enterprise-Wide Network Services. (reversing them) Request the Government correct the listing in the Past Performance section to be consistent with the SOW, the Mandatory Experience listing (pg 104) and the listing of technical areas on the PPQ.	The Solicitation has been updated to reconcile the lists.
1918	The SOW lists Technical Content Area 1 as Enterprise-Wide Network Services, and Area 2 as IT Managed Services. This order is consistent with the Mandatory Experience listing and the PPQ. The Past Performance instructions list lists Area 1 as IT Managed Services, and Area 2 as Enterprise-Wide Network Services. (reversing them) Request the Government correct the listing in the Past Performance section to be consistent with the SOW, the Mandatory Experience listing (pg 104) and the listing of technical areas on the PPQ.	The Solicitation has been updated in an Amendment prior to Amendment 7.
1921	ATTACHMENT J- C_SCRM Attestation Form seems to be corrupt, when you type in any field on the top of page 2 it replicates the information entered across the other fields. Name of Respondent: Title: Name of Organization: Phone number: Email: will not allow you to fill in the appropriate information. Please provide an updated form or give approval to save/complete in another format.	See Comment 1675.

sewp6_rfp_all_comments

1927	4. There seems to be differing information regarding the size of Exhibit 1 vs. past performance. Exhibit 1 - Category A notes that we must submit 3 from 3 different mandatory experience technical areas. Each project must be for \$5M or more in a single order. Whereas in the Past Performance volume, section information from offeror, it notes that "For Small Businesses proposing in Categories A- the past performance provided shall be for similar scope efforts with a minimum average annual cost incurred of \$150,000 (One Hundred-Fifty Thousand) for size to be rated relevant (pertinent)." The same discrepancies appear in Category B and C as well.	See Comment 1709.
1929	Given the breadth of this effort, we request an extension to 60 days after responses to questions.	The Comment is out of date.
1930	Attachment D, page 7, Can you confirm the Diversity Equity and Inclusion plan does not need to be submitted with the proposal? It has a "to be submitted" in A.2.1 GSFC 52.211-101 LIST OF ATTACHMENTS.	See Comment 1675.
1933	Can you confirm nothing in attachment D, Contract Data Requirements needs to be submitted with the offer?	See Comment 1675.
1934	Does the C-SCRM PLAN TEMPLATE need to be completed for each category, or is one fine for all?	See Comment 1675.
1937	Does the Climate Change Risk Management Plan need to be submitted with the proposal? Is there a template – we didn't see it in the Attachments or Exhibits.	See Comment 1675.
1942	The RFP states "A full list of all currently identified in-scope UNSPSC codes for in-scope offerings is found in Attachment C, SEWP Contract Holder User Manual." However, the section on UNSPSC codes in Attachment C states "'A full list of all currently identified in-scope UNSPSC codes for in-scope offerings will be made available for download via the Contract Holder Only Page (CHOP)." Please provide the list of in-scope UNSPSC codes.	See Comment 2949.
1943	A number of items are listed as "To Be Submitted". Does this mean to be submitted with the proposal? If so, there are no corresponding instructions for where in our proposals these items should be included. Further, Attachment D includes submission dates which do not correspond with the RFP's instructions. For example, the C-SCRM Plan is listed as "TBS" in this section, is not required to be submitted by the instructions to offerors, and is "Due 60 calendar days prior to contract award" according to Attachment D. Would the Government clarify which attachments are to be submitted with the proposal and in what volumes they should be presented?	See Comment 1675.

sewp6_rfp_all_comments

1944	<p>Exhibit 2 PPQ – There are several problems with the Past Performance Questionnaire that prevent offerors from sending the form to potential evaluators. The best solution is to use CPARS instead of PPQs. If CPARS is not possible, provide an updated form as soon as possible because each day that passes reduces the already short amount of time offerors have to prepare the Past Performance Volume of the proposal(s). Below are the problems identified.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Instructions: The last sentence is cut off. 2. Basis of Selection: The radial buttons allow for only one selection when two selections are needed. We recommend changing this to “LPTA or Best Value” options. 3. Section 2: Description of Cost: “During the contract performance being evaluated, this company was the:” When one box is checked, the form checks all of the boxes. 4. Section 3: Evaluator Information: When one field is populated, the form populates all fields with the same text (Name, Title, Agency/Company, Email Address, Phone) 5. Section 4: Technical Area Relevance Ratings: When the “Performed” field is populated, the “Did Not Perform” field is populated. 6. General Performance Survey: Recommend making the “Please circle/Highlight” sections easier to select for evaluators. 	See Comment 1804.
1948	<p>On Exhibit 2 - Past Performance Questionnaire, the instructions at the top of page one are cut off. Can you please provide an updated form with completed instructions? At this time it is not clear who the evaluator needs to be (KO, COR, Technical Buyer/User, etc.), nor does it specify with conclusion that they are filling out sections 5 and 6, due to the cut off sentence in the PPQ form.</p>	See Comment 1804.
1949	<p>Due to the issues with the Exhibit 2 - PPQ, as noted in several comments, will the government consider extending the due date on the RFP by the amount of time it takes to provide a corrected form? The issues on the document have greatly reduced the amount of time offeror's have in which to send these out and ensure a timely turnaround from the evaluators.</p>	The Comment is out of date.
1956	<p>for Exhibit 3b and 3c, can NASA provide further guidance on specific service based labor categories associated with SEWP VI Category B & C requirements?</p>	See Comment 2285.
1957	<p>A.3.6 PROPOSAL PREPARATION—GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS, B Proposal content and page limitation section, a limitation of 3 pages to the mandatory experience letter of authorization (LOAs) is given, can you please clarify if 3 pages is for 1 LOA?</p>	The Page limit is 3 pages per LOA. If each LOA is 3 pages, then a maximum of 12 pages will be submitted.

sewp6_rfp_all_comments

1958	<p>Upon review of Exhibit 2, PPQ in preparation for submission to customers for population and evaluation, we have noticed several areas where the form-fillable areas are either broken or copying data across all lines of a table. Would the government please correct the following areas? 1. Instructions: The last sentence is cut off. 2. Basis of Selection: The radial buttons allow for only one selection when two selections are needed. We recommend changing this to "LPTA or Best Value" options. 3. Section 2: Description of Cost: "During the contract performance being evaluated, this company was the:" When one box is checked, the form checks all of the boxes. 4. Section 3: Evaluator Information: When one field is populated, the form populates all fields with the same text (Name, Title, Agency/Company, Email Address, Phone) 5. Section 4: Technical Area Relevance Ratings: When the "Performed" field is populated, the "Did Not Perform" field is populated. 6. General Performance Survey: Recommend making the "Please circle/Highlight" sections easier to select for evaluators.</p>	See Comment 1804.
1962	Will the government allow callout boxes to be 10-point font?	The solicitation will be updated to allow 10 point fonts for headers, footers, callout boxes and captions.
1968	What is meant by "There shall be an LOA for each different designated provider for a maximum of four (4) LOAs." Do we have to atleast provide one LOA per category with a designated provider? what if there are more than one LOA for each category?	The Solicitation has been updated in an Amendment prior to Amendment 7.
1970	On pg. 88 of the RFP, the government states that Attachment G Diversity, Equity, Inclusion, and Accessibility (DEIA) Plan- Applicable for Categories B & C, Attachment H AbilityOne Formal Agreement, and Attachment L Climate Change Risk Management Plan must be submitted with the proposal. Would the government please provide Attachment G, H, and L?	See Comment 1675.
1971	On pg. 96 of the RFP, the proposal submission table under section A.B. states that offerors should submit a Mandatory Experience Letter of Authorization (LOA). Would the government please confirm that an LOA must only be submitted if an offeror submits a proposal under Category A?	See Comment 1782.
1975	Exhibit 2-Past Performance Questionnaire/Instructions Section is missing information. The Offeror shall provide a questionnaire for each past performance reference submission and be submitted directly by the evaluator to Government Contracting Officer via email PastPerformance@sewp.nasa.gov. Sections 1-4 are to be completed by the Offeror and verified by the evaluator. Sections 5 and 6 are completed by the ??	See Comment 1804.
1978	With the expansion in SEWP VI scope to include stand-alone services in Category B and C, which are not typically considered to be commercial services like those included within a Commercial Small Business Subcontracting Plan, are Offerors proposing Category B or C permitted to instead submit an Individual Subcontracting Plan?	In accordance with Federal Acquisition Regulation 19.704, prime contract holders that are other than small businesses are required to submit subcontracting plans at the summary level for agencies. A commercial subcontracting plan is preferred. An individual subcontracting plan may be submitted if a commercial subcontracting plan is not available.

<p>1984</p>	<p>This question pertains to the CMMi Certification requirements found on Page 100, Section (a) ISO 9001 and CMMI Certification and Page 73, section A.1.47 SMALL BUSINESSES WITHOUT CMMI OR ISO 9001-2015 CERTIFICATION AT TIME OF CONTRACT AWARD of the 80TECH24R0001- SEWP VI Request for Proposal (RFP).</p> <p>Would the government offer the same considerations to large businesses that you are providing to small businesses around the CMMI certification? Specifically, would the government offer the following to large businesses:</p> <p>It is acceptable to provide proof that the certification approval is in process by providing the Point of Contact information including the name of appraisal body and name, phone number, and email of a representative from whom the Offeror is obtaining the certification. The certification process must be completed within 12 months of contract award.</p> <p>and</p> <p>For any large businesses that were awarded a contract while still in the process of obtaining a CMMI Certification will have to obtain a certification within 12 months of contract award. Until a certification is obtained, the contractor will be ineligible to compete on acquisitions requiring a certification that the offeror does not possess and while the certification is in process. If after 12 months of contract award, the certification is not obtained, the contractor is subject to being Off ramped and ineligible to compete for new work. If the Contractor has open orders but fails to obtain the necessary certification that was in process at the time of award, the contractor will be placed in Dormant status to complete the performance of any existing orders prior to being off-ramped.</p> <p>The CMMi certification is an investment for any business regardless of size; but relative to size, achieving the certification can be more time consuming for large businesses than small businesses. Therefore, it is a level playing field across small and large businesses when it comes to CMMi certification.</p> <p>As a compromise to the above scenario, would the government consider changing the CMMi requirement to</p>	<p>The Solicitation has been updated in an Amendment prior to Amendment 7.</p>
<p>1987</p>	<p>RFP Page 106, "For Small Businesses proposing in Categories A- the past performance provided shall be for similar scope efforts with a minimum average annual cost incurred of \$150,000 (One Hundred-Fifty Thousand) for size to be rated relevant (pertinent)." But on Page 116, "Small Businesses- In Category A and C, shall furnish the past performance for similar scope efforts with an average annual cost/fee incurred of \$500,000." Can you please clarify which is the correct annual cost for past performance provided by small businesses in category A?</p>	<p>See Comment 1709.</p>
<p>1991</p>	<p>In A.3.7.1 it notes in the Offer Volume "The offeror must provide relevant experience as it relates to the NAICS code being used for competition." Is this a form, a narrative is there a page limit? Is this just a confirmation in the cover letter?</p>	<p>See Comment 2092.</p>

sewp6_rfp_all_comments

1995	Volume I – Offer Volume. There is a three (3) page limit for LOAs, however Category A - Letter of Authorization (page 101) states the maximum number of LOAs is four (4). Please clarify what is the total page limit for the 4 LOAs.	See Comment 1957.
2001	RFP A.3.7.1 (Offer Volume), Paragraph (b), Category A - Will the government allow the use of multiple LOAs from designated vendors for a Technical Area that an offeror is responding to, including its primary Technical Area, so that the offeror can use distinct and relevant CLINs from each designated vendor to meet the minimum CLIN requirements? For example, offeror submits 500 distinct CLINs from Designated Vendor A and 500 distinct CLINs from Designated Vendor B to equal 1000 distinct CLINs under offeror's primary Technical Area tab.	The Solicitation has been updated in an Amendment prior to Amendment 7.
2007	If an Offeror is awarded a Category A or Category B small business set aside base contract, will they always be permitted to bid on unrestricted/large task orders that are released on Category A or Category B respectively?	Yes.
2009	The potential Offeror is submitting to Category A, to include Technical Areas 1a, 2a, 3a, and 8a. The NAICS code specified for Category A is identified as 541519e (footnote 18). However, the NAISC Codes for the selected Technical Subareas varies and is: 1a - 334111 and 334112; 2a – 541519 footnote 18; 3a – 541519 footnote 18; and 8a – 513210. The offeror is a small business VAR under 541519 footnote 18, 334111 and 334112 and a large business under 513210. Does the offeror qualify to submit a response as a Small Business?	The NAICS and UNSPSC codes in A.1.2 GSFC 52.211-91 SCOPE OF WORK refer to when the non manufacturer rule (NMR) waiver applies at the order level and does not imply only companies with that NAICS code can provide solutions in that Technical Area and does not require all products in that Technical Area to have the stated UNSPSC code.
2016	Regarding the statement "Only projects with NAICS codes listed as in-scope for SEWP VI are to be submitted". From what we understand that the federal government has introduced NAICS code 513210, replacing the legacy code 511210 (Software Publishers). Our company has contracts awarded under the legacy NAICS code 511210 that could be utilized for past performance and Relevant Experience Project (REP) references. Could the government consider allowing offerors to submit contracts under NAICS 511210 for Category A REP and Past Performance evaluation, given the code's recent replacement?	See Comment 1826.
2026	Regarding the statement on Page 116: "Small Businesses in Category A and C, shall furnish the past performance for similar scope efforts with an average annual cost/fee incurred of \$500,000." Could the government please clarify whether the average annual cost/fee requirement for Small Businesses in Categories A and C is \$150,000, as specified on Page 106, rather than \$500,000?	See Comment 1709.
2031	The proposal submission table contained in the RFP indicates that a Mandatory Experience Letter of Authorization is to be included in Offer Volume I for all categories. Would the government please clarify this is only a requirement for Category A?	See Comment 1782.

sewp6_rfp_all_comments

2035	In reference to Section A.3.7.1, page 103, should labor category pricing for each CLIN account for all CONUS locations?	As stated in the RFP the pricing "will only be utilized to establish the initial Contract Database of Record upon Contract award. " It is up to the Offeror to decide what offerings and pricing they want to establish upon award.
2036	In reference to Section A.3.7.1, page 103, are bidders required to provide OCONUS pricing in addition to CONUS pricing?	See Comment 2035.
2041	The RFP states under "Category B-Mandatory Experience Technical Areas" that the area 1 is "1. Enterprise-Wide Net" which appears to be a typo. Will the government please revise the language on page 104 to read "1. Enterprise-Wide Network Services" for clarity and consistency with the CATEGORY B Content Representative Areas on page 108?	The Solicitation has been updated in an Amendment prior to Amendment 7.
2042	On Page 110, the RFP states that "The Mission Suitability Proposal must specifically state for which group the offeror is proposing." With this statement, is the government clarifying that every volume should state the Category the offeror is proposing?	See Comment 1706.
2043	On Page 110, the RFP states that "The Mission Suitability Proposal must specifically state for which group the offeror is proposing. The proposal shall clearly and fully demonstrate the offeror's capability, knowledge, and experience regarding the technical requirements of this RFP." Did the government mean to use "Category" instead of "Group"?	See Comment 1706.
2045	In Exhibit 2, the first paragraph under "instructions" is incomplete. Will the Government please clarify and provide a comprehensive expansion of these instructions to ensure all necessary details are included?	See Comment 1804.
2047	The first two "CATEGORY B Content Representative Areas" on page 108 are in a different order (1. IT Managed Services; 2. Enterprise-Wide Network Services) than the first two "Category B-Mandatory Experience Technical Areas" on page 104 (1. Enterprise-Wide Net; 2. IT Managed Services). Will the Government please reorder the Category B-Mandatory experience Technical Areas and CATEGORY B Content Representative Areas be standardized and revised to read "1. Enterprise-Wide Network Services; 2. IT Managed Services for consistency and clarity?	The Solicitation has been updated in an Amendment prior to Amendment 7.
2048	The RFP states, "The information including pricing will these spreadsheets will not be reviewed or evaluated and will only be utilized to establish the initial Contract Data Basebase of Record upon Contract award." Will the government please clarify how and when the information included pricing can be updated, changed, or removed?	See Comment 4152.
2049	Exhibit+2-PastPerfQues-SEWP+VI is not usable. Section 3 - the evaluator name prepopulates in each filled of area of that section, Section 6 - the contract value populates throughout that corresponding section, the bubbles in Basis of Selection (page 1) and was the "is there an overrun" (page 9) are linked together, and section 4 does not allow for "performed" or "not performed" – both columns are checked or not checked. Please update Exhibit 2 so that is works correctly.	See Comment 1804.

2050	Which volume would you like to see the C-SCRM plan?	See Comment 1675.
2060	<p>In reference to Section A.3.7.3 Technical Approach, The solicitation states: "The offeror must provide a summary description of their offerings and capabilities as it relates to the scope of the proposed Category as provided in A.1.2 GSFC 52.211-91 SCOPE OF WORK (FEB 2016). The summary shall provide detail as to how the offeror will support the four Acquisition Objectives including information in the following areas:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The scalability and extensibility of the offeror's capabilities that demonstrates the offeror's ability to deliver the fullest range of ITC/AV Solutions and/or Services for the proposed category, both inclusive of the listed technical areas and the breadth and depth beyond those Areas within the scope of the given Category. 2. The offeror shall describe their ITC/AV-based solutions and/or services and how the proposed features provide technological leadership in allowing for the next generation of technology in terms of both solutions and services. 3. The offeror shall describe their ITC/AV-based solutions and services and how the proposed architectural features provide technological leadership in allowing for the next generation of technology." <p>Could the government give some illustrative examples or explanation of what is meant by "the proposed architectural features" of services in item 3 as they would apply to vendors proposing in Categories B or C.</p>	See Comment 1808.
2067	<p>The sample Table 1 shown on page 109 that is to be included in the Past Performance Volume is titled "Sample Past Performance Matrix - Category A. The categories listed across the first row do not match the list of Category A technology areas shown on page 108 and elsewhere throughout the solicitation. We understand that it is a sample table, but we do want to make sure that we are to use the actual lists under Category A that are shown consistently everywhere else in the solicitation</p>	The Solicitation has been updated in an Amendment prior to Amendment 7.
2070	<p>The RFP instructions under Technical Approach relating to technological leadership are nearly identical in A.3.7.3(a)(2) and A.3.7.3(a)(3). Specific to Category C responses, please explain the Government's distinction between "features" in A.3.7.3(a)(2) and "architectural features" in A.3.7.3(a)(3) and the expectations for Offeror responses.</p>	See Comment 1808.

sewp6_rfp_all_comments

2071	<p>In A.3.7.3(a)2 and A.3.7.3(a)3 it states "2. The offeror shall describe their ITC/AV-based solutions and/or services and how the proposed features provide technological leadership in allowing for the next generation of technology in terms of both solutions and services.</p> <p>3. The offeror shall describe their ITC/AV-based solutions and services and how the proposed architectural features provide technological leadership in allowing for the next generation of technology."</p> <p>Question: Is NASA is asking bidders to submit two separate narratives with only the word "architectural" distinguishing between the proposed features, or should the two sections should be addressed as part of one narrative?</p>	See Comment 1808.
2075	<p>In Exhibit 2 – Past Performance Questionnaire, several fields in the document auto-populate, propagate information from other fields, or will not allow us to complete them successfully. Please provide a version so we a can complete these questionnaires.</p>	See Comment 1804.
2076	<p>It's not clear what information the Government is requesting specific to Exhibit 3c-Category C Solution Spreadsheet. Please provide instructions for completing each of the columns as well as an example row to allow all Offerors to better understand the Government's expectation.</p>	See Comment 2214.
2077	<p>Should "Sub-areas" in the header for Category C on page 104 be "Technical Areas" to be consistent with Categories A and B?</p>	The Solicitation has been updated in an Amendment prior to Amendment 7.
2079	<p>A.2.1 List of Attachments (p.88): Please confirm Attachment G: DEIA Plan should be part of the Offeror's proposal submission. If so, will the Government provide a template? And in which volume should Attachment G be included?</p>	See Comment 1675.
2080	<p>A.1.51 Climate Change Risk Management (p.76) Please confirm Attachment L: Climante Change Risk Management Plan should be part of the Offeror's proposal submission. If so, will the Government provide a template? And in which volume should Attachment L be included?</p>	See Comment 1675.
2084	<p>Page 117 states: "However, an offeror with favorable, recent, and relevant past performance that meets the average value as specified in A.3.7.2 may be considered more favorably than an offeror with no relevant past performance information." However, page 118 states: "Only Offerors with Past performance level of confidence ratings of Satisfactory or Neutral will have their proposal proceed to Phase 3 of evaluations." If both Satisfactory and Neutral ratings proceed to Phase 3, how are Offerors with Satisfactory ratings considered more favorably?</p>	The Solicitation has been updated in an Amendment prior to Amendment 7.
2085	<p>Item 3 in list of information required in response to (a) TECHNICAL APPROACH (SUBFACTOR A) (Page 111) is nearly a duplicate of what is listed in Item 2. Can the Government please clarify?</p>	The Solicitation has been updated in an Amendment prior to Amendment 7.

sewp6_rfp_all_comments

2086	The RFP instructions for the Mandatory Experience/Offerings section for Exhibit 3a state, "The designated provider for each of the proposed areas must be from the list of approved SEWP Providers listed in Enclosure 1." Some providers listed within the enclosure do not have the capabilities to provide UNSPSC Codes. Will the Government consider removing the UNSPSC code requirement or allowing providers from off the Enclosure 1 list?	The Solicitation will remain as stated.
2088	Page 102 on the RFP states, "A brief description is to be provided in Column 'D' for each Technical Areas with no more than 2500 characters, 500 words." What is the minimum requirement for this column? Would a product name suffice for the description?	No, a product name is not a description. The description should be a brief overview of the offering from the designated provider.
2090	The Technical Approach asks for: "how the proposed features provide technological leadership in allowing for the next generation of technology in terms of both solutions and services" as well as, "how the proposed architectural features provide technological leadership in allowing for the next generation of technology." Will the Government clarify what is the difference in these requirements? Will the Government also define what an "architectural feature" is in regards to Category A?	The Solicitation has been updated in an Amendment prior to Amendment 7.
2091	Page 101 of the RFP in section A.3.7.1(b) asks for a maximum of four LOAs, but section A.3.6(B) on page 96 lists a page limitation of 3 pages for the section. Can this be expanded to 4 pages to include a letter from each designated OEM?	See Comment 1957.
2092	The RFP states requirements for the Offer Volume include, "The offeror must provide relevant experience as it relates to the NAICS code being used for competition." Will the Government clarify what is required in this section to meet this requirement?	The solicitation was updated in Amendment 6 to remove the statement.
2095	Document: Exhibit 4 NAICS Size Standard - Category C - 519190* is listed. Q: 519190* is not a valid NAICS code in the SBA Table of NAICS codes and is not available in SAM. Please advise or clarify if there should be another NAICS identified here.	The Solicitation has been updated in an Amendment prior to Amendment 7.
2096	Document: 80TECH24R0001 SEWP VI Final RFP - A.3.7.1(b) and A.3.7.2(a) - Pages 103 and 109 - Relevant Experience Projects (REPs) and Past Performance references. Q: How does a "Relevant Experience (REPs)" in Offeror Volume differ from Past Performance reference in Volume II? Can the same contracts be used as REPs and Past Performance references if those projects meet the minimum requirements of each section?	See Comment 3704.
2098	In Section A.3.7.1 (a), the last sentence states, "Offerors proposing to Category A and Category C are not required to have a CMMI certification." This is not stated elsewhere in the proposal where CMMI is discussed. Could the Government confirm that Category A and C offerors do not need to have a CMMI certification?	See Comment 3493.
2100	In Section A.3.7.1, Second Bullet, it states, "The offeror must provide relevant experience as it relates to the NAICS code being used for competition." Could the Government expand on what specific kinds of relevant experience information the Government is looking for at this place in the proposal?	See Comment 2092.

sewp6_rfp_all_comments

2103	A.3.7.3(a)2; A.3.7.3(a)3 are worded very similarly with the main difference between "proposed features" vs. "proposed architectural features". Did the Sponsor intend for the two requirements to be so similar?	See Comment 1808.
2104	The Table indicates that the Mandatory Experience Letters of Authorization (LOAs) are limited to 3 pages; however, A.3.7.1(b) states that there may be a "maximum of four (4) LOAs". Will the Sponsor please clarify if the page limitation is per LOA, or in total?	See Comment 1957.
2105	The first paragraph on page 25 states that "each technology area includes specific mandatory technology that must be supplied"; however, each Technical Area now includes Sub-Areas but none are labeled as "mandatory". Will the Sponsor please clarify which sub-areas are mandatory?	The Solicitation has been updated in an Amendment prior to Amendment 7.
2106	The description in Technical Area 8 (p31) refers to Mandatory and Additional Sub-Areas; however, only Sub-areas are stated in the section. Will the Sponsor please clarify if there is a delineation in Mandatory and Additional?	The Solicitation has been updated in an Amendment prior to Amendment 7.
2107	Is the deliverable "Reports of Work" required monthly for Offeror's bidding in Category A?	See Comment 1862.
2108	Page 102, states in the 3rd paragraph that "a minimum of 100 CLINs shall be proposed from the designated provider for the other three (3) non-primary proposed Technical Areas"; however, the instructions in Exhibit 3A state that "50 CLINs from at least one other provided must be proposed below". Will the Sponsor please clarify the required number of CLINs for the non-primary provider?	The Solicitation has been updated in an Amendment prior to Amendment 7.
2116	In Exhibit 2 – Past Performance Questionnaire, several fields in the document auto-populate, propagate information from other fields, or will not allow us to complete them successfully. Please provide a version so we can complete these questionnaires.	See Comment 1804.
2118	<p>Page 103 states, "Offerors proposing to category B and/ or C shall complete Exhibit 3b- Category B Solutions Spreadsheet and Exhibit 3c- Category C Solutions Spreadsheet. The UNSPSC codes must accurately match the proposed services/technology in each row and must be the full 8-digit UNSPSC code. If the CLIN is for an hourly labor rate, then the associated labor category shall be provided in Column G (Labor Category if Hourly Rate)."</p> <p>According to the UNSPSC website, "the UNSPSC provides a very specific product-centric viewpoint." Most service-providers are not subscribers and would have a difficult time translating their NAICS or PSC codes into UNSPSC codes.</p> <p>How should service providers in Category C fill out columns A, B, C E and F in Exhibit 3b?</p>	UNSPSC codes now include IT and other services. Offerors should follow the provided Solicitation directions in Section A.1.22 UNSPSC CODES and provide their best effort to relate the services being offered to a UNSPSC code.
2120	Page 57 states, "a C-SCRM Plan must be submitted to the SEWP Program Management Office annually and no later than 60 calendar days prior to the Contract award date..." Does this imply that the C-SCRM Plan must be submitted with the initial proposal?	See Comment 1675.
2127	Attachment D - CDRL, DRD 3 SEWP Cybersecurity-Supply Chain Risk Management (C-SCRM) Plan, states, "Submission: The plan shall be submitted no later than 60 calendar days prior to the contract award date." Does this imply that the C-SCRM Plan must be submitted with the initial proposal?	See Comment 1675.

2130	<p style="text-align: center;">Technical Approach (Subfactor A)</p> <p>The instructions (Page 111) state that “the summary shall provide details as to how the offeror will support the four Acquisition Objectives including information in the following areas”. Items 2 and 3 below are as follows:</p> <p>2. The offeror shall describe their ITC/AV-based solutions and/or services and how the proposed features provide technological leadership in allowing for the next generation of technology in terms of both solutions and services.</p> <p>3. The offeror shall describe their ITC/AV-based solutions and services and how the proposed architectural features provide technological leadership in allowing for the next generation of technology.</p> <p>Can the government explain the distinction between area 2 and 3? The wording is exactly the same except for the addition of the word “architectural”.</p>	See Comment 1808.
2140	<p>It states in RFP" A.3.7.2 PAST PERFORMANCE VOLUME" For Small Businesses proposing in Categories A- the past performance provided shall be for similar scope efforts with a minimum average annual cost incurred of \$150,000</p> <p>But it contradicts with the value stated in Evaluation section: which states "Small Businesses-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In Category A and C, shall furnish the past performance for similar scope efforts with an average annual cost/fee incurred of \$500,000." 	See Comment 1709.
2142	In 2022, NAICS 519190 was transitioned to 519290. Can you update Exhibit 4 accordingly?	See Comment 1777.
2145	A.3.7.2 (a) states, for small business in Category A, that the past performance provided shall be for similar scope efforts with a minimum average annual cost incurred of \$150,000 however, the Evaluation for the same factor, A.4.3, states \$500,000. Please confirm which is correct.	The Solicitation has been updated to the correct value of \$150,000.
2150	<p>Attachment D – CDRL- C-SCRM - Is a copy of the Offeror’s valid active Open Trusted Technology Provider™ Standard (O-TTPS) Certification required in conjunction with the required SEWP Cybersecurity-Supply Chain Risk Management (C-SCRM) Plan or in lieu of?</p> <p>If both valid active Open Trusted Technology Provider™ Standard (O-TTPS) Certification and a SEWP Cybersecurity-Supply Chain Risk Management (C-SCRM) Plan are required with the proposal, in which Volume and Section does the Government require the documents?</p>	See Comment 1675.
2154	Section 3.7.1 A- Are offerors who are only submitting for Category C required to submit CMMI certification or proof that certification is currently in progress?	See Comment 3493.

sewp6_rfp_all_comments

2158	When page limitations apply to a volume or specific section, a page is defined as one side of a sheet, 8-1/2" x 11", with at least one-inch margins on all sides, using not smaller than 12-point type Times New Roman font inclusive of headers, footers, and any graphic captions. Respectfully request headers/footers and graphic captions be allowed at 10-point font	See Comment 1962.
2167	Can you add 517810 "all other telecommunications" to the NAICS list? NAICS 517919 was folded into that NAICS code in 2022 so please also confirm that any projects in NAICS 517919 could list 517810 as the appropriate NAICS code.	The solicitation will be updated to add NAICS 517810. See Comment 1826 regarding non-existing NAICS codes.
2170	Exhibit 1- please clarify that not documentation is required for Part III, it is in direct conflict with REP directions in A.3.7.1; For Cat B and C on page 103 - "No additional information is requested in support of the Exhibit 1 REP template".	The Solicitation has been updated in an Amendment prior to Amendment 7.
2173	For the Exhibit 2 Past Performance Questionnaire, in the instructions section the last sentence is incomplete. Would the government please confirm that sections 5 and 6 are completed by the evaluator?	See Comment 1804.
2182	REPs for Category B - Are vendors expected to submit 3 REPs for each of the three (any) mandatory experience technical areas, a total of 9 REPs?	The Solicitation has been updated in an Amendment prior to Amendment 7.
2184	Are Letter of Authorization required for products being offered not manufactured by the designated providers?	See Comment 1874.
2185	Are LOAs from secondary providers required?	See Comment 1874.
2187	Requesting clarification regarding the number of Technical Areas listed for Category C in the RFP. On pages 35-38, there are 11 Technical Areas mentioned. However, on pages 104 and 108, only 10 Technical Areas are listed. Could you please confirm if this discrepancy is an error? If so, could the RFP be corrected accordingly?	See Comment 4778.
2191	It has been indicated that the proposal submission upload will not be available until 06/10. Is it possible to make this available on the 8th or 9th. We want to prevent any lag or issues caused by a high volume of submissions.	The Comment is out of date.
2193	(e) States "I The Contractor shall include the substance of this clause, including this paragraph I, in all subcontracts involving the development or delivery of any information technology whether acquired as a service or as a supply." What clause is this statement referring to, and what/where is paragraph I?	The Solicitation has been updated in an Amendment prior to Amendment 7.

2200	ISO Certification: Please confirm that POC details of appraisal body are enough as proof for "ISO 9001-2015 certification in process" or we need to provide more details such as contract or activity documents?	Offerors should only submit what is stated in the Solicitation. See A.3.7.1 OFFER VOLUME; (a) ISO 9001 and CMMI Certification: "It is acceptable to provide proof that the certification approval is in process by providing the Point of Contact information including the name of appraisal body and name, phone number, and email of a representative from whom the Offeror is obtaining the certification. "
2202	Category A, Exhibit 3a requires a brief description for each Technical Area in Column D. Will the Sponsor please clarify if the brief description applies to the four selected Technical Areas + Technical Area 9, or all nine Technical Areas?	See Comment 2506.
2204	In Section 12, the RFP states: "Offerors identified as HUBZone, SDVOSB, EDWOSB, 8a in Category B and C shall provide past performance references showcasing relevant work in at least two (2) content representative areas for content to be rated relevant (pertinent)." Should this also include VOSB and WOSB?	See Comment 1697.
2207	In Section A.3.7.1 the requirement states "Offeror's subcontracting plan and Ability One Commitment Letter, if applicable. Will the government clarify what is required in the subcontracting plan and if small businesses are required to provide the subcontracting plan.	Section A.3.7.1 states that Other Than Small Businesses (OTSB) must submit a subcontracting plan. The subcontracting plan should follow the format in FAR 52.219-9 and include goals for subcontracting with AbilityOne nonprofits for applicable NAICS codes, as described in section A.1.35. Therefore Small Businesses do not need to submit a subcontracting plan A.3.7.1 OFFER VOLUME and A.1.35 AbilityOne SUBCONTRACTING

2213	<p>The government states: "Offerors proposing to category B and/ or C shall complete Exhibit 3b- Category B Solutions Spreadsheet and Exhibit 3c- Category C Solutions Spreadsheet. The UNSPSC codes must accurately match the proposed services/technology in each row and must be the full 8-digit UNSPSC code. If the CLIN is for an hourly labor rate, then the associated labor category shall be provided in Column G (Labor Category if Hourly Rate). The information including pricing in these spreadsheets will not be reviewed or evaluated and will only be utilized to establish the initial Contract Database of Record upon Contract award." Is it the government's expectation that the offer provide a comprehensive list of labor categories and rates and align them to UNSPSC codes? Most offerors that provide services are unfamiliar with UNSPSC codes, is there a standard code the government would expect to see for SEWP offerors in the Category B and C designations?</p>	See Comment 2118.
2214	<p>The instructions for Exhibits 3b and 3c are unclear as to how Services should be broken into CLINs. (e.g., should each enterprise service area be a CLIN, or should each labor category the offeror could propose be a separate CLIN?)</p> <p>Question: Could the government please provide more detailed information on what is needed in Exhibits 3b and 3c? It is unclear if we are supposed to be providing just labor categories or services.</p>	<p>A CLIN can be as discrete as an hourly labor category or a complete service line item such as "Installation of one compute server". CLINs should be added such that the Contract Holder can respond to a Government requirement with the CLINs that exist in the SEWP Database of Record for that Contract Holder. In terms of the information in Exhibits 3b and 3c, all columns are applicable; Provider is the OEM or Service provider; Part Numbers are unique identifiers for the offering whether a product with a standardized number or a service that might have a self-generated value or the labor category; UNSPSC codes are the related service UNSPSC codes; SEWP price is the price/labor rate; CLINs are created by the offeror - the only requirement is that each CLIN be unique for the offeror; Description is a brief description of the offering.</p>
2218	<p>RFP paragraph A.3.6.B RFP Proposal Submission Table, pp. 95-96 specifies a three-page limit for Volume 1 Mandatory Experience Letter of Authorization (LOA). Category A- Letter of Authorization, p. 101, indicates a Category A Offerors may submit as many as four LOAs. Assuming each LOA is at least one page, a Category Offeror submitting four LOAs will exceed the stated three-page limit. Please confirm the LOA page limit is three pages per LOA.</p>	See Comment 1957.
2225	<p>May you allow a provision to allow people to request an extension if needed, since the Q&A period ends very soon, but the RFP is not due for another month? So far we do not need an extension, but there may be some unknowns as we go through the process, and since we are relying on others.</p>	The Comment is out of date.

sewp6_rfp_all_comments

2227	RFP Paragraph A.3.7.2(a), pp. 106 states "For Small Businesses proposing in Categories A- the past performance provided shall be for similar scope efforts with a minimum average annual cost incurred of \$150,000;" however, RFP Paragraph A.4.3 p. 116 states "Small Businesses- In Category A and C, shall furnish the past performance for similar scope efforts with an average annual cost/fee incurred of \$500,000" to be considered relevant. Please clarify the Small Business Category A value required for past performance to be considered relevant.	See Comment 1709.
2228	RFP Paragraph A.3.7.2(a), pp. 106 states "For Small Businesses proposing in Categories A- the past performance provided shall be for similar scope efforts with a minimum average annual cost incurred of \$150,000;" however, RFP Paragraph A.4.3 p. 116 states "Small Businesses- In Category A and C, shall furnish the past performance for similar scope efforts with an average annual cost/fee incurred of \$500,000" to be considered relevant. The first citation references "minimum average annual cost incurred" for Small Businesses in Category A, while the second citation references "average annual cost/fee incurred" for Small Businesses in Category A. Please clarify whether the Small Business Category A required value is based on (a) costs only, or (b) cost and fee.	See Comment 1709.
2234	When a small business offeror submits a REP, are they limited to only using REPs that are for a NAICS in which they qualify as small in that Category's list of applicable/in-scope NAICS?	See Comment 1886.
2236	Section A.1.3 of the RFP (pp. 35-38) lists 11 technical areas for Category C, but Section A.3.7.1.(b) of the RFP (p. 104) has only 10 mandatory experience areas listed for Category C. Will the government please verify the number and types of technical areas included in Category C?	See Comment 4778.
2237	For (a) TECHNICAL APPROACH (SUBFACTOR A), the government asks, "The offeror shall describe their ITC/AV-based solutions and services and how the proposed architectural features provide technological leadership in allowing for the next generation of technology." If responding to Category C, would the government please define the term "architectural features."	See Comment 1808.
2238	Will the Government please allow for a period of Q&A for the proposal submission tool that extends beyond June 7th since the proposal submission tool is not available for full review by offerors until June 10th?	The Comment is out of date.
2239	The draft RFP stated that responses would be due no less than 60 days after the release of the RFP. With that in mind, would you consider extending the due date to at least July 23?	The Comment is out of date.
2244	Can the government please refer to the UNSPSC Codes, can the government guide us what are the codes for category B and C?	See Comment 2118.

2254	<p>A.3.7.2(a) and A.4.3 Past Performance Volume Information From the Offeror and Phase 2 Past Performance Evaluation</p> <p>The dollar threshold for the Past Performance Project requirements for Small Businesses in Category A appear to conflict in Sections A.3.7.2(a) and A.4.3. Is the dollar threshold for Small Businesses in Category A \$150,000 or \$500,000?</p>	See Comment 1709.
2258	Can you please advise what documentation will be acceptable in demonstrating that a company is working on getting the ISO Certification	Offerors should only submit what is stated in the Solicitation. See A.3.7.1 OFFER VOLUME; (a) ISO 9001 and CMMI Certification: "It is acceptable to provide proof that the certification approval is in process by providing the Point of Contact information including the name of appraisal body and name, phone number, and email of a representative from whom the Offeror is obtaining the certification."
2259	Page 116 Small Businesses- In Category A & C, ...with an cost/fee of \$500,000. Question: it is in conflict with A.3.7.2 (a) which annual cost of \$150,000	See Comment 1709.
2262	We recommend that the C-SCRM Plan be due 60 calendar days after contract award date to avoid requiring Offerors to develop a plan when they may not be awarded a contract. If the government does require this plan to be submitted prior to award, what date is the C-SCRM Plan due and to whom/how should it be submitted?	See Comment 1675.
2263	Attachment H was not provided with the Final RFP. Can the government please provide?	See Comment 1659.
2265	<p>"Section A.1.35, third paragraph states the ""formal agreement with AbilityOne"" will be incorporated into the contract as Attachment I. Should this be Attachment H, which is the AbilityOne Formal Agreement per the list of Attachments in A.2.1 on RFP page 88?</p> <p style="text-align: center;">"</p>	The solicitation has been updated to state Attachment H.

2275	Category A - Letter of Authorization. Can a Letter of Authorization (LOA) come from the distributor of the OEM in question, or does the LOA have to come directly from the OEM, even if the product is actually sourced from a distributor?	Whether the products from the 4 designated providers are sourced directly, through a distributor or through a partner the designated provider LOAs must originate from the OEM.
2276	The instructions state: "Identify any consultants, generative artificial intelligence, and/or sub-contractors used in writing this proposal (if any) and the extent to which their services will be available in the subsequent performance of this effort." Could you please clarify what the Govt refers to as generative AI? Could the Govt also clarify what information should be provided when "identifying" consultants and/or sub-contractors?	The Government is referring to artificial intelligence systems that can create new content such as text, images, audio, video, code, etc. When identifying consultants and/or subcontractors, offerors should provide company name and address, the nature of services provided in proposal development, and the extent to which they would be involved in performance of the contract.
2282	In reference to Section A.3.7.3(a), Items (2.) and (3.) on RFP Page 111 referring to "proposed features" and "proposed architectural features" respectively: Given that Category B and Category C services focus on the strategic, operational, and coordination aspects of delivering ITC/AV services across the enterprise and the term "architectural features" is inherently associated with system architecture, network architecture, data architecture, security architecture, software architecture, integration architecture, etc., where such associations are aligned to the sets of intertwining Category A technological products, we recommend that the Government not require item #3 as a response area in relation to Category B and Category C services. This revision will allow offerors to focus on "service delivery approaches" instead of "architectural features," as service delivery approaches align more appropriately with the nature of Category B and Category C services. Category B and Category C have a clear emphasis on enterprise-wide service delivery, managed services, and strategic IT service management. This update will make items #1 and #2 consistent with the service-oriented scope of Category B, Category C, and some Category A items, as appropriate. Item #3 will continue to be appropriately aligned with Category A items, clarifying for Offerors the use of the term "architectural features" in item #3 versus its applicability to Category B and Category C.	See Comment 1808.
2285	Exhibit 3b- Category B Solutions Spreadsheet and Exhibit 3b and 3c- Category b& C Solutions Spreadsheet. The UNSPSC codes must accurately match the proposed services/technology in each row and must be the full 8-digit UNSPSC code. If the CLIN is for an hourly labor rate, then the associated labor category shall be provided in Column G (Labor Category if Hourly Rate). Is there a minimum number of labor categories that the offeror must propose? Will the offeror be allowed to add labor categories after award? If so, what is the estimated time to have new labor categories approved and added to the offeror's contract after award?	No, there is no minimum number of labor categories required. The Offeror determines what labor categories they want to establish in the initial Contract Database of Record upon Contract award. The Offeror can update their offerings including labor categories post award utilizing the process described in A.1.23 TECHNOLOGY REFRESHMENT.

sewp6_rfp_all_comments

2295	<p>"Offeror NAICS Size Standard Crosswalk (Exhibit 4) An Offeror will be grouped within a scope category based on the size standard associated with NAICS code identified on Exhibit 4."</p> <p>What does it mean to be "grouped within a scope category"? Following award, will contract holders only be able to bid on task orders released under the specific NAICS indicated in Exhibit 4?</p>	See Comment 1881.
2300	What is the minimum number of projects that a WOSB has to submit for this volume?	See Comment 1697.
2305	Enclosure 1 – SEWP VI Providers. Forcepoint has rebranded as Everfox. Will SEWP allow an LOA from Everfox?	Yes. The LOA can be from any legal name associated with the provider including subsidiaries or other variations.
2306	<p>Offerors proposing to category B and/ or C shall complete Exhibit 3b- Category B Solutions Spreadsheet and Exhibit 3c- Category C Solutions Spreadsheet. The UNSPSC codes must accurately match the proposed services/technology in each row and must be the full 8-digit UNSPSC code. If the CLIN is for an hourly labor rate, then the associated labor category shall be provided in Column G (Labor Category if Hourly Rate). The information including pricing in these spreadsheets will not be reviewed or evaluated and will only be utilized to establish the initial Contract Database of Record upon Contract award.</p> <p>On all other Best In Class (BIC) Government-wide contracts (Alliant, CIO3P3, STARS III, OASIS, HCAATS, etc), GSA Scheduled, and Agency Multiple Award Contracts (MAC), whether they are for IT Services, Professional or Administrative Services, or other, use a standardized set of labor categories with defined requirements. The contracts' customers (the agency) have a level of confidence that all vendors provide labor services to a standard.</p> <p>This RFP's approach to pricing doesn't appear to consider your customers' needs for IT service labor. Would the SEWP team consider reviewing other BICs and large service contracts to understand how the market purchases services?</p>	The Solicitation will remain as stated.
2311	<p>Exhibit 3a - Category A Solutions Spreadsheet, Technical Area Tabs: Will the Government please confirm if only the primary TA shall have a minimum of 1,000 distinct and relevant CLINs?</p> <p>Will the Government please confirm if the 3 non-primary TAs shall have a minimum of 100 CLINs for EACH of the 3 non-primary TAs or is it a TOTAL of 100 CLINs across the other 3 non-primary TAs?</p>	The Solicitation has been updated to clarify the requirement. See Instructions in Section A.3.7.1 OFFER VOLUME;(b) Mandatory Experience/ Offerings; Technical Area Tabs

sewp6_rfp_all_comments

2312	<p>RFP Section 3.7.1 page 103. For Other Than Small Businesses in Category B the government is requiring four programs in the specified NAICS to meet the requirement threshold of \$30M. However the Past Performance requirement threshold is only \$2.5M annual cost, seemingly acknowledging the value of smaller but appropriately scoped work in determining and vendors ability to perform.</p> <p>Emerging large businesses face similar challenges to small businesses when competing in their pool, yet unlike small businesses, no allowances are made to ensure their ability to compete. Providing 4 contracts at \$30M in the right NAICS will put SEWP out of reach for many high performing emerging large business, locking them out for possibly 10 years. We respectfully request that the government consider lowering the TCV required for OTSBs, or at least asking for at least 2 contracts valued at \$30M allowing the other 2 to be at some lower value.</p>	The Solicitation will remain as stated.
2316	<p>Pg 103 of the Final RFP indicates that Relevant Experience Projects (REP) must be for projects/contracts that were issued under one of the in-scope NAICS listed in the RFP (pgs 62 & 63). Will the Government consider allowing projects conducted under other NAICS that are relevant to the SEWP scope to be submitted? For example, a contract issued under NAICS 541715 may have significant requirements in software development, IT architecture, cybersecurity, etc that is relevant to SEWP and potentially of much greater scope than a project listed in one of the in-scope NAICS.</p>	See Comment 1671.
2317	<p>Can the Government provide additional instructions on what is desired in Exhibits 3B and 3C?</p>	See Comment 2214.
2319	<p>Does the Government expect that each awardee will be capable of executing both CONUS and OCONUS task orders, or will some CONUS-only providers be considered?</p>	There is no requirement that a Contract Holder be able to fulfill OCONUS work. Note that many SEWP requirements span the world.
2321	<p>Does the Government intend to release an updated version of the Past Performance Questionnaire? The current version has choice-cells that are linked, which will prevent the respondents from responding correctly.</p>	The Solicitation has been updated in an Amendment prior to Amendment 7.
2322	<p>Is every offeror required to have a Letter of Commitment from AbilityOne regardless of whether they intend to compete only on TOs with NAICS that do not require AbilityOne?</p>	A Letter of Commitment from AbilityOne is required of all Offerors without exception.
2328	<p>Regarding Exhibit 3b, the RFP states: "The UNSPSC codes must accurately match the proposed services/technology in each row and must be the full 8-digit UNSPSC code. If the CLIN is for an hourly labor rate, then the associated labor category shall be provided in Column G (Labor Category if Hourly Rate)." Does this mean that the offeror is limited to the number of labor categories that exactly match the number of relevant codes in the 81160000 Family?</p>	See Comment 2118.

2329	<p>A.3.7.1 OFFER VOLUME (b) Mandatory Experience/ Offerings</p> <p>Exhibit 3a- Category A Solutions Spreadsheet</p> <p>In the instructions for completing Exhibit 3a, under the Point of Contact (POC) Tab, the RFP states “The designated provider for each of the proposed areas must be from the list of approved SEWP Providers listed in Enclosure 1. The same designated provider may be identified in more than one of the four (4) Technical Areas but the offerings from the provider must be distinct, relevant, and different in each Technical Area.” Please clarify if this means that all solutions listed in the Technical Area Tabs must be from providers listed in Enclosure 1. Or can offers list other companies and distributors not listed in Enclosure 1 to demonstrate “The proposed offerings shall reflect all possible solutions that can be acquired by the government for the given Technical Area” as stated for the Technical Area Tabs?</p>	See Comment 5655.
2333	Mandatory Experience LOAs - please confirm if the page limit is 3 pages per LOA (for a total of 12 pages).	See Comment 1957.
2345	Can government please give an extension to the due date of July 13 as this is a big proposal and as a small business we would need more time to write a comprehensive and compliant proposal.	The Comment is out of date.
2346	Can government please give an extension to the due date of July 13 as this is a big proposal and as a small business we would need more time to write a comprehensive and compliant proposal.	The Comment is out of date.
2352	Section A.3.7.1(a) ISO 9001 and CMMI Certification (Page 100) - For small businesses, the RFP states proof that the ISO 9001 and CMMI certification is in process is acceptable at time of proposal, with certification required within 12 months of award. Can you please clarify what specific documentation is required at proposal submission to show the certification is "in process"?	See Comment 2200.
2353	Section A.3.7.1(b) Mandatory Experience/Offerings (Page 101-105) - For Category A, can you clarify if there is a required minimum number of total CLINs that need to be proposed across the 4 selected technical areas and technical area 9 combined? The RFP specifies minimums for the primary technical area, other 3 non-primary technical areas, and technical area 9 individually, but not an overall total minimum.	The Solicitation has been updated in an Amendment prior to Amendment 7.
2360	Section A.3.7.1(b) Category A Letter of Authorization (Page 101-102) - For Category A, the RFP requires a Letter of Authorization (LOA) for each proposed designated provider for the 4 selected technical areas. Can you clarify if an LOA or teaming agreement is also required for any secondary providers proposed beyond the designated provider in each technical area?	See Comment 1874.
2363	If we are a small business, do we need to submit 3 REPs for each of the 10 services areas under each Service Category? Or we can submit a total 3 REPs covering all the 10 services areas?	The Solicitation has been updated to clarify this requirement.

2368	Can you provide the Relevant Experience Project Table in word format?	The Solicitation has been updated in an Amendment prior to Amendment 7.
2369	Are the rates proposed with the offer to be in effect for the life of the contract or can they be added and removed at the IDIQ level? Can a contractor have multiple rates for a labor category to address varying degrees of task order complexity?	See Comment 2285.
2370	There appears to be no access to the CHOP for bids for SEWP VI to obtain the UNSPSC code list.	See Comment 2395.
2372	We have completed work for SEWP V prime contract holder within the last three years. Can we use what we were hired to do as relevant experience within their contract that they had won within a category or can we not use that?	Information concerning the requirements for submitting Relevant Experience Projects is contained in A.3.7.1 OFFER VOLUME(b) Mandatory Experience/ Offerings
2376	"Zebra Technologies is selling significantly through its resellers utilizing the SEWP V contract. It is should be listed in Enclosure 1: SEWP VI Providers.pdf. Zebra products sold through SEWP V are Rugged Tablets, Rugged Handhelds, Barcode Scanners, Barcode Printers, and Supplies".	See Comment 5655.
2382	What does the "*" mean by "TBS"?	The Solicitation has been updated in an Amendment prior to Amendment 7.
2383	Does the government have a template for Attachments G, H, I, J, K, & L? Recommend that the government provides the templates for attachments G, H, I, J, K, & L to ensure the offeror provides all information required for each attachment and the format that the government requires.	See Comment 1675 regarding the post-award document G, I and L. The information to be included in Attachment K is described in Section A.3.7.1 OFFER VOLUME . The AbilityOne Formal Agreement is Attachment H. Attachment H is to be provided by the contractor in coordination with Source America/National Industries for the Blind. Reference Solicitation A.1.35 AbilityOne Subcontracting for guidance. Attachment I- Commercial Small Business Subcontracting Plan (Other than Small Businesses) is to be provided by the contractor and what is provided will be incorporated into the contract as Attachment I. For guidance on Attachment I- Commercial Small Business Subcontracting Plan (Other than Small Businesses) reference FAR 52.219-9(g).

sewp6_rfp_all_comments

2384	What does the government mean and restriction by the following statement: "Subcontractors from Other Than Small Businesses that creates a CTA will not be evaluated."? Please explain the restriction(s) for the offeror by that statement.	See Comment 5061.
2389	Does Category A mandatory experience/offerings that is filled out in Exhibit 3a all have to come from the prime?	All SEWP offerings must be orderable from the Prime Contract Holder. Products not directly produced by the Contract Holder may be sourced directly, through a distributor or through a partner.
2395	For Exhibit 3c, how do you know what UNSPSC Code to use even doing a word search on the UNSPSC website?	Enclosure 2-In scope UNSPSC is provided for reference when completing Exhibit 3a/b/c. The Offeror determines the best methodology to use provided information and other sources.
2396	For Category C, does all the 3 REPS must have a NAICS Code of 541512?	See Comment 1886.
2397	For Category C, can the REPS submitted be one of the NAICS Codes in Section A.1.34 on page 63 Table "Category C- Information Technology, Communication, and Audio Visual (ITC/AV) Mission Based Services"?	See Comment 1886.
2399	During the industry day on June 4th, the government demonstrated the process of submitting a proposal on the NASA portal and was selecting various offeror information like NAICS Code, does all the offeror's Category B REPs must all have the same NAICS Code that was entered on the proposal submission portal? For example, all being the NAICS Code 541512.	See Comment 1886.
2400	During the industry day on June 4th, the government demonstrated the process of submitting a proposal on the NASA portal and was selecting various offeror information like NAICS Code, does all the offeror's Category C REPs must all have the same NAICS Code that was entered on the proposal submission portal? For example, all being the NAICS Code 541512.	See Comment 1886.
2401	Page 98 states that offerors should provide "Offeror's subcontracting plan and AbilityOne Commitment Letter, if applicable." Please confirm that proposals from Small Business offerors do not require a subcontracting plan, as indicated on Page 59 which says, "SMALL BUSINESS SUBCONTRACTING PLAN AND REPORTS. - APPLICABLE TO OTHER THAN SMALL BUSINESS".	See Comment 2207.

sewp6_rfp_all_comments

2411	<p>"The Non-Manufacturer Rule (NMR) is applicable to SEWP VI. When providing the products of a large business it did not manufacture, the NMR creates a size standard of 500 employees. However, SAM makes no accommodation for the NMR. This creates a potential conflict where a business may show as LB in SAM, but actually be an SB under that NAICS for SEWP VI.</p> <p>For example, NAICS Code 513210 has a size standard of \$47M. However, since the NMR applies to this NAICS Code for SEWP VI, the size standard is 500 employees. So a company with more than \$47M in revenue is listed as large in SAM, but would be small for SEWP VI if they have under 500 employees.</p> <p>Which size should such a company list in the Exhibit 4 crosswalk?"</p>	An Offeror's size standard shall match the NAICS information reflected in SAM.gov entity information. This exhibit is being collected to verify an Offeror's size standard and for the SEWP data repository.
2415	Under Section A.3.7.2 Past Performance Volume, Part (a) Information from the Offeror, Category A page 106. Small Business past performance shall have an annual cost of \$150,000. However, in Section A.4.3 on page 116, it states Category A and C for small business must have an annual cost of \$500,000. Can you please clarify?	See Comment 1709.
2423	Under Section A.3.7.2 Past Performance Volume, Part (a) Information from the Offeror, it states that a minimum of one but no more than 3 recent past performance references are required. However, in Section A.4.3 on page 116, it states Category C for small business must have references for either 2 or 3 depending on socioeconomic status. Can you please clarify if one or 2-3 is required per category?	The Solicitation has been updated in an Amendment prior to Amendment 7.
2428	Reference Exhibit 2 - PastPerfQues-SEWP VI. Highly recommend looking at the GSA OASIS+ J.P-6 form as a more reasonable and realistic rating structure given the timeframe for proposal submission and the difficulties all offerors face to have these types of forms completed.	The Solicitation will remain as stated.
2436	Proposal Preparation A.3.7.1 (b) Page 104: For Categories B and C, where the solicitation lists socio-economic categories that require a reduced number of REPs and reduced minimum total contract value, the offeror requests that Small Disadvantaged Businesses (SDBs) who qualify as SDBs IAW FAR 19.304 and 13 CFR 124.1001, be included in this list.	The Solicitation has been updated in an Amendment prior to Amendment 7.
2439	Section A.3.6 (B)- The proposal Submission Table against Volume 1 shows Mandatory Experience LOA as 3 pages. If we are bidding for Category B and C, please confirm there is no LOA needed and it is only the REP template that needs to be submitted.	See Comment 1782.
2443	On page 104, related to the number of REPs to be submitted in Category and corresponding socioeconomic status: It states: For HUBZone, VOSB, SDVOSB, WOSB, EDWOSB, 8a, offerors (inclusive of first-tier subcontractors, if applicable): "A total of 2 different REPs from different mandatory experience technical areas shall be submitted." On page 116, it states: "HUBZone, SDVOSB, EDWOSB, 8a shall provide past performance references showcasing at least 2 content representative areas", omitting the WOSB status. Assuming the socioeconomic breakdown will be the same for REPs and PPs, should WOSB also be included in the past performance guidelines on page 116?	See Comment 1697.
2444	Given that the proposal period includes 3 federal holidays and the draft RFP led us to expect a 60 day turnaround we humbly request that the proposal due date be extended, preferably to the end of July.	The Comment is out of date.

sewp6_rfp_all_comments

2447	Page 103 of the RFP mentions that "For Small Businesses: A total of three (3) different REPs from different mandatory experience technical areas shall be submitted". Please confirm if this is a total of 3 REP or is 3 REP in each of the mandatory technical areas i.e. 30 REP	The Solicitation has been updated in an Amendment prior to Amendment 7.
2458	There seems to be several bugs within the PPQ PDF form provided to offerors (Exhibit 2-PastPerfQues-SEWP VI.pdf). When trying to check the Prime Contractor box in Section 2, the other 2 boxes get checked as well (checking one box automatically checks the other 2 and you cannot remove them). Also, when trying to enter the customer's information in Section 3, whatever is written in one box immediately gets pasted into the box below it. There also appears to be similar issues inputting the various values in Section 6. Additionally, the textboxes for the last 3 questions on page 9 paste over each other when you try to enter text in them. Can this form be replaced by a Word form, which will make it easier for both the offeror and our customer? Can this be updated soon so that offerors don't lose more time sending the PPQ to their customer?	See Comment 1804.
2460	A.3.7.3 (a) TECHNICAL APPROACH (SUBFACTOR a) Page 111: Items 2. and 3. how will the Government evaluate the difference between "proposed features" and "proposed architectural features"? Confirming that it is required that offerors enumerate -and differentiate between- "features" and "architectural features" for each of the technical areas in scope?	See Comment 1808.
2463	A.4.4 Page 120: The table depicting how the Technical Approach and Management Approach confidence levels are combined to make an overall confidence rating does is not clear about how the ratings combine to make an overall rating.	The Solicitation has been updated in an Amendment prior to Amendment 7.
2464	Page 116 states, "Small Businesses- In Category A and C, shall furnish the past performance for similar scope efforts with an average annual cost/fee incurred of \$500,000." However, page 106 states, "For Small Businesses proposing in Categories A- the past performance provided shall be for similar scope efforts with a minimum average annual cost incurred of \$150,000 (One Hundred- Fifty Thousand) for size to be rated relevant (pertinent)." Please advise whether the Category A, Small Business past performance relevancy threshold is \$150,000 or \$500,000.	See Comment 1709.
2469	page 112 "The offeror shall either fill out Exhibit 5: C-SCRM Attestation Form or provide a copy of a valid active Open Trusted Technology Provider™ Standard (O-TTPS) Certification to attest to meeting the ISO 20243 standard. " Does O-TTPS self certification meet the requirement or is third party certification required?	Third party ISO 20243 certification is not required.
2471	PAGE 101 The Mandatory Experience Letter of Authorization (LOA) page limit on the Proposal Content and Page Limitations table on page limit table on page 95 and 96 is 3 pages. Category A- Letter of Authorization. Under A.3.7.1 Offer Volume, offerors shall provide a Letter of Authorization (LOA) from a designated provider (OEM) for each of the four (4) Technical Areas. Please clarify if the page limit is per LOA or is the page limit for all LOAs.	See Comment 1957.

sewp6_rfp_all_comments

2473	PAGE 106 There is a discrepancy in the RFP concerning average annual cost as it relates to Past Performance for Small Business in Category A. RFP Page 106, "For Small Businesses proposing in Categories A- the past performance provided shall be for similar scope efforts with a minimum average annual cost incurred of \$150,000 (One Hundred-Fifty Thousand) for size to be rated relevant (pertinent)." But on Page 116, "Small Businesses- In Category A and C, shall furnish the past performance for similar scope efforts with an average annual cost/fee incurred of \$500,000." Please clarify which annual. cost is required for small business.	See Comment 1709.
2474	PAGE 102 Exhibit 3a- Category A Solutions Spreadsheet offerors are required to provide a brief description in Column 'D' for each Technical Areas with no more than 2500 characters, 500 words. Can the government provide additional guidance on what they require in the decription?	The description should demonstrate the Offeror's understanding of the scope of that technical area and the relevance of the Offeror's proposed solutions and services.
2475	PAGE 109 To meet the requirement for prior customer evaluations the offeror is instructed to coordinate with references to complete the questionnaire provided as Exhibit 2, PPQ. When preparing PPQ we have noticed several areas where there are issues with the form-fillable areas are either broken or copying data across all lines of a table. We request that an updated form be posted to allow for offerors to process.	See Comment 1804.
2479	Offerors proposing to category B and/ or C shall complete Exhibit 3b- Category B Solutions Spreadsheet and Exhibit 3c- Category C Solutions Spreadsheet. The UNSPSC codes must accurately match the proposed services/technology in each row and must be the full 8-digit UNSPSC code. If the CLIN is for an hourly labor rate, then the associated labor category shall be provided in Column G (Labor Category if Hourly Rate). The information including pricing in these spreadsheets will not be reviewed or evaluated and will only be utilized to establish the initial Contract Database of Record upon Contract award. will the Government please provide the IN SCOPE SEWP VI UNSPSC Codes, this document was provided with the DRFP as Attachment D but was not provided with the final? on Exhibit 3b and 3c there is a column for "SEWP Catalog Price" where do we find that price? we are proposing services only, no products, there are limited services categories to choose from under the UNSPSC list, is there a broader list for services? where do we find the CLINs that are required in column A of each form? please provide clearer instructions for completion of these two forms for offerors that are providing services only	See Comment 2395.
2481	A.3.7.1 states "The Offeror shall complete SF1449 Blocks 12 (if applicable), 17, and 30,," however, the instruction in the SF1449 for all three categories states "the offeror shall complete Blocks 12, 17,23,24 and 30 please clarify which blocks the offeror is to complete	The Solicitation has been updated in an Amendment prior to Amendment 7.
2482	For a CTA, under category A, exhibit 3A, does the relevant experience and past performance have to be solely of the prime or can the subcontractor submit past performance and relevant experience as well?	The Solicitation has been updated in an Amendment prior to Amendment 7.

sewp6_rfp_all_comments

2483	<p>Section A.3.2 states: "Questions regarding the SEWP VI RFP Application (e.g., access, system issues, and upload issues) must be submitted via email to sewp6@nasa.gov at least 72 hours in advance of the RFP deadline."</p> <p>Will the Government please make the SEWP VI RFP Application available to Offerors a minimum of 96 hours before the RFP deadline? This will give Offerors a minimum of 24 hours in order to test the system and report any issues NLT 72 hours in advance of the RFP deadline (to be in compliance with Section A.3.2).</p>	Yes.
2491	<p>Please clarify: in Section A.1.2, Category C lists 11 technical areas, including Program Management/Ancillary Services, but paragraph A.3.7.2(a)12, paragraph 3 does not include this area in the listing of Content Representative Areas.</p> <p>Can we count technical area 11c Program Management/Ancillary Services as one of the "at least two (2) content representative areas for content to be rated relevant (pertinent)"?</p>	See Comment 4778.
2492	<p>Section A.3.7.1(b) states that for Categories B and C: Only projects with NAICS codes listed as in-scope for SEWP VI are to be submitted."</p> <p>Will the Government please confirm Relevant Experience Projects (REPs) may be for contracts under any of the SEWP VI NAICS codes identified in RFP Section A.1.34? This permits and Offeror to demonstrate experience across multiple applicable SEWP VI NAICS codes.</p>	See Comment 1886.
2493	<p>Section A.3.7.3(a), page 111, Mission Suitability Technical Approach (Subfactor A), bullet #3 states: "The offeror shall describe their ITC/AV-based solutions and services and how the proposed architectural features provide technological leadership in allowing for the next generation of technology."</p> <p>Will the Government confirm that, for all Categories, bullet #3 is being removed from the response requirements? The removal resolves repetition of bullet #2.</p>	See Comment 1808.
2494	<p>Sections A.3.7.3(b)(4)(vi) and A.4.4(b)(4). Requirement # vi was added to Final RFP Section A.3.7.3(b)(4); however, corresponding evaluation criteria was NOT added in A.4.4(b)(4). Will the Government provide evaluation criteria for this requirement?</p>	The Solicitation has been updated in an Amendment prior to Amendment 7.
2496	<p>Exhibit+2-PastPerfQues-SEWP+VI. The Exhibit 2 released May 23 can not be edited on all pages. For example, there are issues when trying to complete page 2, Section 5, General Performance Survey, Will the Government please release a revised Exhibit 2 as a fillable PDF form? Considering the time it may take for Government and Commercial customers to receive, complete, and submit this revised Exhibit (especially given the July 4th Holiday), will the Government give Offerors a minimum of 3 weeks between receipt of the revised Exhibit and the RFP deadline?</p>	The Comment is out of date.
2497	<p>Section A.3.7.1(b) Exhibit 3(a) states that "A brief description is to be provided in column 'D' for each Technical Areas with no more than 2500 characters, 500 words." Is this description supposed to be about the OEMs' offerings selected as designated providers, or about the reseller's experience and value-add in the area?</p>	See Comment 2474.

2500	PAGE 102 The RFP states "A minimum of 50 distinct and relevant CLIN's from these secondary providers must be proposed in each of the four Technical Areas". Whereas the Exhibit 3a- Category A Solutions Spreadsheet guidance states "50 CLINs from at least one other provided must be proposed below" Please verify that offerers are not restricted to submitting only 50 CLINs.	See Comment 5061.
2505	<p>In the RFP instructions, A.3.7.2 PAST PERFORMANCE VOLUME (pgs 105-106), it indicates: For Small Businesses proposing in Categories A- the past performance provided shall be for similar scope efforts with a minimum average annual cost incurred of \$150,000 (One Hundred- Fifty Thousand) for size to be rated relevant (pertinent).</p> <p>For Small Businesses proposing in Categories C- the past performance provided shall be for similar scope efforts with a minimum average annual cost/fee incurred of \$500,000 (Five Hundred Thousand) for size to be rated relevant (pertinent).</p> <p>However, under A.4.1 Evaluation, specifically A.4.3 Phase Two-Past Performance (pgs 115-116) it indicates: Small Businesses-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In Category A and C, shall furnish the past performance for similar scope efforts with an average annual cost/fee incurred of \$500,000. • In Category B, shall furnish the past performance for similar scope efforts with an average annual cost/fee incurred of \$1,000,000. <p>What is the correct value for Category A?</p>	See Comment 1709.
2506	For Exhibit 3a - Category A Solutions Spreadsheet, Information Tab, the RFQ states the offeror must "A brief description is to be provided in Column D for each Technical Areas with no more than 2500 characters, 500 words." Question 1) Can SEWP provide additional guidance as to what they are looking for in the brief description? Should this description be an overview of the category or an overview of the Vendors/Providers proposing? Question 2) Is the direction to provide brief descriptions only for the 4 Technical Areas proposed, plus Technical Area 9 OR should the offeror be providing brief descriptions for ALL 9 Technical Areas?	The description should be a brief overview of the offering from the 4 designated Technical Areas. A description is not required for Technical Area 9 nor is a description required for the other 4 non-designated Technical Areas.
2507	For each of the four technical areas we select, we are required to choose an OEM from the designated provider list [Enclosure 1] and a secondary provider. Does the secondary provider also need to be selected from the designated provider list?	No. Only the designated providers need to be from the list in Enclosure 1. There are no restrictions for the selection of secondary and additional providers.
2508	The page limitation for the Letters of Authorization (LOAs) on the Proposal Submission Table states 3 pages, but we are required to submit 4 LOAs. Can NASA adjust this page limit to accommodate the requirement of submitting 4 LOAs?	See Comment 1957.

sewp6_rfp_all_comments

2513	In the SEWP VI Past Performance Questionnaire- the check boxes do not work correctly (each checkbox is marked when a single checkbox is clicked) and many of the tables auto populate the entire table. This is confusing and will not give a compliant or scorable PPQ for NASA to evaluate. Please provide a corrected form that functions properly for easier scoring.	See Comment 1804.
2517	Given the extension changes between the Draft RFP and the final RFP, we kindly request a 30 day extension to the proposal due date to allow adjustments in teaming, solutions, and PPQ requirements.	The Comment is out of date.
2519	How should offerors demonstrate proof that CMMI is in process within the proposal submission? What documentation is acceptable?	See Comment 2200.
2520	After attending the Industry Day, we noticed a statement from that did not align with the RFP. Will the government clarify if the Relevant Mandatory Experience projects AND the Past Performance projects need to have a NAICS code within scope, or just the Relevant Mandatory Experience projects need to have a NAICS code within scope?	See Comment 1886.
2522	Do NAICS codes for Mandatory Experience projects (REPs) have to map to the NAICS codes listed within the specific Categories for A,B,C respectively provided in A.1.2? For example, can a project with a NAICS code relevant to Category A be also utilized in the REP Mandatory Experience for Category B and still be considered within in-scope? Please clarify.	See Comment 1886.
2525	Now that Everfox and Forcepoint have split to become two separate companies, will the Government accept Everfox as one of their preferred vendors for CAT A Mandatory Experience? If so, please provide an amended Enclosure 1 indicating Everfox as a preferred vendor.	See Comment 2305.
2526	Category A Mandatory Experience requires 4 unique preferred vendors from Enclosure 1 solutions and second vendor solution across each of the 4 out of 8 selected technical areas as the minimum response requirements. Given this is a Pass/Fail evaluation criteria, is there an advantage to providing more vendor solutions within Exhibit 3a? If offerors meet the minimum solution requirements, the assumption is a rating of "Pass". Please clarify.	See Comment 5061.
2529	We recommend NASA add NAICS 517110 to Category A, B, and C, as many Contracting Officers utilize this NAICS code for enterprise-wide services and various technology solutions. The omission of this NAICS code from NASA SEWP prevents offerors from utilizing directly relevant contract references as Mandatory Experience and Past Performance references.	See Comment 2949.
2539	Given that four LOAs are required, can the Government expand A.3.7.1(b) Mandatory Experience Letter of Authorization from three pages to four pages, assuming one page per LOA?	See Comment 1957.
2547	Is a O-TTPS Self-Assessed Certification considered a valid active Open Trusted Technology Provider™ Standard (O-TTPS) Certification to attest to meeting the ISO 20243 standard or is a third party assessed certification required.	See Comment 2469.
2552	Where within the Mission Suitability Volume should offerors address this requirement: "The Mission Suitability Proposal must specifically state for which group the offeror is proposing"?	The Solicitation has been updated in an Amendment prior to Amendment 7 to remove this requirement.

sewp6_rfp_all_comments

2556	In reference to Section A.3.7.1, subsection c, page 105, the RFQ states that, " Each Offeror (inclusive of first-tier subcontractors, if applicable) for each NAICS code represented in Section A.1.33 NORTH AMERICAN INDUSTRY CLASSIFICATION SYSTEM (NAICS) & NAICS CODES WITHIN SCOPE..." Should this be addressed as A.1.34?	The solicitation will be updated in an upcoming amendment to state A.1.34.
2558	Please consider exempting Small Businesses from the AbilityOne submission requirement.	See Comment 2322.
2562	In reference to Section A.3.7.1(b), page 103, for Categories B and C, the RFP states that, " If the CLIN is for an hourly labor rate, then the associated labor category shall be provided in Column G (Labor Category if Hourly Rate). " Given the current structure of Exhibit 3b and 3c, can the Government confirm only a Labor Category is to be provided and NOT labor rates?	The labor rate for the labor category should be provided in the SEWP Price column.
2563	Would an offeror submitting a proposal for SEWP VI under NAICS 33411 (size standard 1250 employees) be considered a small business if the offeror has 400 employees?	Yes.
2564	In reference to Section A.3.7.1(b), page 103, for Categories B and C, the RFP states that, " If the CLIN is for an hourly labor rate, then the associated labor category shall be provided in Column G (Labor Category if Hourly Rate)." Will the Government provide additional guidance on CLINS structures and alignment to an Offerors proposed labor categories?	See Comment 2214.
2566	A.3.7.1 OFFER VOLUME, Pg. 98, states "Offeror's subcontracting plan and AbilityOne Commitment Letter, if applicable: The AbilityOne Commitment Letter shall identify the POC from SourceAmerica/NIB and identify plans to subcontract with qualified nonprofit agencies for SEWP opportunities within identified NAICS Codes." If the Offeror is a Small Business, is there a requirement for a separate subcontracting plan or does the AbilityOne Commitment Letter satisfy the subcontracting plan requirement?	See Comment 2207.
2572	A.3.7.1 OFFER VOLUME, Pg. 103, states "Only projects with NAICS codes listed as in-scope for SEWP VI are to be submitted." Is the Offeror required to put the NAICS code that appears in FPDS on Exhibit 1 or are we able to include NAICS that is most relevant to the scope of our contract?	The Offeror is required to use the NAICS code from the Federal Procurement Data System (FPDS) for the referenced project in Exhibit 1. Only projects with NAICS codes listed as in-scope for SEWP VI may be submitted.
2577	A.3.7.2 Past Performance Volume, Pg. 108, states "Offerors identified as HUBZone, SDVOSB, EDWOSB, 8a in Category B and C shall provide past performance references showcasing relevant work in at least two (2) content representative areas for content to be rated relevant (pertinent)." Request that WOSB is added to this list as it is included in list of set-asides for the Relevant Experience Projects (REPs) required in the Offer Volume and WOSBs remain underrepresented in SEWP VI NAICS codes.	See Comment 1697.

sewp6_rfp_all_comments

2581	A.4.3 Phase Two-Past Performance, Pg. 116, states "In Category C, shall provide past performance references showcasing at least 3 content representative areas. HUBZone, SDVOSB, EDWOSB, 8a shall provide past performance references showcasing at least 2 content representative areas." Request that WOSB is added to this list as it is included in list of set-asides for the Relevant Experience Projects (REPs) required in the Offer Volume and WOSBs remain underrepresented in SEWP VI NAICS codes.	See Comment 1697.
2582	Final RFP, pg. 50, Section A.1.22 UNSPSC Codes. A full list of all currently identified in-scope UNSPSC codes for in-scope offerings is found in Attachment C, SEWP Contract Holder User Manual. Attachment C states the full list of UNSPSC codes will be available for download via the Contract Holder Only Page (CHOP). We visited the UNSPSC website and there is a fee to download the codes and we do not know what codes are in-scope for SEWP VI. How do Offerors know what codes apply for Category C (Exhibit 3c)?	See Comment 2395.
2583	How do the UNSPSC codes apply to Category C (services) when the codes seem to be for computer hardware, etc.?	See Comment 2118.
2585	For Exhibit 3c, should Category C Services Vendors create CLINs for labor categories being listed?	See Comment 2214.
2586	Final RFP, pg. 98, Section 3.7.1 Offeror Volume. The second bullet states "The offeror must provide relevant experience as it relates to the NAICS code being used for competition." Please provide an example of what the Offeror is required to provide to address this bullet.	See Comment 2092.
2600	Are current approved commercial subcontracting plans acceptable instead of Individual Subcontracting plans as referenced on page 107 under Information from the Offeror?	See Comment 1978.
2603	The PPQ format in Adobe provided with the solicitation does not function properly. When completing the top of some sections it fills in other data fields automatically and incorrectly, the "radio buttons" on the first page do not work properly as only 1 of the 4 can be "lit up" at once versus it should be 2 (either Y or N in each row, not either Y or N for both rows). We will not be able to get our customers to fill these forms out if they do not work properly and are not easy to use. Please provide an updated PPQ in MS Word and/or an Adobe form that is set up and working properly.	See Comment 1804.
2604	Since "Diagrams, tables, artwork, and photographs shall not be used to circumvent the text size limitations of the proposal." We respectfully request the Technical Approach Volume page count be increased to 30 pages.	The Solicitation will remain as stated.
2605	To be able to address all the requirements for the Management Approach Volume, we respectfully request the total page count for the volume be increased to 20 pages.	The Solicitation will remain as stated.
2606	Paragraph (1) ii. For Category B and C. If the Category C offeror has not identified any ancillary products required for performance, what should the offeror include in their commitment to supply chain management?	See Comment 6409.

sewp6_rfp_all_comments

2610	Reference Attachment I: Would the Government provide Attachment I Small Business Subcontracting Plan, or confirm that we should follow the Subcontracting Plan provided in the CHUM, which is not labeled as Attachment I?	See Comment 2207.
2618	RFP A.3.7.3(a) numbers 2 and 3 are nearly identical; please confirm that 3 is a duplicate in error and should be removed.	See Comment 1808.
2620	The RFP states, "The offeror must provide relevant experience as it relates to the NAICS code being used for competition." Can the Government please clarify what "relevant experience" is required to satisfy this requirement in the Offer Volume versus the Mandatory Experience and Past Performance additionally provided?	See Comment 2092.
2621	Section A.1.47 states, "For any small businesses that were awarded a contract while still in the process of obtaining either a CMMI or ISO 9001-2015 Certification will have to obtain a certification within 12 months of contract award." The cover letter dated 23 May mentions October 2024 as the contract award date but the June 4, 2024 webinar stated May 1, 2025 which was originally the contract start date. Please confirm when contract awards can be expected.	NASA will update timeline information as it becomes available.
2623	An Offeror may submit a single award IDIQ/ BPA at the contract/ agreement level for as a single past performance reference. However, Offerors are not permitted to submit a multiple award or GWAC as an individual past performance reference. Given the scope of SEWP is a multi-award vehicle, please reconsider contractors ability to use a multi-award IDIQ or BPA as a single past performance reference. This will demonstrate an offerors ability to manage a contract of similar construct.	The Solicitation will remain as stated.
2624	pg. 102, A.3.7.1 (b). The designated primary Technical Area shall have a minimum of 1,000 distinct and relevant CLINs from the designated provider for that Technical Area. A minimum of 100 CLINs shall be proposed from the designated provider for the other three (3) non-primary proposed Technical Areas. A minimum of 50 distinct and relevant CLIN's from these secondary providers must be proposed in each of the four Technical Areas. All Offerors must propose a minimum of two service CLINs for Technical Area 9- Product Based Services. If bidders provide more than the minimum number of CLINs, how will those additional CLINS be evaluated?	See Comment 5061.
2628	Please consider reducing font size of headers, footers, and table titles to 10-point.	See Comment 1962.
2629	Please consider allowing bidders to use Arial style font for figures/graphics and tables.	The Solicitation allows for other fonts as long as the result is "not smaller than 12-point type Times New Roman font"

sewp6_rfp_all_comments

2631	<p>In Section 4 of Exhibit 2-PastPerfQues-SEWP VI.pdf, the table where offerors are required to indicate whether they "Performed" or "Did Not Perform" the Technical Areas is not functioning properly. When inserting an "x" under one answer, an "x" appears in both the "Performed" and "Did Not Perform" boxes.</p> <p>Please provide a functional Exhibit as soon as possible and extend the due date for these forms to be returned to be commensurate with the time lapse from RFP release to release of a functional Exhibit 2.</p>	See Comment 1804.
2635	In reference to Exhibit 2, PPQ form, would the government please re-issue the past performance questionnaire in MS Word format? The current document (saved in PDF Format) is not functioning properly.	The Solicitation has been updated in an Amendment prior to Amendment 7.
2642	On page 101, A.3.7.1 (B), under Category A - Letter of Authorization, the RFP states that the LOAs must include "a reference to SEWP VI." Requiring a direct reference to SEWP VI is unreasonable. This requires Offerors to go back to all of their providers and modify otherwise valid and relevant LOAs simply to add a reference to SEWP VI. Will the Government please remove the requirement that LOAs reference SEWP VI directly? Providers will often approve vendors/resellers to offer their products across contracts and not limit the scope of the LOA to one specific contract.	See Comment 1799.
2643	A.1.30 (e) Will the government verify the reference to "paragraph I" is correct?	The Solicitation has been updated in an Amendment prior to Amendment 7.
2645	A.1.30.1 paragraph 1: Please provide clarification as to when the C-SCRM Plan is to be submitted.	The Solicitation has been updated in an Amendment prior to Amendment 7.
2646	<p>Regarding ISO 9001 certification requirements for Small Business Offerors. "It is acceptable to provide proof that the certification approval is in process by providing the Point of Contact information including the name of appraisal body and name, phone number, and email of a representative from whom the Offeror is obtaining the verification."</p> <p>Accreditation by a formal registrar for ISO 9001 only takes 1-2 months. However, there is significant preparation in advance of the assessment by the registrar needed. Given the Government has stipulated that an awarded small business offeror has 12 months to obtain their ISO certification, might the Government also accept points of contact for 3rd party consultancies that help businesses prepare for the ISO assessment or a project plan for completing the ISO assessment within the required 12 months as proof the certification is in process?</p>	As noted in the Solicitation, It is acceptable to provide proof that the certification approval is in process by providing the Point of Contact information including the name of appraisal body and name, phone number, and email of a representative from whom the Offeror is obtaining the certification.
2647	A.1.34, Category C NAICS Table: In accordance with 2022 NAICS code manual, NAICS 519190 has been replaced with 519290. Please confirm that NAICS 519190 remains valid.	The Solicitation has been updated in Amendment 1 to replace NAICS 519190 with 519290.
2649	A.1.38 (d): The first sentence refers to "paragraph I." Please provide the location of paragraph I.	The Solicitation has been updated in an Amendment prior to Amendment 7.

sewp6_rfp_all_comments

2657	A.2.1: In reference to Attachment G. This Attachment is not referenced anywhere with the RFP. Please provide Attachment G and/or instructions as to the content, when this is required for submittal, and in which volume it should be included.	See Comment 1675.
2662	The provided SEWP VI EXHIBIT 2- PAST PERFORMANCE QUESTIONNAIRE form has several data entry issues; radio buttons/checkboxes don't work correctly, evaluator information table will copy text all the way down the table, and the Section 4. Technical Area Relevance Ratings copies the checks across the row and marks "performed" and "not performed" simultaneously. Will a new PPQ form be provided?	See Comment 1804.
2663	Reference A.3.7.1; RFP pg.101: Will an offeror be permitted to leverage a parent company provider Letter of Authorization for Technical Area?	See Comment 2305.
2667	RFP page 103, Section A.3.7.1 OFFER VOLUME (b) Mandatory Experience/Offerings states, "Only projects with NAICS codes listed as in-scope for SEWP VI are to be submitted." For prime contracts, must Offerors cite the NAICS listed on Federal Procurement Data System (FPDS), or can they list the relevant NAICS to which work was performed as it relates to Category B?	See Comment 2572.
2669	SEWP VI Final RFP document; Page 103 Reference: "...(b) Mandatory experience offering. For Category B and C. Only projects with NAICS codes listed as in-scope for SEWP VI are to be submitted." Question/Comment: Will the government consider adding NAICS code 541611?	The Solicitation has been updated in Amendment 1 to add NAICs 541611.
2673	Category A, Technical Area 6a Audio/Video Equipment: Does this Category and Technical Area allow the inclusion of projects to custom design and install complex video walls and audio visual multimedia suites such as those that have been created for the launch facilities at NRO Vandenberg and Canaveral, and which cannot be priced in advance due to the customization and complexity of such projects? In other words, can complex ITC/AV projects be listed as "price TBD" CLINS under this Category and Technical Area?	The types of services noted are in scope for SEWP. When adding the products prior to award, the price can be set to \$0 and the description note the item is "To be Priced". Contract Holders will be provided guidance on how to handles To be Priced CLINs post-award.
2674	80TECH24R0001 SEWP VI Final RFP; Page 103 - (b) Mandatory experience offering. For Category B and C. Only projects with NAICS codes listed as in-scope for SEWP VI are to be submitted. QUESTION: Will the government consider adding NAICS code 541611?	See Comment 2669.
2676	80TECH24R0001 SEWP VI Final RFP; Page 111 - 2. The offeror shall describe their ITC/AV-based solutions and/or services and how the proposed features provide technological leadership in allowing for the next generation of technology in terms of both solutions and services. 3. The offeror shall describe their ITC/AV-based solutions and services and how the proposed architectural features provide technological leadership in allowing for the next generation of technology QUESTION - Will the government consider combining #2 and #3 based on their similarity in wording or provide additional clarification on the differences between the requirements?	The Solicitation has been updated in an Amendment prior to Amendment 7.

sewp6_rfp_all_comments

2681	In Section A.3.7.1 on page 98, the RFP states, "relevant experience as it relates to the NAICS code being used for competition" as part of the Offeror Volume. This is almost an identical requirement to page 105, Past Performance Volume, "The offeror must provide past performance submissions as it relates to the NAICS code being used for competition." Will the Government please clarify what information is required, where, with regards to experience as it relates to the NAICS codes?	See Comment 2092.
2686	A.3.6 (B)(2): RFP states, "...using not smaller than 12-point type Times New Roman font inclusive of headers, footers, and any graphic captions" and "the margins may contain headers and footers" Question, given that text in headers and footer must not contain proposal content to be evaluated, may text in headers and footers be 10-pt font size?	See Comment 1962.
2689	Section A.1.47 states that: "for any small businesses that were awarded a contract while still in the process of obtaining either a CMMI or ISO 9001-2015 Certification will have to obtain a certification within 12 months of contract award." Is it sufficient to submit a letter of intent from an ISO 9001 registrar which shows that the audit is scheduled for FY Quarter 3?	See Comment 2646.
2690	Section A.3.7.1 (a) states: "If an offeror is a small business that is not certified to the standard at the time of proposal submission, proof that the certification approval is in process is acceptable and shall be provided at the time of proposal submission". May the Government please confirm that a Letter of Intent which shows the audit is scheduled from a Registrar is sufficient? May the Government provide a list of acceptable documents which provide proof that the certification is in process (i.e., results from an internal audit, letter of intent from the registrar, etc.)?	The minimum requirement can be met by starting the process and identifying the POCs as stated in the Solicitation. There is no requirement that the formal certification process is in progress beyond identifying the POCs who will perform the certification. No additional information beyond the POCs should be submitted.
2691	Section A.3.7.1 OFFER VOLUME, Page 103, the RFP requires Offerors proposing to Category C to complete Exhibit 3c-Category C Solutions Spreadsheet. It further requires the use of UNSPSC Codes. Is there additional instruction available on completing this exhibit? Understand the labor rates will not be reviewed or evaluated but the actual instruction on completing this Exhibit needs clarity and expansion.	See Comment 2214.
2695	RFP A.3.7.3(a) numbers 2 and 3 are nearly identical; please confirm that 3 is a duplicate in error and should be removed.	See Comment 1808.
2717	80TECH24R0001 SEWP VI Final RFP, Section A.4.4 Phase Three- Mission Suitability, Page 120 states "Offerors will need a high confidence rating in both subfactors to have an overall High confidence rating in Mission Suitability," followed by a table that seems contradictory to this statement. This table includes columns, rows, and cells that are misaligned / mislabeled. QUESTION: Can the Government please clarify the meaning of this table or provide an updated table that reflects the referenced statement?	The Solicitation has been updated in an Amendment prior to Amendment 7.
2718	A.1.2 - Technical Area 1a and 4a, pages 26 & 28: "Anti-fatigue mats, Bags and cases for ITC/AV products, ITC/AV Shipping Products and Supplies". These three sub areas are included in both technical area 1a and 4a. Which technical area do these belong to?	See Comment 4028.

2722	<p>80TECH24R0001 SEWP VI Final RFP, Section A.1.22 UNSPSC CODES, Page 50 states: "A full list of all currently identified in-scope UNSPSC codes for in-scope offerings is found in Attachment C, SEWP Contract Holder User Manual."</p> <p>ATTACHMENT C- SEWP Contractor Holder User Manual, Section entitled "UNSPSC Codes," Page 27 states: "A full list of all currently identified in-scope UNSPSC codes for in-scope offerings will be made available for download via the Contract Holder Only Page (CHOP)."</p> <p>QUESTION: Can the Government please provide the list of all currently identified in-scope UNSPSC codes for in-scope offerings so that Offerors can complete Exhibits 3a/3b/3c- Category A/B/C Solutions Spreadsheets?</p>	See Comment 2395.
2726	<p>Reference: Exhibit 2-PastPerfQues-SEWP VI & RFP Page 109</p> <p>QUESTION: Various Sections in this form are not functional. For example, clicking on Prime Contractor check box on Page 1 results in a check in the box for Prime Contractor, Significant Contractor, and Team Member and these checkmarks are not editable. Numerous fields are inappropriately auto-populated based on values input for other fields (e.g., Section 3 – Evaluator Information, after entering the Name, all other fields are populated with the value of the Name field and are not editable; Section 6, after entering the Contract Value, many other fields are populated with the contract value and are not editable). Could the Government please correct all of these issues and test the form to ensure it is functional, then release an updated form ASAP so that Offerors can obtain PPQ responses from customer references and meet the proposal response deadline?</p>	See Comment 1804.
2729	<p>Exhibit 2, Instructions: Will the government provide an updated Exhibit 2 - Past Performance Questionnaire? The Instructions paragraph cuts off at the end.</p>	The Solicitation has been updated in an Amendment prior to Amendment 7.
2730	<p>Exhibit 2, Section 3 & 6: Will the government provide an updated Exhibit 2 that resolves the auto-population and overwriting of data in Sections 3 and 6?</p>	See Comment 1804.
2733	<p>Exhibit 2, Section 4, Category C: The Technical Areas do not match Section A.1.2 Scope of Work starting on page 36. Will the government update Exhibit 2?</p>	See Comment 1804.
2737	<p>A.3.7.1: Category A - Letter of Authorization: "There shall be an LOA for each different designated provider for a maximum of four (4) LOAs." The page count in the Proposal Submission Table on page 96 states the page limitation is 3 for "Mandatory Experience Letter of Authorization (LOAs)". An LOA is at least 1 page. How do we submit 4 LOAs when the page limitation 3? Is this a typo?</p>	See Comment 1957.
2739	<p>Will the Government please confirm that none of the attachments listed, G-L, on page 88 in Section A.2.1 are due at time of proposal submission?</p>	See Comment 1659 and 1675.

sewp6_rfp_all_comments

2740	If any of the attachments G-L on page 88 of Section A.2.1 are due at time of proposal submission, will the Government please clarify which?	See Comment 1659 and 1675.
2742	Exhibit 2, Section 4: May the Offeror delete Categories A and B of Exhibit 2 if they are only representing Category C?	The Solicitation has been updated to separate Exhibit 2 by Category.
2744	Exhibit 2, Section 2: When selecting a response to "During the contract performance being evaluated, this company was the:", all options are selected by auto-population. Will the government remove the auto-populated sections and provide an update to Exhibit 2?	See Comment 1804.
2747	In A.1.30.1, the RFP states, "In accordance with DRD #3, a C-SCRM Plan must be submitted to the SEWP Program Management Office annually and no later than 60 calendar days prior to the Contract award date and will be incorporated into the contract as Attachment J." The cover letter lists October 2024 as the contract award timeframe, with May 1, 2025 as the contract start date. Recently SAM.gov was changed to say contract award date is May 1, 2025 with no mention of contract start date. Would the government please confirm the contract award date?	See Comment 1675.
2750	In Section A.1.2, on page 27, Category A, Technology Group 3a includes unified communications and telecommunication devices and services. Similar and related technologies would presumably include teleconferencing equipment and headsets. These technologies, however, are also included in Technical Area 6a. Will the Government please confirm such technologies may be listed under either Technology Area?	See Comment 4028.
2751	Exhibit 2, Section 3: The fields do not allow for individual input for each item. For example, when entering the "Name," the form automatically populates through the "Phone" field. We request a correction of the form for proper evaluation.	See Comment 1804.
2753	The RFP states, "The offeror must provide relevant experience as it relates to the NAICS code being used for competition." Can the Government please clarify what "relevant experience" is required to satisfy this requirement in the Offer Volume versus the Mandatory Experience and Past Performance additionally provided?	See Comment 2092.
2754	The Government provides that, "The offeror must provide relevant experience as it relates to the NAICS code being used for competition." Does this mean that the REP and Past Performance submission MUST match the NAICS code being used for competition? For example, if Offeror qualifies as SB under NAICS 518210, only past performance and REP projects with NAICS 518210 may be utilized?	See Comment 2092.
2755	Section A.1.2, on page 25: Category A, Technology Area 1a focuses on computers and includes related and peripheral technologies. Presumably this would also include keyboard, mouse, and monitors. These peripherals, however, are called out in Technology Area 4a. Will the Government please confirm that computer peripherals can be included in Technology Area 1a?	See Comment 4028.
2758	Category A in the PWS includes 9 content areas, with 9 being product services. The RFP instructions for past performance only direct offerors to address content areas 1 - 8. In the June 4 Industry Day, the speaker implied that Cat A Past Performance included content area 9. Request the Government clarify whether content area 9 should be addressed in Cat A Past Performance.	See Comment 4778.

sewp6_rfp_all_comments

2759	The list of Category B content areas for Mandatory Experience (pg 104) is consistent with the PWS listing. The Category B listing for past performance (pg 108) is numbered differently. The list of Category C content areas for Mandatory Experience (pg 104) is not consistent with the PWS. The list of Category C content areas for past performance (pg 108 - 109) is consistent with the PWS. Request the government make the sequence and numbering of content areas consistent between the PWS, Mandatory Experience list, Past Performance List, and questionnaire to prevent confusion when aligning responses to the content areas.	The Solicitation has been updated in an Amendment prior to Amendment 7.
2766	Enclosure 1 is now incredibly limited. Many of the OEMs listed on Enclosure 1 also sell third party products, such as SonicWall. When completing Exhibit 3a, may Offerors list third party products procured through the designated provider? E.g., SonicWall products purchased through Microsoft or Dell Technologies?	See Comment 5655.
2767	There is clear overlap between the Category A technology areas. Will the Government please confirm that it is acceptable to include related technologies under desired Technology Areas without splitting hairs about which specific technology belongs in which specific area (e.g., conferencing equipment in group 3a vs. 6a)?	See Comment 4028.
2769	Exhibit 2, Section 4, Category C: When you enter an "X" under Perform or Did Not Perform, that "X" shows up under both columns. We request correction of the form for proper evaluation.	See Comment 1804.
2772	For Mandatory Experience (REP) "Small Businesses: A total of three (3) different REPs from different mandatory experience technical areas shall be submitted". Does this mean a total of 30 REPs must be submitted?	The Solicitation has been updated in an Amendment prior to Amendment 7.
2777	SF1449: Will the government provide an extension for submission based on the number of unanswered questions and required corrections to Exhibits?	The Comment is out of date.
2787	If a small business bids on both Category B and Category C with 2 REP's (as a WOSB for instance), will they receive solicitations in the SB track? Even if SB track requires more capabilities (like 3 REP's vs 2 for certain Socio-Economic tracks)?	See Comment 1881.
2794	Chances are many Offerors will propose the same OEMs' products for the Category A CLINs, with no way of knowing whether other Offerors are proposing the same part numbers. Please confirm that identical product data (provider, part numbers, descriptions) among different offerors' proposals is not a disqualifier.	The Solicitation restriction for duplicate offerings does not refer to proposed products and services listed in Exhibit 3.
2795	Regarding Management Approach Volume (III-B), please consider expanding the page limitation to 30 pages to allow for enough space to provide sufficient detail.	The Solicitation will remain as stated.
2798	The \$30M requirement is an excessive amount for a single project, even for enterprise-wide services. Most task orders on NASA SEWP V were/are much lower in value than the \$30M requirement. Would the government consider reducing the REP dollar requirement to \$5M per REP for Other Than Small Businesses as well?	The Solicitation will remain as stated.

sewp6_rfp_all_comments

2799	Some of the large OEMs only provide a standard form Letter of Authorization which states that a company is authorized to sell their product and services. This Form letter typically is on the OEM's letterhead, contains a statement that a company is authorized to sell their product and services, signed or sometimes stamped, by an authorized representative of the company and has the company contact and address information -- but being a standard form letter will not include a reference to SEWP VI. Is this an acceptable LOA?	See Comment 1799.
2800	Some OEMs have licensed reseller and distributors for their product and services. When asking for the CLINs and/or LOA, these OEMs have directed us to contact their reseller or distributors for the data. The RFP requirements state that the LOA needs to be provided directly from the OEM. Can this requirement be changed to include LOAs from Licensed Distributors and Resellers?	The Solicitation will remain as stated.
2801	Please consider allowing Other Than Small Businesses who are pursuing CMMI certification to provide proof that certification approval is in process at the time of proposal submission.	The Solicitation has been updated in an Amendment prior to Amendment 7.
2809	There is no listing of in-scope UNSPSC codes published in the final RFP. Are you going to publish a listing in time for final RFP submissions?	See Comment 2949.
2829	If an Offeror is awarded a SEWP VI contract, during the performance of the contract can the Offeror add new CLINs within Technical Areas that they did not originally bid?	See Comment 4152.
2840	Will the Government support a 2 week extension on the proposal submission deadline from 11 July to 25 July? This will allow offerors additional time to decouple answers to questions and analyze any revised solicitation documents.	The Comment is out of date.
2845	RFP States "A total of 2 different REPs...shall be submitted" for SDVOSB offerors. Can more than two REPs be submitted?	No. Only the required number of REPs as indicated in A.3.7.1 OFFER VOLUME (b) Mandatory Experience/ Offerings should be submitted.
2850	Attachment J- C-SCRM Attestation Form: Please Confirm that this form is not required for our proposal.	See Comment 1675.
2851	8. OFFER DUE DATE/ LOCAL TIME: Request for extension of offer due date by 60 days from the date of publishing the Q&A response.	The Comment is out of date.
2854	Industry was previously told that there would be a 60-day response time when the RFP posted, would SEWP consider providing the full 60 days updating the due date to 7/22/2024?	The Comment is out of date.
2861	Is there only one letter of authorization required per each 4 categories of our choosing?	See Comment 1957.

2862	We need to provide 4 LOA's but the page limit for the LOA's is 3 pages, please advice?	See comment 1957.
2870	Attachment J, C-SCRM PDF doc will not allow the doc to be completed as presented, The vendor Response column only allows one out of the many choices to be clicked on, there is no way to directly address/complete this. Can NASA please release a document that is editable?	See Comment 1675.
2877	If a certified 8(a) offeror successfully bids using the associated 8(a) thresholds on REPs and Past Performance, will that 8(a) offeror be eligible to bid Small Business set-aside opportunities upon award? Or does the 8(a) offeror need to meet the more stringent Small Business thresholds to be eligible for Small Business set-asides upon award?	See Comment 1881.
2878	Section A.3.7.1(b) Category A Letter of Authorization (Page 101-102) - For Category A, the RFP requires a Letter of Authorization (LOA) for each proposed designated provider for the 4 selected technical areas. Can you clarify if an LOA is required for any secondary providers proposed beyond the designated provider in each technical area?	See Comment 1874.
2888	2. The offeror shall describe their ITC/AV-based solutions and/or services and how the proposed features provide technological leadership in allowing for the next generation of technology in terms of both solutions and services. 3. The offeror shall describe their ITC/AV-based solutions and services and how the proposed architectural features provide technological leadership in allowing for the next generation of technology. Please clarify the difference between #2 and #3.	See Comment 1808.
2892	Exhibit 3b. SEWP Catalog Price, Labor Category (if Hourly Rate). Are vendors being asked to provide their own Labor Categories, Descriptions, Requirements, and Hourly Rates?	See Comment 2285.
2893	Exhibit 3b OEM Provider, Provider Part Number, UNSPSC Code. Please clarify how Category B Contract Holders should complete this Exhibit, when we are responding to services in Section A.1.2, not supplying facilities, products, or equipment.	See Comment 2214.
2897	There is a very high interest in the SEWP VI contract. Some companies may not be totally familiar with the AbilityOne program and processes. As a result the AbilityOne program may be overrun with questions creating delays. Would the SEWP PMO consider the following? At proposal submission companies must demonstrate that they are in the process of securing needed documentation required for the AbilityOne requirements. Additionally all documentation must be provided 60 days after submission.	See comment 2322.

sewp6_rfp_all_comments

2899	<p>Referencing Exhibit 3b, if the offeror is tool and software agnostic in responding to NASA SEWP solutions please confirm that for Category B, Exhibit 3b only our related CLINs (Column A), SEWP Catalog Price (Column F), and Labor Categories (hourly) (Column G) are required.</p> <p>Please confirm that the UNSPSC Code (Column E) does not need to be entered into Exhibit 3b for proposal submission. If it does, where does the Offeror find the UNSPSC codes if they are not provided before proposal submission?</p>	See Comment 2214.
2914	<p>"Any proposal found to be a duplication or replica of another offeror (company) or have a section that is a duplication or replica of another offeror (company), that is not a part of a joint venture or contractor teaming arrangement, will lead to all identified offerors being ineligible for award and will not be evaluated by the Government."</p> <p>Does this apply to CLINS used to satisfy the requirements of Exhibit 3a? Please note that there are only so many CLINS available from the limited list of OEMs in Enclosure 1; it is likely that those OEMs will distribute standard lists of CLINS to all their authorized resellers and NASA will receive those lists multiple times.</p>	See Comment 2794.
2916	The table in this section lists attachments A - L but the Final RFP package only seems to have attachments A - D and J. Would the Government please provide the missing attachments.	The Solicitation has been updated in an Amendment prior to Amendment 7.
2918	<p>Exhibit 3b-cContract Line Item Number (CLIN):</p> <p>Can bidders use CLINS from any government contract? Or should we just start with 0001 and count up from there, on the assumption that this "will only be utilized to establish the initial Contract Database of Record upon Contract award."?</p>	See Comment 2214.
2919	<p>Exhibit 3b-cMultiple columns:</p> <p>For labor categories, should bidders leave the Provider (OEM/Service Provider), Provider Part Number, Description, and UNSPSC Code columns blank?</p>	See Comment 2214.
2920	<p>The Technical Approach references the A.1.2 GSFC 52.211-91 SCOPE OF WORK (FEB 2016) which includes 11 technical areas (the 11th area is Program Management); however, the content representative areas associated with REPs (A.3.7.1 - page 104) and Past Performances (A.3.7.2 - page 108) include only 10 areas. Did the government intend the two Category B technical area lists to be different? If not, will the 11th technical area on page 29 be removed to mirror the REP and Past Performance Content Areas?</p>	See Comment 4778.
2925	Based on the significance of the changes from the draft RFQ to final RFQ and the number of questions proposed by industry. Kindly requesting the SEWP Program Office consider extending the due date of proposals to 60 days after questions answered.	The Comment is out of date.

sewp6_rfp_all_comments

2926	<p>Cybersecurity-Supply Chain Risk Management (C-SCRM) Plan (Attestation Form)</p> <p>In accordance with DRD #3, a C-SCRM Plan must be submitted to the SEWP Program Management Office annually and no later than 60 calendar days prior to the Contract award date and will be incorporated into the contract as Attachment J.</p> <p>When is 60 calendar days prior to contract award?</p>	<p>The solicitation was updated to remove the reference to 60 calendar days prior to contract award. See Comment 1675.</p>
2929	<p>Attachment A SEWP Scope - A1. Acquisition Objectives: Please clarify if Acquisition Objective 3 is solely for Category A Offerors.</p> <p>3. To provide the federal government with a wide range of ITC/AV hardware, communications, audio-visual and related hardware, software, and ITC/AV services to enhance the federal government's Information Technology capabilities.</p>	<p>All Acquisition Objectives are pertinent to all Categories as stated: " ITC/AV hardware, communications, audio-visual and related hardware, software, and ITC/AV services " which includes services.</p>
2930	<p>Mandatory Experience Letter of Authorization (LOAs) - 3 Pages</p> <p>There are 4 LOAs required, and some of the letters are more than 1 page each. Recommend excluding LOAs from the page restrictions.</p>	<p>See Comment 1957.</p>
2933	<p>Mandatory Experience Letter of Authorization (LOAs):The Proposal Submission Table lists that the Offeror Volume 1 must have Mandatory Experience Letters of Authorization (3 page limit), but does not specify which Category this applies to. Please confirm that only Category A needs to submit LOAs and not Categories B and C.</p>	<p>See Comment 1782.</p>
2936	<p>Currently NAICS 541611 is not listed in Category C in A.1.34. The work performed in this NAICS is similar to work listed in Category C technical services areas. This includes technical areas such as: 1c)Innovation Services, 2c) Information and Data Analysis Services (IDAS), 6c) Digital Multimedia and Technical Communications Services, and 11c) Program Management and Ancillary Services. Would the government consider adding 541611 as an acceptable NAICS code for Category C in order to allow vendors to present related and capable past performance examples demonstrating their ability to effectively provide Category Services to clients?</p>	<p>See Comment 2669.</p>
2944	<p>The offeror must provide relevant experience as it relates to the NAICS code being used for competition.</p> <p>Is this bullet requesting information in addition to the REPs requested later in this section, or is this bullet simply guidance?</p>	<p>See Comment 2092.</p>

sewp6_rfp_all_comments

2946	Currently NAICS 541611 is not listed in Category C in A.1.34. The work performed in this NAICS is similar to work listed in Category C technical services areas. This includes technical areas such as: 1c) Innovation Services, 2c) Information and Data Analysis Services (IDAS), 6c) Digital Multimedia and Technical Communications Services, and 11c) Program Management and Ancillary Services. Would the government consider adding 541611 as an acceptable NAICS code for Category C in order to allow vendors to present related and capable past performance examples demonstrating their ability to effectively provide Category Services to clients?	See Comment 2669.
2949	Given that NAICS 517111 Wired Telecommunications Carriers, is commonly used for services-based contracts, with activities including Network Tier 1 and 2 support, Voice support, Network Engineering, Voice Engineering, Information Assurance, Cyber Security Support, ITSM support, and Systems Engineering, will the Government consider adding NAICS 51711 to the in-scope list for category B and C?	The Solicitation has been updated in a previous amendment to include 517111 Wired Telecommunications Carriers.
2952	(2)Page 48 DD250 -- Manufacturers ship direct to agency. The Form DD250 inside or outside the box is not likely. Can contract holders send the DD250 via e-mail to the CO? a.DD250, "Material Inspection and Receiving Report" (whs.mil) b.Steve, look at the DD250 form and rewrite the question. I do not think we want to have to do this if we can help it. If we schedule shipment directly from the OEM to the agency, is a DD250 required.	The Solicitation has been updated in an Amendment prior to Amendment 7.
2956	Regarding Offerors to provide a Letter of Authorization (LOA) from a designated provider (OEM), can you modify this requirement to allow the Letter of Authorization to be issued by the authorized distributor(s)	The Solicitation will remain as stated.
2959	Can you please consider extending the proposal due date by 3 weeks since the questions are not yet answered by NASA.	The Comment is out of date.
2966	Please confirm—if an Offeror submits a proposal under Category A as a small business and is awarded a contract, the small business will qualify for full and open large business opportunities as well as small business set-aside?	Yes.
2970	The PPQ format provided with the solicitation does not function properly. When completing the top of some sections it fills in other data fields automatically. Will you be issuing an amended PPQ document? Also, the box provided in Section 2: Description of Contract does not provide adequate space for us to make sure our response can speak to all of the required Technical Areas. Can the box be expanded?	The Solicitation has been updated in an Amendment prior to Amendment 7.
2976	Page 103 states that "Offerors proposing to category B and/ or C shall complete Exhibit 3b- Category B Solutions Spreadsheet and Exhibit 3c- Category C Solutions Spreadsheet." For Exhibit 3b and Exhibit 3c, would the Government provide several rows of examples on how Services providers should complete these attachments for Categories B and C?	See Comment 2214.

sewp6_rfp_all_comments

2977	Regarding A.3.7.1, Offeror Volume, Offeror NAICS Size Standard Crosswalk (Exhibit 4). Will the Government Clarify what "An Offeror will be grouped within a scope category based on the size standard associated with NAICS Code identified in Exhibit 4"? For example, if an Offeror is categorized as a Small Business and a Service Disabled Veteran-Owned Small Business per NAICS 541519, but there are certain NAICS within Exhibit 4 that qualify the SB/SDVOSB as a LB.	See Comment 1881.
2980	Page 36 Recommend replacing "threshold restriction" with "award value limit."	The Solicitation will remain as stated.
2981	The listed Attachments include items G-L. These were not found in the solicitation files. Please confirm that these will be attached to the contract and will not be required with the offer.	See Comment 1659 and 1675.
2983	Please confirm that a SDVOSB Offeror who is awarded a contract under Category B - Small Business will be able to pursue task orders that are both Small Business AND SDVOSB after contract award, vice only being able to pursue SDVOSB set-asides.	See Comment 1881.
2984	Page 109 of the RFP states that "Offerors identified as HUBZone, SDVOSB, EDWOSB, 8a in Category B and C shall provide past performance references showcasing relevant work in at least two (2) content representative areas for content to be rated relevant (pertinent)." We believe that the WOSB designation is missing from the following paragraph. Will the Government add WOSB to this list?	See Comment 1697.
2987	Page 110 The solicitation references Exhibit 2 - PastPerfQues, on page 2, the Prime Contractor, Significant Subcontractor, and Team Member checkboxes all populate when one box is checked. This error occurs in Sections 3 & 4 as well. Please provide a revised Exhibit 2 reconciling these errors.	See Comment 1804.
2988	If a vendor submits a prime offer as a WOSB or 8(a) or one of the other socioeconomic, then once the task order proposals are issued under the eventual SEWP VI GWAC, will we only be limited to task orders that are set aside for our specific socioeconomic category? Meaning, a WOSB can only bid on task orders set aside for WOSBs and not small businesses generally?	See Comment 1881.
2991	Page 88 of the RFP lists Attachment G, "Diversity, Equity, Inclusion, and Accessibility (DEIA) Plan- Applicable for Categories B & C" to be submitted with proposal. Would the Government remove this Plan from the requirements for all SB offeror types? This would help to alleviate administrative and financial pressures on all small businesses types, allowing them to focus on their core operations and growth. This can level the competitive playing field, enabling all small business types to compete more effectively with firms that have more resources to implement DEIA programs.	See Comment 1675.
2993	Page 88 of the RFP lists Attachment G, "Diversity, Equity, Inclusion, and Accessibility (DEIA) Plan- Applicable for Categories B & C" to be submitted with proposal. If the Government will not remove this proposal requirement from all SB offeror types, would the government provide a template for all SB offeror types to work from?	The Solicitation will remain as stated. SEWP will work with all Contract Holders on all aspects of the Program post-award.
2994	Can the Government please consider extending the due date by at least two months to allow for vendors to evaluate the volume of questions that have been asked?	The Comment is out of date.

sewp6_rfp_all_comments

2995	<p>Question regarding: Exhibit 3b- Category B Solutions Spreadsheet attachment.</p> <p>Please provide additional instructions on how you want us to fill out this spreadsheet. If you are not providing products in your response, how do you want us to respond to this requirement?</p>	See Comment 2214.
2996	<p>For category A Past performance reference it states minimum average annual cost incurred of 150,000 for these to be rated relevant but than category C is at 500,000 dollars. Was this a typo and both are \$500,000 or is Category C \$150,000. Thank You</p>	See Comment 1709.
3002	<p>NAICS Code 519190 does not exist anymore. Would the Government remove this NAICS from the listing?</p>	The Solicitation has been updated in an Amendment prior to Amendment 7.
3011	<p>For the in-scope training area, are there any specific training programs or curricula that the government prefers?</p>	See Comment 6670.
3013	<p>Exhibit 2 is a fillable form, however it has a glitch in which forces an auto populate. Would the government please create an amendment to address this issue?</p>	See Comment 1804.
3015	<p>Reference: RFP Section A.2.1, List of Attachments, page 88 Question: Attachments G through L include a "TBS = To Be Submitted" designation, and Attachments G, H, J, and L have an asterisk in front of the TBS. a.)Are all TBS attachments to be submitted with the proposal, or should some of them be submitted post award? If some are to be submitted post award, please define which. b.)Please define the asterisk.</p>	The solicitation has been updated to clarify the table listings and remove the asterisk.
3016	<p>Reference: RFP Section A.3.6.B, Proposal Format and Organization, page 96 Question: Since Offerors are required to submit 4 Mandatory Experience Letters of Authorization under Category A, will the Government please change the page limitation from 3 pages to 4 pages?</p>	The Solicitation has been updated in an Amendment prior to Amendment 7.
3018	<p>Reference: RFP Section A.3.7.1(b) Offer Volume, Mandatory Experience Offerings, Points of Contact and Technical Area Tabs, page 102 Question: Will the Government please consider removing the requirement that each of the 4 required designated "must be from the list of approved SEWP Providers listed in Enclosure 1". This is a limited list of offerings, many of which are not future focused.</p>	The Solicitation will remain as stated.
3025	<p>Reference: RFP Section A.3.7.2(a)12, Past Performance History, page 108 Question: The solicitation defines CATEGORY A Content Representative Areas 1-8, but does not identify Content Representative Area 9 - Product-Based Services. Please add this area to the list.</p>	See Comment 4778.
3031	<p>Is the Letter of Authorization required for Categories B or C? There is no explicit reference to LOA for Categories B and C.</p>	See Comment 1782.

3032	Refer to RFP page 100, section "(a) ISO 9001 and CMMI Certification." What constitutes adequate verification to demonstrate that a CMMI certification is in process? Would a letter or email from the certification body, including their contact information, suffice?	See Comment 2200.
3033	Following contract award, will each successful awardee within a particular Category of their proposal (A, B or C) be eligible to participate in all the sub-areas of their successful Category bid, or will they be restricted only to the subareas explicitly identified and described in their proposal?	See Comment 1881.
3038	Mandatory Experience Letter of Authorizations page limit is 3; however, offerors can provide a max of 4 LOAs. Please increase the page limit to allow 4 pages (1 for each LOA) for relevant submissions.	See Comment 1957.
3042	The second bullet in the referenced paragraph asks the Offeror to provide relevant experience as it relates to the NAICS code being use for competition. Is this experience in addition to the Mandatory Experience requirements/Offerings? Please clarify the requirements for this section of the proposal.	See Comment 2092.
3043	The third bullet in the referenced paragraph asks the Offeror to provide a subcontracting plan and AbilityOne commitment letter if applicable. Paragraph A.2.1 on page 87 of the RFP (list of attachments) does not include a subcontracting plan and there is no subcontracting plan noted in the exhibits or instructions to offerors. Please confirm that this solicitation does not require a small business subcontracting plan.	See Comment 2207.
3046	For Category A proposals: are bidders limited to only including products under four (4) Technical Areas (for Areas 1-8) + Technical Area 9, or can proposers bid products (and include them in Exhibit 3a) across as many of the nine (9) Technical Areas as they are able to provide products for? If bidders are allowed to bid across more than four (4) Technical Areas, are bidders allowed to provide LOAs from more than four (4) OEMs? If it is the Government's intent to restrict bidders to only bidding products under four (4) Technical Areas (Areas 1-8) and Technical Area 9, the Government should consider revising this requirement to allow Category A proposals to include products across all Technical Areas (with a minimum of four (4) +Technical Area 9) and also allow them to provide LOAs from as many OEMs as necessary to cover all proposed products. Revising this Requirement will significantly increase both the quantity and variety of products that SEWP VI customers can access and purchase under the Vehicle and will increase competition/drive pricing down for products that are within Scope under the Vehicle. It will also decrease the number of Technical Refreshes made by Contract Holders which will result in cost savings for NASA.	See Comment 5061.
3048	Please confirm that Offerors are not limited to bidding on the four selected technical areas after contract award, but may bid on orders in any technical area represented in their complete SEWP VI catalog.	See Comment 1881.

3050	<p>The RFP indicates that only products that have in-Scope UNSPSC codes will be accepted under the SEWP VI Contract. The RFP states that Attachment C has more information on the codes that will be acceptable (in-Scope) under SEWP VI, however, Attachment C doesn't appear to have this information (Attachment C verbiage: "A full list of all currently identified in-scope UNSPSC codes for in-scope offerings will be made available for download via the Contract Holder Only Page (CHOP)"). Is the Government planning to update Attachment C to include the full list of the UNSPSC codes that will be allowed under Category A since bidders cannot access CHOP until they have been awarded a SEWP VI Contract? If the Government does not plan to share the list of in-Scope UNSPSC codes, the Government should consider revising the requirement to remove the inclusion of UNSPSC codes, as bidders will have no way of knowing if the products they have selected for their bids align with in-Scope UNSPSC codes.</p>	See Comment 2949.
3051	Please confirm that LOAs are required only for proposals submitted for Category A.	See Comment 1782.
3055	<p>The referenced section states that small businesses proposing in Category A must provide past performance with a minimum average annual value of \$150,000 to be considered relevant. However, Section IV.A.4.3, Phase Two-Past Performance (page 116) states that small businesses in category A shall furnish past performance with an average annual cost/fee incurred of \$500,000. Please specify the correct annual value.</p>	See Comment 1709.
3057	<p>The RFP indicates that Category A proposers must include at least 1,000 distinct and relevant CLINs for the primary proposed Technical Area and 100 distinct and relevant CLINs for the other three (3) non-primary proposed Technical Areas, and that those (1,000 and 100) CLINs must be from a Designated Provider, as defined in Enclosure 1. Further, the RFP indicates that at least 50 distinct and relevant CLINs per proposed Technical Area must be included from Secondary Providers. It is unclear whether the Secondary Providers must be providers defined in Enclosure 1, or if they can be OEMs not identified in Enclosure 1. Please clarify whether Secondary Providers can be OEMs not included in the list provided in Enclosure 1. If the Secondary Providers can be OEMs not listed in Enclosure 1, what are the requirements surrounding Secondary Providers? For example, can a company who is an Approved Provider under SEWP V- but that is not on the Designated Provider list in SEWP VI Enclosure 1 - be included in SEWP VI proposals as a Secondary Provider? Will the Government require Secondary Providers to provide LOAs to bidders to include in their proposal submission?</p>	See Comment 1874 and 5655.
3060	<p>A.3.7.1 OFFER VOLUME (b) Mandatory Experience - Can the Government please confirm that past performance can be provided by either the offeror or members of an SBA approved mentor-protégée JV, at the full value of the award and not as a representation of the workshare performed by the member?</p>	The Solicitation has been updated in an Amendment prior to Amendment 7.
3063	<p>I understand the Government will have over 2K questions they have to answer, resulting in many changes to the solicitation. Question: would the Government consider a second round of questions in advance if some of the answers are still confusing to industry?</p>	The Comment is out of date.

sewp6_rfp_all_comments

3065	A.3.7.1(b) Offer Volume, Mandatory Experience/Offerings (page 101) states, "Offerors shall provide a Letter of Authorization (LOA) from a designated provider (OEM) for each of the four (4) Technical Areas, excluding Technical Area 9, which does not require a designated provider, identifying that the provider is aware and approves of the offeror proposing their solutions for the SEWP VI proposal." The table in A.3.6(B) Volume I (Offer Volume) on page 95 shows that bidders are allocated three (3) pages for Mandatory Experience Letter of Authorization (LOAs). If bidders use a different provider for all for Technical Areas in Exhibit 3a, they will need four (4) separate LOAs. Question: would the Government allocate up to four (4) pages in Volume I for LOAs?	See Comment 1957.
3069	The referenced paragraph states that the Offeror shall fill out Exhibit 5: C-SCRM Attestation Form. The Final RFP was released with two difference C-SCRM Attestation Forms, Exhibit 5 and Attachment J. Please confirm that Exhibit 5 is the correct form and Attachment J will not be used.	See Comment 3479.
3070	In A.3.7.2(a) Past Performance Volume (Information from the Offeror) (page 106), the RFP states, "For Small Businesses proposing in Categories A- the past performance provided shall be for similar scope efforts with a minimum average annual cost incurred of \$150,000 (One Hundred- Fifty Thousand) for size to be rated relevant (pertinent)." Additionally, in A.4.3 Phase Two-Past Performance (page 115), the RFP states, "In Category A and C, shall furnish the past performance for similar scope efforts with an average annual cost/fee incurred of \$500,000." Question: could the Government please clarify if Offerors bidding on Category A must show a minimum average annual cost incurred of \$150,000 for size to be rated relevant (pertinent) or must they show an average annual cost/fee incurred of \$500,000 for size to be rated relevant?	See Comment 1709.
3076	Part 3 of Exhibit 1, REP Template, indicates allows up to 3 pages of text in a fillable table that may not be smaller than 10 point ariel font. However, the fillable table does not expand to 3 pages and auto-reduces the text to fit 3 pages into less than half a page. Can the government please provide a corrected Exhibit 1 REP template?	The Solicitation has been updated in an Amendment prior to Amendment 7.
3078	The checkboxes for marking the role of the Offer on the contract as "Prime Contractor", "Significant Subcontractor" and/or "Team Member" are not working correctly. Please provide a correct Exhibit 2.	See Comment 1804.
3086	Page 8 of Attachment C under Fee Calculation states, "The fee is not 0.34% of the total order amount which would mean SEWP is charging a fee on top of the fee. The .034% is applied against the total order amount minus the fee." Is the discrepancy between the two numbers (0.34% vs. .034%) intentional, or is this a typo to be corrected?	The Solicitation has been updated in an Amendment prior to Amendment 7.

sewp6_rfp_all_comments

3090	<p>Issue: For multiple NASA engineering, science, and R&D contracts with significant in-scope IT services, this work is performed by Small Businesses. If these NASA-recognized, award-winning service-providers cannot cite obviously relevant past performance, then their ability to work on SEWP VI the next ten years is compromised.</p> <p>Issue: If current/incumbent Small Business IT service providers are precluded from pursuing follow-on work, then the risk for NASA mission customers migrating their IT service work off of large engineering, science and R&D contracts onto SEWP VI is greatly increased, compromising the stated NASA goals of further IT contract consolidation.</p> <p>Question: Would the government consider either a) expanding the list of NAICS Codes in A.1.34 to include all contracts with significant IT service provision, or b) eliminating the citable contract NAICS code requirement entirely?</p>	The Solicitation has been updated in an Amendment prior to Amendment 7.
3100	Can you please provide clear instructions on where to submit our proposal? (Which tab on the website, etc.) It only states "The Offeror shall submit all proposal files to: https://www.sewp.nasa.gov/sewp6rfp "	A registered Interested Party with an Organization Type of Industry at https://www.sewp.nasa.gov/sewpvi/ has access to the proposal upload tool at https://www.sewp.nasa.gov/sewp6rfp after logging in. For any technical issues including accessing the Upload tool, send an e-mail to sewp6@sewp.nasa.gov .
3101	Since all product-related services appear in Technical Area 9a, it's unclear what is meant by the sentence "Also included in this technical area are the full suite of technology and services related to setting up and maintaining compute facilities." What services related to setting up and maintaining compute facilities are included in Technical Area 1a? Can we/should we put services into Technical Areas 1a-8a as well as 9a?	See Comment 4028.
3102	The listed NAICS ("33411") appears to be missing a final digit.	The Solicitation has been updated in an Amendment prior to Amendment 7.
3103	The following items are listed in both Technology Areas 1a and 2a: Optical storage technology; Storage management systems / file servers; Media storage technology; and Storage virtualization system. Is there a reason for listing them in both places?	See Comment 4028.
3105	The heading is listed as only "Technical Area 8" vs. "Technical Area 8a."	The Technical Area 8 heading in Category A will be revised in an upcoming amendment to reflect Technical Area 8a.
3106	The following sentence appears "Software and cloud solutions are not limited to those listed as Mandatory or Additional Sub-Areas." The use of "Mandatory" and "Additional" Sub-Areas appears to have been removed between the Draft RFP and the Final. Please advise.	The Solicitation has been updated in an Amendment prior to Amendment 7.

sewp6_rfp_all_comments

3107	<p>Technical Area 7a includes “virus and spyware detection tools, two and three factor authentication tools, ... , encryption capabilities, monitoring tools,..”</p> <p>Technical Area 8a includes “Security and protection software”</p> <p>The two appear to be similar, if not identical. What determines whether a security technology belongs in Technical Area 7a vs. 8a.</p>	See Comment 4028.
3110	<p>Thresholds (\$2M per order for 1st year and \$10M for 2nd year) apply to Group C. Are years 1 and 2 defined as the SEWP GWAC contract years and apply to all Task Orders awarded in its first two years, or are years 1 and 2 the first two years of every Task Order awarded on the SEWP GWAC contract?</p>	Years 1 and 2 refers to the first 2 years of the SEWP VI Contracts and apply to the total dollar amount of any Task Order issued during those first 2 years of the Contract.
3112	Should list item 4 be list item D?	The solicitation will be revised in an upcoming amendment to change 4 to D.
3113	<p>Are the bullets at the bottom supposed to be subordinate to the O-TTPS bullet? If so, what is being conveyed with respect to O-TTPS and/or the other standards?</p>	No, the bullets at the bottom are not subordinate to the O-TTPS bullet. The solicitation will be revised to reflect this correction.
3118	<p>[Final RFP, A.1.2, page 24; A.3.7.1, pages 100-104; and A.3.7.2, page 105] Technical Area 11c Program Management/Ancillary Services appears in Section A.1.2 Scope of Work, but it is not listed as a requirement or area to address in A.3.7.1 for Relevant Experience Projects, or A.3.7.2 Past Performance Volume for Past Performance History. Will the government please clarify if Technical Area 11c is considered a content representative/technical area?</p>	See Comment 4778.
3122	<p>[Final RFP, A.3.7.1, page 103] As Category C is providing services and not physical products, how is a Category C Small business to complete the Exhibit 3c spreadsheet? The columns for OEM, part number, etc. seem invalid or unnecessary for this Category.</p>	See comment 2214.
3123	<p>[Final RFP, A.3.7.1, page 104] If an offeror proposes in Category C as a SDVOSB and receives an award, will they automatically receive a Small Business award and be able to respond to SB solicitations? If not, do we need to submit two separate proposals that meet the individual requirements for SDVOSB and SB?</p>	See Comment 1881.
3129	How will a successful offeror establish CLINs on the contract?	See Comment 4152.
3131	<p>What proof should be provided by small businesses that the ISO 9001 certification is in process at the time of submission?</p>	See Comment 2646.

<p>3135</p>	<p>Please clarify the date(s) of submission for the C-SCRM plan and/or O-TTPS certificate. The date specified is the 'Contract award date'. That might work for the initial submission, but for the annual submissions is it actually the 'Contract award date anniversary'?</p>	<p>The Solicitation has been updated in an Amendment prior to Amendment 7.</p>
<p>3137</p>	<p>Combination of: --RFP A.1.2 Category A Definitions (Pages 24-32) --RFP A.1.34 Category A Table (Pages 61-63) --Exhibit 4 Category A Tab --SBA Table of Small Business Size Standards (3/17/2023)</p> <p>The referenced documents are not in alignment with each other:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •NAICS 333316 is mentioned in the definitions (page 29) and table (page 62), but is no longer in use as a NAICS code. •Technical Area 1a cites an NMR for NAICS 33411 (page 25), which is missing a final digit (likely 334111). <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •NMRs are cited in the Category A definitions (pages 24-32) for the following NAICS: 334111, 334112, 334118, and 334210, but they aren't indicated ("**") correctly on the Category A Table (pages 61-63) or on the Exhibit 4 Category A Tab. •AbilityOne contracting is indicated for NAICS 334112, which doesn't make sense. Please validate. It may have been an attempt to indicate an NMR. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •NAICS 518210 is the only one flagged for AbilityOne on Category A. Please validate that is correct. •NAICS 541512 is included in the NAICS Table (page 62) but not in the Exhibit 4 Category A Tab. •Since NAICS 541512 is included in the NAICS Table (page 62), please validate that NAICS 541511 should not also be included. •Please add a Legend to Exhibit 4 that defines the flags for NMRs and the like. Right now, the only place these flags are defined is in the RFP NAICS Table (pages 61-63). Also, it may be possible to be both NMR and AbilityOne. •Since the NAICS Table will be used throughout the duration of the term of the SEWP contract, for ease of lookup, please sort the table by NAICS in ascending order (i.e., currently 334515 and 517121 are out of sequence). 	<p>The Solicitation has been updated to fix all the noted issues.</p>
<p>3139</p>	<p>Combination of: --RFP A.1.34 Categories B & C Table (Page 63) --Exhibit 4 Category C Tab --SBA Table of Small Business Size Standards (3/17/2023)</p> <p>Both in the NAICS Table (RFP page 63) and in Exhibit 4 Category C Tab, NAICS 519190 is referenced. It does not appear to be a valid NAICS anymore.</p>	<p>The Solicitation has been updated in an Amendment prior to Amendment 7.</p>

sewp6_rfp_all_comments

3140	For Category C, can you lower the minimum average annual cost/fee for HUBZone, 8(a) to \$100k for Volume II - Past Performance?	The Solicitation will remain as stated.
3142	Both "Phase 1" and "Phase One" are used. The same is true for 2 and 3. For ease of search, is it possible to consolidate to a single consistent form?	The Solicitation has been updated in an Amendment prior to Amendment 7.
3145	RFP / A.3.7.2 and A.4.3 Section A.3.7.2 specifies Small Business Category A past performances must have a minimum average annual cost incurred of \$150,000 for size to be rated relevant. Section A.4.3 specifies Small Business Category A past performances must have an annual cost/fee incurred of \$500,000. Please reconcile.	See Comment 1709.
3153	Two different e-mail addresses: 1) sewp6@sewp.nasa.gov and sewp6@nasa.gov have been provided in various locations for seemingly similar purposes. Please validate that two e-mail addresses are indeed in effect. If both are in effect, please clarify for what purposes each should be used.	The correct email address is sewp6@sewp.nasa.gov. The solicitation will be revised in an upcoming amendment to reflect the correct email address.
3159	Please clarify what is meant by the sentence "Subcontractors from Other Than Small Businesses that creates a CTA will not be evaluated." Is this in the context of a Meaningful Relationship, which is the theme of the entire paragraph, or is it absolute in that no "other than small business" may be in a CTA with any other business of any size?	See Comment 5061.
3163	Volume I requires 4 Mandatory Experience Letters of Authorization (LOAs), but only allocates 3 pages to that section. We request an additional page allocation to the LOAs.	See Comment 1957.
3170	Please clarify the number of "Mandatory Experience Sub-areas" required to be covered (RFP page 104). Is there any minimum or maximum for categories B and C? Page 101 states in reference to Category A, "for any four (4) of the eight (8) Mandatory Technical Areas," but there is no specific number or range given for Categories B or C.	The Solicitation has been updated to remove the reference to Mandatory Experience Sub-areas. The referenced section does not apply to Category B and C.
3175	Cover Letter File: There are 4 highlighted URLs in the cover letter. While the SAM.gov link takes you to the SAM.gov site; it does not take you to the NASA SEWP VI solicitation. None of the other 3 links take you to the advertised pages.	The Comment is out of date.
3176	Section A.3.7.1 Offer Volume page 98 the solicitation states "Identify any consultants, generative artificial intelligence, and/or sub-contractors used in writing this proposal (if any) and the extent to which their services will be available in the subsequent performance of this effort." Can the Government clarify what is referred to as generative AI?	See Comment 2276.

sewp6_rfp_all_comments

3177	For the Program Management section of the Management Volume, the instructions request inputs on 6 (vi.) items, but the evaluation only seems to be looking for 5 (v.). Please reconcile.	The Solicitation has been updated in an Amendment prior to Amendment 7.
3178	Is the Letter of Authorization required for Categories B or C? There is no explicit reference to LOA for Categories B and C	See Comment 1782.
3179	Refer to RFP page 100, section "(a) ISO 9001 and CMMI Certification." What constitutes adequate verification to demonstrate that a CMMI certification is in process? Would a letter or email from the certification body, including their contact information, suffice?	See Comment 2646.
3180	Following contract award, will each successful awardee within a particular Category of their proposal (A, B or C) be eligible to participate in all the sub-areas of their successful Category bid, or will they be restricted only to the subareas explicitly identified and described in their proposal?	See Comment 1881.
3181	Table A.2.1 GSFC 52.211-101 LIST OF ATTACHMENTS. Attachment G, Diversity, Equity, Inclusion, and Accessibility (DEIA) Plan- Applicable for Categories B & C is listed as TBS = To Be submitted. Can the Government confirm if this is supposed to be submitted with the proposal? If so, can the government please provide instructions or a template? The table is the only time the DEIA is referenced.	See Comment 1675.
3183	Can the Government please confirm when Attachment J is to be submitted? Table A.2.1 states it is TBS = To be Submitted. However, this is not listed in the instructions and A.1.30.1 states it is to be submitted 60 days prior to contract award.	See Comment 1675.
3184	Attachment A / A.2 : Paragraph 3 The description of Category B doesn't properly capture the services and scale of this Category. Reading the next one on Category C and comparing it to Category B's description, it appears that Category B does more and at greater scale.	The Solicitation will remain as stated.
3187	RFP / A.3.7.1 (c) Offeror NAICS Size Standard Crosswalk (Exhibit 4) If a contractor is bidding the Master Contract as a small business and is small under some of its Category sub-NAICS and large under others, how are the sub-NAICS under which the contractor is large at the time of award? Can they still respond to those NAICS RFQs if they are released Unrestricted?	See Comment 1881.
3188	Page 96, A.3.6 (B) (2) of the RFP states: "not smaller than 12-point type Times New Roman font inclusive of headers, footers" *** Since we are required to provide specific information on every page in the header and/or footer (per A.3.6 (A) (2)), would the government consider allowing 10-point font in the headers and footers?	See Comment 1962.

sewp6_rfp_all_comments

3190	Section A.1.22 UNSPSC CODES directs offerors to Attachment C SEWP Contract Holder User Manual for a full list of currently in-scope UNSPSC codes. In the contract Holder User Manual (CHUM), it states: "A full list of all currently identified in-scope UNSPSC codes for in-scope offerings will be made available for download via the Contract Holder Only Page (CHOP)." Will this list be made available for the proposal?	See Comment 2395.
3191	RFP / A.3.7.1 (c) Offeror NAICS Size Standard Crosswalk (Exhibit 4) If a contractor is bidding the Master Contract as a small business and is small under some of its Category sub-NAICS at the time of bid submission, but becomes large prior to award, how are those circumstances handled at the time of award? Can they still respond to those NAICS RFQs if they are released Unrestricted?	See Comment 1881.
3192	Page 96, A.3.6 (B) (2) of the RFP states: "Text in Diagrams, schedules, charts, tables, artwork, and photographs shall be no smaller than 10-point type Times New Roman font." *** Would it be permissible to format any CAPTIONS for schedules, charts, tables, artwork, and photographs in 10-point type Times New Roman font as well?	See Comment 1962.
3197	Would the government accept adding Lenovo and Xerox to the vendor list (Enclosure 1) of SEWP VI Providers?	See Comment 5655.
3199	Section A.3.7.1 Offer Volume page 103 the solicitation states "Offerors proposing to category B and/ or C shall complete Exhibit 3b- Category B Solutions Spreadsheet and Exhibit 3c- Category C Solutions Spreadsheet." Will the Government please provide the IN SCOPE SEWP VI UNSPSC Codes? Will the offeror be able to change these rates or add labor categories once the contract is awarded?	See Comment 2395.
3201	RFP Section A.3.7.2 Past Performance Volume: The Government states that "Prime Offerors shall furnish the information requested below a minimum of one (1) but no more than three (3) of your most recent similar contracts that are completed or ongoing within three (3) years of the solicitation release date to be considered recent." Request the Government allows bidders to provide past experience and past performance going back five (5) years as it is common practice for most Federal IDIQs. Recent examples include OASIS+ (GSA), Polaris (GSA), and CIO-SP4 (HHS/NIH).	The Solicitation will remain as stated.
3203	Please consider a two week extension in order to ensure that our customers have time to return Past Performance Questionnaires, and to accommodate changes to the Final RFP from the draft.	The Comment is out of date.
3207	Exhibit 2 - This PDF fillable document has some errors. Data entered into cells in Sections 1, 2, 3, 4 and 6 repeats in cells where it is not relevant. Can this be corrected promptly in order to send correct forms to our references?	See Comment 1804.

sewp6_rfp_all_comments

3208	Volume I, A.3.7.1(b): The Exhibit 3b and Exhibit 3c Spreadsheets include columns for the Provider Part Number (C) and UNSPSC code (E). This requested information seems to be suited for Category A. Would the government consider removal of columns C and E for those proposing in Categories B and C?	See Comment 2214.
3222	RFP Ref A.4.4 (b) (1) v, Page 119, RFP Text- The Government will evaluate the Offeror has a valid Exhibit 5: C-SCRM Attestation Form or valid active Open Trusted Technology Provider™ Standard (O-TTPS) Certification specified in Section A.3.7.3(b)(1)(v). A response of “no” to any disqualifying items in Exhibit 5 renders a proposal ineligible for award. Question: Does this mean that the offeror needs to answer all the questions in Exhibit 5 affirmatively?	See Comment 3529.
3230	Page 109 Past Performance History: The 2nd paragraph of page 109 states: "Offerors identified as HUBZone, SDVOSB, EDWOSB, 8a in Category B and C...." WOSB is not listed. Is this intentional?	See Comment 1697.
3231	RFP Ref: A.3.6 (B), Page 95, RFP Text - Category C-IT service page limit 15. Question: Can the page limit be increased so that we will have enough space to write for this section?	The Solicitation will remain as stated.
3232	Page 116 A.4.3 Phase Two - Past Performance: Under heading "Small Business," the 2nd Bullet "In Category B" and 3rd bullet "In Category C," WOSB is not listed. Is this intentional?	See Comment 1697.
3240	RFP Section A.1.34 NAICS Codes within Scope: Request that the Government add NAICS code 541715 (previously 541712) Research and Development in the Physical, Engineering, and Life Sciences (except Nanotechnology and Biotechnology) to all bidding categories for evaluation purposes. NAICS code 541715 often includes computer related services and including this category permits a broader range of SEWP VI qualified past performance citations. In addition, major Federal contract IDIQs, with NAICS code 541715, include Responsive Strategic Sourcing for Services (RS3), Defense Technical Information Center (DTIC) Information Analysis Center Multiple Award Contract (IAC MAC), and One Acquisition Solution for Integrated Services (OASIS). Combined task order values on these IDIQs exceed \$33B, a significant portion of these awards include computer related services.	See Comment 1671.
3250	With reference to “The offeror must provide relevant experience as it relates to the NAICS code being used for competition.” To not limit relevant experience to the single NAICS code being used for competition, can this be changed to “The offeror must provide relevant experience as it relates to the proposed Category’s list of in-scope NAICS codes”?	The solicitation has been updated in Amendment 6 to remove the statement.
3251	RFP Section A.3.7.1 Offer Volume: Request the Government lowers the threshold of \$30M for Past Experience projects for OTSB to \$19.M to increase competition of mid-tier companies. NAICS code 541990 which is included in RFP Section A.1.34 has a size standard of \$19.5M and NAICS code 611420 has a size standard of \$16M.	The Solicitation will remain as stated.
3253	Will the government please add Google to the list of SEWP VI Providers?	See Comment 5655.

sewp6_rfp_all_comments

3255	RFP Document - 80TECH24R0001 SEWP VI Final RFP.pdf; Section Reference - A.2.1; Page Number(s) - 88; Question - There are two (2) completely different C-SCRM Attestation Forms provided as attachments to the RFP: ATTACHMENT J- C_SCRM Attestation Form.pdf, and Exhibit 5 C-SCRM Attestation Form.pdf. Instructions are provided for the Exhibit 5 version only. Can the Government please confirm that offerors do not need to complete and submit the C-SCRM Attestation Form provided as Attachment J?	See Comment 3479.
3256	A.3.7.2(b) Exhibit 2 PastPerfQuest: Only one total radio button can be selected under this header. Will the Government please confirm that the user should be able to select one radio button in the Technical row and one radio button in the Cost/Price row, and if so, will the Government update the PDF's formatting/controls to allow this?	See Comment 1804.
3260	Past Performance Questionnaire, Section 1, Basis of Selection: Only one total radio button can be selected under this header. Will the Government please confirm that the user should be able to select one radio button in the Technical row and one radio button in the Cost/Price row, and if so, will the Government update the PDF's formatting/controls to allow this?	See Comment 1804.
3261	Could the Government please go to a phased submission process where offerors submit phases after being notified of successfully passing gates? This would significantly decrease the cost to small businesses without impacting the number of submissions that NASA must review.	The Solicitation will remain as stated.
3263	RFP Document - 80TECH24R0001 SEWP VI Final RFP.pdf; Section Reference - A.3.7.2; Language Cited - Category B Content Representative Areas 1 through 10; Question - Regarding Volume III, should Technical Area 11b: PROGRAM MANAGEMENT/ ANCILLARY SERVICES AND SUPPLIES be included in our response to Technical Approach (Subfactor A), or Management Approach (Subfactor B)?	See Comment 4778.
3270	Page 76; 88; Attachment D: Climate Risk Management Plan: Attachment D states "Initial Submission: The Climate Change Risk Management Plan shall be submitted within 12 months of Contract Award. On page 76, Section A.1.51 - the RFP states "within 12 months of Contract Award, the Contractor shall submit a Climate Change Risk Management Plan.". On page 88, the RFP states that the Climate Change Risk Management Plan is "*TBS" To Be Submitted. Please clarify when the government requires Offerors to submit their initial Climate Change Risk Management Plan.	See Comment 1675.
3275	Past Performance Questionnaire, Section 4 pages 3-7: There is an apparent issue with completing Section 4 of the form. If the user populates the "Performed" cell in a row, the "Did Not Perform" cell automatically populates too with the same character(s), and vice versa. Will the Government please update the PDF's formatting/controls to allow only of the columns to be populated for each row, and not both of the columns?	See Comment 1804.
3276	RFP, Section A.3.7.1 OFFER VOLUME, Category A- Letter of Authorization. Do offerors need to obtain LOA specifically written to SEWP 6, or are general, pre-existing LOAs acceptable?	See Comment 1799.

3289	RFP Section A.1.34 NAICS & NAICS codes within Scope: Our company has identified programs that can be used as a Past Experience for Category B that meet the RFP's relevance criteria. However, these projects fall under NAICS code 541715 as they meet the computer related services criteria. We request that the Government includes NAICS code 541715 in all categories for evaluation purposes thus enabling bidders to present more relevant experience and capabilities. Note, other federal agencies, such as GSA and the Department of Defense, use NAICS code 541715 for computer related services.	See Comment 1671.
3294	Can the government please provide detailed instructions, including examples, for completing Exhibits 3b and 3c?	See Comment 2214.
3311	A.1.2 Category B pg33, A.3.7.1(b) pg104, A.3.7.2(a) pg108: The order of the first two Category B technical areas in the Scope of Work and Proposal Volume I instructions (Technical Area 1b: ENTERPRISE-WIDE NETWORK SERVICES, Technical Area 2b: IT MANAGED SERVICES) does not match the order in the Category B Content Representative Areas in the Proposal Volume II instructions and the PPQ (1. IT Managed Services, 2. Enterprise-Wide Network Services). Would the Government make the order of these two areas consistent across the solicitation to avoid confusion in references?	See Comment 4778.
3313	Can the Government please confirm that LOAs are only to be submitted in Category A proposals?	See Comment 1782.
3314	A.1.51 CLIMATE CHANGE RISK MANAGEMENTpg76. "In accordance with DRD #5, within 12 months of Contract Award, the Contractor shall submit a Climate Change Risk Management Plan that identifies climate-related risks that could negatively impact performance of any resultant task order(s). The Climate Change Risk Management Plan will be attached to the contract as Attachment L." QUESTION: To clarify, is a draft Climate Change Risk Management Plan required with the proposal submission, or only within 12 months of award?	See Comment 1675.
3316	A.1.2 GSFC 52.211-91 SCOPE OF WORK, A.3.7 PROPOSAL VOLUMES (pgs 35, 104, 108): The Scope of Work for Category B includes Technical Area 11b PROGRAM MANAGEMENT/ANCILLARY SERVICES AND SUPPLIES. However, this technical area is not included in the Volume I Mandatory Experience Technical Areas, the Volume II Content Representative Areas, or the Category B Technical Areas in Exhibit 2 Past Performance Questionnaire. Will the Government please confirm if Area 11b may or may not be used in an Offeror's Volume I and/or Volume II? And if an offeror may use Area 11b in Volume II, will the Government please update the Past Performance Questionnaire to include Area 11b?	See Comment 4778.
3319	General: If an Offeror submits a proposal for Category C and REPs and Past Performance showcase experience in several (but not all) Content Representative Areas/Mandatory Experience Areas, will this Offeror be able to bid to on any Technical Area within Category C? For example, REPs and Past Performance are provided for 1c, 3c, 4c and 5c. After award, a TO is issued with services related to Technical 6c. Is the contractor able to submit a TO proposal?	See Comment 1881.

sewp6_rfp_all_comments

3322	In Section A.3.7(b), for Category B and C, there are differing requirements for Small Business offerors and Small Disadvantaged Business offerors (8(a), HUBZone, VOSB, SDVOSB, WOSB, EDWOSB). Can the government please confirm that, if an Offeror wishes to be awarded as both a SDVOSB and as a Small Business, only one submission is necessary?	Yes. Only one submission is necessary and allowed.
3325	Within A3.7.3(a), Technical Approach (Subfactor A), the only difference between #2 and #3 is the distinction between "proposed features" and "proposed architectural features." Would the Government remove #3 as the "proposed features" offerors respond to in #2 may already include architectural features?	See Comment 1808.
3326	Within A3.7.3(a), Technical Approach (Subfactor A), the only difference between #2 and #3 is the distinction between "proposed features" and "proposed architectural features." If question #3 is not removed, would the government please provide clarification on what "proposed features" and "proposed architectural features" are (potentially including examples)?	See Comment 1808.
3332	Can a Category C Offeror representing themselves as a WOSB and only providing two different REPs compete for Category C SB set-aside task orders, or only Category C WOSB set-aside task orders?	See Comment 1881.
3336	Attachment J - SCRM Attestation Form. "Attachment J - SCRM Attestation Form" is set so that the vendor can only select "Yes" and "No" once through the entire form. The vendor should be able to select "Yes" or "No" for each individual question. Will the government please fix this form so Offerors can appropriately answer the questions?	See Comment 1675.
3337	Can a Category C SB Offeror that provides 3 different REPs and certifies as a WOSB compete for both Category C SB task orders as well as Category C WOSB tasks orders?	See Comment 1881.
3339	A.3.7.1.(b) – Category A – Letter of Authorization, page 101 – The RFP states that “There shall be an LOA for each different designated provider for a maximum of four (4) LOAs.” Please confirm this should read "There shall be an LOA from a designated provider for each Technical Area for a maximum total of four (4) LOAs."	See Comment 1957.
3342	Please advise if "Each proposal volume shall be submitted in a single searchable Adobe Portable Document Fonnat (PDF) file (compatible with ADOBE Reader version DC or 2017), with appropriate bookmarks to at least to the section header." This deviates from the instructions that advise how to label each file name.	The Solicitation has been updated in an Amendment prior to Amendment 7.
3343	A.2.1 GSFC 52.211-101 LIST OF ATTACHMENTS. (NOV 2022) pg88. What do the "*" mean by some of the TBS items in the Date column? Some do not have an "*", what is the difference? Can additional details/footnotes be added to the legend for clarity? The lack of specific information is confusing. When are they to be submitted, with proposal or what/when?	The solicitation has been updated to remove the asterisks from the A.2.1 List of Attachments and clarify which Attachments are required with the proposal and which are post-award attachments.

sewp6_rfp_all_comments

3345	A.3.7.1.(b) – Category C – Mandatory Experience Sub-areas, page 104 – Please confirm the title should be “Category C - Mandatory Experience Technical Areas” instead of “Category C – Mandatory Experience Sub-areas”.	The solicitation will be revised in an upcoming amendment to reflect Category C- Mandatory Experience Technical Areas.
3348	RFP Document, Section A.2.1 GSFC 52.211-101 List of Attachments, Pg. 88: Section "A.2.1 GSFC 52.211-101 List of Attachments" has multiple attachments notated "*TBS" but there is no later definition of what the "*" stands for. Will the government confirm what the "*" stands for and which of these documents are to be submitted with the proposal vs. to be submitted post-award?	See Comment 1869.
3352	A.3.7.3 – Mission Suitability Volume, page 110 – The first sentence under the referenced heading states that “The Mission Suitability Proposal must specifically state for which group the offeror is proposing.” Will the Government please confirm "group" refers to "category"?	See Comment 1706.
3355	For Exhibit 3B – Category B Solutions Spreadsheet, if the CLIN is for an hourly labor rate, should the Prime Offeror’s name be inserted in Column B (Provider)?	See Comment 2214.
3360	For Exhibit 3C – Category C Solutions Spreadsheet, if the CLIN is for an hourly labor rate, should the Prime Offeror’s name be inserted in Column B (Provider)?	See Comment 2214.
3363	A.1.34 – North American Industry Classification System (NAICS) & NAICS Codes within Scope, pages 61-63 – "Exhibit 4 – NAICS Size Standard Crosswalk The table with the title “Category A: ITC/AV Solutions (Information Technology, Communication and Audio Visual) – NAICS 541519 (footnote 18- IT Value Added Reseller)” at the bottom of Page 61 has a total of 44 NAICS codes. Meanwhile, Category A in Exhibit 4 has only 42 NAICS codes, missing 333316 and 541512 that appear in the referenced table. Could the Government please reconcile the difference?"	The Solicitation has been updated in an Amendment prior to Amendment 7.
3365	A.3.7.1.(b) – Category A – Letter of Authorization, page 101 – Please confirm that Letters of Authorization are not required for the second provider identified for each Technical Area under Category A.	See Comment 1874.
3367	Exhibit 3a - Category A Solutions Spreadsheet and A.3.7.1.(b) – Category A, page 101 – On the Technical Area tabs of Exhibit 3a - Category A Solutions Spreadsheet, row 3 states, "If this is one of the 4 minimum proposed Technical Area other than the primary Technical Area..." Page 101 of the solicitation states, "All Offerors shall complete Exhibit 3a- Category A Solutions Spreadsheet and propose technology solutions for any four (4) of the eight (8) Mandatory Technical Areas below and technical Area 9". The use of the word "minimum" in Exhibit 3a suggests bidders can propose more than 4 Technical Areas. Please confirm bidders are only allowed to propose CLINs for 4 Technical Areas from Areas 1-8 plus Technical Area 9.	See Comment 5061.

sewp6_rfp_all_comments

3372	Does this apply to Cat A orders or is this intended for Categories B & C orders?	See Comment 1862.
3374	Due to the three (3) Federal holidays present during the preparation of proposals, and the complexity of the instructions, would the Government please extend the due date for all proposals 2 additional weeks, until July 25, 2024?	The Comment is out of date.
3378	UNSPSC Codes – Text states "A full list of currently identified in-scope UNSPSC codes for in-scope offerings is found in Attachment C, SEWP Contract Holder User Manual." However the CHUM document only references that "a list will be made available via CHOP." Please provide the full list of currently identified within scope UNSPSC codes.	See Comment 2395.
3382	A.3.7.3(a)2 and A.3.7.3(a)3 in the requirement for all categories for Subfactor A appear to be nearly duplicate requirements. Please clarify how we should respond to these requirements	See Comment 1808.
3383	Offerors cannot begin filling out Exhibit 3a with accurate CLIN data until we are provided with the full list of "in-scope" UNSPSC Codes. Please extend the due date of the SEWPVI solicitation to six (6) weeks past the date that the list of "in-scope" UNSPSC Codes is provided to bidders.	See Comment 2949.
3391	RFP page 50 states, "To properly identify products and services all CLINs in the SEWP database of record must have an associated United Nations Standard Products and Services Code (UNSPSC) code. The United Nations Standard Products and Services Code® (UNSPSC®), managed by GS1 US® for the UN Development Programme (UNDP), is an open, global, multi-sector standard for efficient, accurate classification of products and services. Full information concerning UNSPSC is located at: https://www.unspsc.org/ ." Can you please confirm where we can locate our company's full list of UNSPSC does?	See Comment 2395.
3398	Proposal Submission Table – Please confirm that the 3 page limit for LOAs is stating that each singular LOA must be no more than three pages.	See Comment 1957.
3399	QUESTION - Category A - Letter of Authorization, RFP Page 101 - Please clarify, the maximum 4 LOAs for each different designated provider. Is this a maximum 4 LOAs per Technical Area, totaling up to 16 LOAs if they are all different providers?	The Solicitation has been updated in an Amendment prior to Amendment 7.
3400	Instructions to Offerors, page 109, second paragraph. "Offerors identified as HUBZone, SDVOSB, EDWOSB, 8a in Category B and C shall provide past performance references showcasing relevant work in at least two (2) content representative areas for content to be rated relevant (pertinent)". Can NASA SEWP include VOSB (veteran owned) and WOSB (woman owned) in this socio economic business past performance instruction? Information regarding REPs under the Offer Volume were inclusive of all socio-economic offerors.	See Comment 1697.
3402	Proposal Submission Table - this states that LOAs are allotted no more than 3 pages of page count; however, offerors are obligated to submit up to four (4) LOAs with their proposal if necessary. Please confirm that it is the government's intention to state that each of the 4 required LOAs must not exceed 3 pages, which means that this section's page limit is actually 12 pages.	See Comment 1957.

sewp6_rfp_all_comments

3407	How many mandatory experience technical areas of Category B and C shall small business contractors meet to qualify for award in these respective categories?	See Comment 2372.
3409	Instructions to Offerors – page 96. The Mandatory Experience LOAs page limitation is 3 pages total or 3 pages per LOA?	See Comment 1957.
3410	Please clarify A.1.1 Deliverable Requirements, Item 7, Certificate of Maintainability, page 24 of the RFP. This references A.1.22 as the resource for information, however, A.1.22 is the UNSPSC Code requirement information	The Solicitation has been updated in an Amendment prior to Amendment 7.
3415	RFP Section Reference: A.3.7.2(a) and A.4.3 Question: In the proposal requirements section, the RFP calls for a small business project size / Average Annual Value of \$150,000 for a Category “A” submission. In the evaluation section the requirement is stated as \$500,000. Would the government please identify what the correct number is and fix the one which is incorrect?	See Comment 1709.
3418	Under "Technical Area 1a: IT COMPUTER SYSTEMS / COMPUTE FACILITIES", Paragraph 2: "Technology within this Technical Area have an NMR class waiver utilizing NAICS 33411 for commercial off-the-shelf laptops and tablets... " Can the Government confirm that the above NAICS code is missing a 1 at the end, and it should state 334111?	The Solicitation has been updated in an Amendment prior to Amendment 7.
3420	Enclosure 1 – SEWP VI Providers Our company has invested heavily to position ourselves to provide Lenovo products to our clients, past and future. We notice that Lenovo is not referenced on the SEWP VI Providers list. Would the government please add Lenovo to the Providers list and share with industry the process for adding additional providers to the list?	See Comment 5655.
3426	Under A.3.6, Section (B), Number (2), Would the Government consider decreasing the font size headers, footers, and any graphic captions from 12-point type Times New Roman font to 9-point type Times New Roman font?	See Comment 1962.
3435	Over the last five to ten years, government contracting has made a publicly announced concerted effort to minimize the amount of single award BPAs and IDIQs in favor of large, multi-award GWACs/IDIQs via the Strategic Sourcing Initiative. As such, the requirement for SEWPVI Past Performance references which states “Offerors are not permitted to submit a multiple award or GWAC as an individual past performance reference” is counter to the way the government has elected to structure contracts for the last decade. Please amend this requirement to state that “single award Task/Delivery Orders on multiple award GWACs or IDIQs are acceptable as long as minimum dollar threshold’s outlined in SEWPVI RFP are met.”	See Comment 2623.

sewp6_rfp_all_comments

3441	Please confirm submission of Attachment J C_SCRM Attestation form is not required for Category C.	The C_SCRM Attestation form is a post-award document that will be required for all SEWP VI Contract Holders in all Categories.
3444	Please clarify that socio-economic category WOSB is also included. There are sections throughout the proposal that include WOSB and some sections where it is excluded.	See Comment 1697.
3453	The list of attachments, which includes attachments to be submitted with proposals, does not match the attachments that were provided with the RFP. Please review and clarify the attachments required to be submitted with proposals.	The solicitation has been updated to clarify the attachments that are required with a proposal and which are post-award attachments.
3455	RFP Section A.1.6 states that the effective ordering period of the Contract shall be for a period of 10 years from the Contract's Effective Date of TBD. The RFP Cover Letter states the anticipated Award Date is October 2024, with a May 1, 2025 Contract Effective Date. However, the Industry Day slides presented on 6/4/2024 and the SEWP VI Information page (https://www.sewp.nasa.gov/sewpvi/) show a tentative Award Date of May 1, 2025. Please clarify both the estimated Contract Award Date and the estimated Contract Effective Date.	See Comment 2621.
3456	In Exhibit 2-Past Performance Questionnaire, would the Government please complete the last sentence of the first paragraph of the Instructions. As of now it reads, "Sections 5 and 6 are completed by the"	See Comment 1804.
3457	For Exhibit 3B and 3C, please confirm what the offer shall complete. Does the offer only provide Labor Categories (LCATS) in Column A (CLIN) and the fully burdened ceiling rate in Column G (Labor Category Rate)? In addition, is the offeror required to map the LCAT to a UNSPSC code from the list on the website (https://www.ungm.org/Public/UNSPSC)	See Comment 2214.
3460	Will the Government provide a list of LCATs they would like the offeror to provide rates for?	See Comment 2285.
3462	Is the LCAT rate for CONUS work only? Is the rate the on-site rate or off-site rate?	The Offeror determines whether they want to include LCATs CONUS, OCONUS, on-site, and/or off-site.
3464	Please confirm submission of Attachment J C_SCRM Attestation form is not required for Category C.	Attachment J C-SCRM Attestation form is required post award for all 3 Categories.
3470	Exhibit 3a - Category A Solutions Spreadsheet; All "Technical Area' Tabs; Columns A, "Contract Line Item Number (CLIN)"- There does not appear to be any instruction on what bidders should enter for Column A "Contract Line Item Number (CLIN)" in the spreadsheet Exhibit 3a - please confirm that bidders simply number their proposed CLINs as they see fit.	See Comment 2214.

sewp6_rfp_all_comments

3479	Does a copy of a contractor's active Open Trusted Technology Provider TM Standard (O-TTPS) Certification submitted with Volume I satisfy the Attachment J (C-SCRM Plan) and Exhibit 5 (C-SCRM Attestation Form) SEWP C-SCRM requirements?	Yes. As stated in the solicitation, a copy of an ISO 20243 (O-TTPS) certification can be used as an alternative to Exhibit 5 in the proposal and for the post-award Attachment J C-SRM plan.
3483	Requesting clarification on the following instructions: "Offerors shall provide a Letter of Authorization (LOA) from a designated provider (OEM) for each of the four (4) Technical Areas, excluding Technical Area 9, which does not require a designated provider, identifying that the provider is aware and approves of the offeror proposing their solutions for the SEWP VI proposal. The same provider may be designated for multiple Technical Areas. There shall be an LOA for each different designated provider for a maximum of four (4) LOAs." Can the Government confirm if it's a maximum of four (4) LOAs TOTAL, or does the contractor need to include LOAs for the secondary providers (OEMs)?	See Comment 1874.
3484	A.1.51 Can a sample of an acceptable Climate Change Risk Management Plan be provided?	See Comment 1675.
3488	In Section A.1.34, under Category C, it lists NAICS 519190. Upon review, NAICS 519190 All Other Information Services is not a valid 2022 NAICS code at Census.gov/naics. Please review and provide guidance on what current NAICS code this work may reference.	See Comment 1777.
3489	A.3.7.3.(b).(1). ii - Please confirm 'ancillary products' includes non-hardware and software items in addition to any hardware and software that may be required for performance; for example, contractor facilities, IT systems, and personnel.	See Comment 6409.
3491	In the Scope of Work, the Government is identifying a Group A1 - Unrestricted and Group A2 - Small Business Set Aside under Category A. Can the Government clarify if Small Businesses awarded the contract going to be restricted to only Group A2 - Small Business Set Aside task orders, or will they be able to bid on any task order in Category A?	See Comment 1881.
3493	It seems that CMMI is most relevant to category C specifically and not as much categories A and B. Would the government please confirm it only desires ISO for Category C? If so, can Offeror's provide EITHER an ISO or CMMI certification under Category C for compliance with this provision?	As stated in the Solicitation, CMMI certification is only required for Category B. ISO 9001 certification is required for all three Categories. CMMI and ISO 9001 are different standards and cannot be interchanged.
3494	A.2.1 seems out of alignment with the language under Section A.1 as several of the plans that have a "TBS" due date are in fact stated as being due not as part of the proposal but either by the time of award or within one year of contract award. Please clarify the deadlines for all items listed but in particular Attachment H, J and L.	See Comment 3015.
3496	Under the chart in A.2.1 what does the * listed for Attachment H, J and L mean?	See Comment 3015.

sewp6_rfp_all_comments

3502	A.1.43 GOVERNMENT PURCHASE CARD it states: "The surcharge amount is limited to the specific and negotiated acceptance rate of a contract holder and the networks; meaning that contract holder is not allowed to profit from choosing to assess surcharges. For example, if a contract holder's negotiated acceptance rate with VISA and MasterCard is 3%, the contract holder is allowed to impose a surcharge of no more than 3% of the total transaction value. Please note that the total surcharge rate a contract holder can impose cannot exceed 4% in any State." Some credit card surcharges are significantly more than 4%. Can NASA increase the surcharge to accommodate these higher surcharges?	The Solicitation will remain as stated.
3503	Attachment D – Page 2: DRD No. 2, Initial submission states: "October 1st." Please advise the Government's expectations if the contract is not operational by October 1st, 2024.	The Comment is out of date.
3504	On Page 96, in the page limitation table, the Mandatory Experience LOA has a limit of 3 pages. But in page 101, Category A – Letter of Authorization paragraph, it states that there can be a maximum of 4 LOAs. How would page limit hold in such an event?	See Comment 1957.
3505	Attachment D – Page 3: DRD No. 3, Initial submission states: "The plan shall be submitted no later than 60 calendar days prior to the contract award date." Since there is not a firm contract award date, please clarify when DRD No. 3 should be submitted.	See Comment 1675.
3506	In Exhibit 2-PastPerfQues-SEWP VI.pdf, the last sentence of the Instructions paragraph is missing. (It currently states, "Sections 5 and 6 are completed by the") Would the Government please provide the full sentence?	See Comment 1804.
3508	Attachment D – Page 3: DRD No. 3 Format states "The contractor's format is acceptable." The procurement package contains an ATTACHMENT+J-+C_SCRM+Attestation+Form.pdf. The final RFP document (80TECH24R0001+SEWP+VI+Final+RFP.pdf) discusses Attachment J in section A.1.30.1. on page 57. The question is should we use the Attachment J as provided or is a format of our choosing acceptable for DRD No. 3?	See Comment 1675.
3513	Will SEWP consider modifying the CMMI requirement to allow offerors who are in the process of achieving their CMMI certification to propose to Category B -Other Than Small Business; mirroring that of the Small Business CMMI requirement? We are currently underway towards achieving our Level 3 certification, and can supply the necessary REPs, but our CMMI appraisal will not be complete by the proposal submission deadline. We are expecting to complete the appraisal and become CMMI Level 3 certified by September 2024	The Solicitation has been updated in an Amendment prior to Amendment 7.
3517	The stated threshold limit results in a disincentive for mature SBs who customarily perform on contracts 10x+ in size (as noted in our REPs and PPs). Would NASA please strike this provision entirely or increase the threshold to \$10M in year 1 and \$20M in year 2, with no limit thereafter.	The Solicitation will remain as stated.
3520	On Page 98 under the Offer Volume (Section A.3.7.1 Offer Volume) it states that "The offeror must provide relevant experience as it relates to the NAICS code being used for competition". Do offerors have to provide this experience in the Offer Volume or in the Past Performance volume?	See Comment 2092.

3522	Section A.2.1 GSFC 52.211-101 List of Attachments (Document 3, Page 88) - Can the government provide any templates or samples of DEIA plans to help guide offerors in developing compliant plans as required by DRD #1?	See Comment 1675.
3526	Section A.3.7.1(b) Mandatory Experience (Pages 103-105) - The Exhibit 1 Relevant Experience Project (REP) Template instructions state the completed REP is limited to 3 pages. Can the government clarify if this page limit includes the cover page tables in Parts I-III, or if those are excluded from the 3-page limit for the Project Description?	The Solicitation has been updated in an Amendment prior to Amendment 7.
3529	Section A.4.4(b)(1)(v) Management Approach - Exhibit 5 (Page 112) - How should offerors indicate if a particular practice on the Exhibit 5 C-SCRM Attestation Form is not applicable to their organization or solution? For example, if they do not use any "publicly accessible systems" as referenced in question 4.	Exhibit 5 will be updated to allow for I(n progress) and NA (Not Applicable) responses. A relevant explanation is required when I or NA is entered.
3530	Section A.4.4(b)(1)(v) Management Approach - Exhibit 5 (Page 112) - The Exhibit 5 C-SCRM Attestation Form states that answering "no" to any question disqualifies an offeror. Many questions align with NIST 800-171 controls. If an offeror is working toward, but has not yet fully implemented, all 800-171 controls, will they be eligible for award?	See Comment 3529.
3531	Section A.3.7.1(b) Mandatory Experience - Exhibit 3a (Pages 101-102) - The Exhibit 3a Category A Solutions Spreadsheet instructions reference "mandatory" and "additional" CLINs, but those terms do not appear to be defined in the RFP documents. Can the government clarify what constitutes a mandatory vs. additional CLIN?	The Solicitation has been updated to remove the terms "mandatory" and "additional" CLINs.
3533	NAICS code 519190 does not appear on the current SBA Table of Size Standards. Can the government confirm if this NAICS code is still being used, and if so, what the acceptable SB size standard is?	See Comment 1777.

sewp6_rfp_all_comments

3535	<p>There are a concerns regarding Exhibit 3c as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Exhibit asks offerors to define CLINs. However, the selection and definition of appropriate CLINs is, by definition, a Government responsibility. • Asking offering offerors to identify define the CLIN structure may result in offerors coming up with different CLIN structures which would make Category C contract administration extremely burdensome for NASA. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Exhibit appears to be focused on products, not services; at the very least, it apparently considers products and services as equivalent. For example, the Exhibit asks for parts numbers—which are inappropriate for services. • Given that the specific services to be acquired are not yet defined (as that happens at the order level), it is impossible for offerors to assign a UNSPSC code at the GWAC level. • The Exhibit asks for "Catalog Price"—but NASA has specifically stated that the SEWP VI submission entails no pricing. • The Exhibit asks for LCATs. Given the broad scope of the SEWP VI requirements, there could be hundreds of LCATs per offeror at the GWAC level. Soliciting LCATs without task order requirements against which to align them could create significant challenges for NASA in contract administration. <p>In view of the foregoing issues, would NASA please remove the requirement for the Exhibit 3c submission?</p>	See Comment 2214.
3536	<p>The Exhibit 3c asks offerors to define CLINs. However, the selection and definition of appropriate CLINs is, by definition, a Government responsibility. Will the Government please confirm that offerors may leave column A blank?</p>	See Comment 2214.
3538	<p>The Exhibit 3c asks offerors to provide a UNSPSC code for each line item. For labor categories that are relevant to Category C, there is no direct mapping of UNSPSC codes to LCATs: The list of UNSPSC codes does not cover all of the potential LCATs. Will the Government please confirm that offerors may leave column E blank?</p>	See Comment 2118.
3541	<p>A.3.5 states, "Only one proposal per group for each scope category will be accepted per offeror." Please define what "group" means.</p>	The Solicitation has been updated in an Amendment prior to Amendment 7.
3542	<p>The draft RFP did not include this Exhibit 3c or any similar requirement, so offerors now face a huge, unexpected, and burdensome task to complete this Exhibit. Would the Government please provide a 2-week extension to the submission deadline to provide a full, fair, and reasonable opportunity for offerors to submit a compliant Exhibit 3c?</p>	The Comment is out of date.

sewp6_rfp_all_comments

3550	<p>"an offeror with favorable, recent, and relevant past performance that meets the average value as specified in A.3.7.2 may be considered more favorably than an offeror with no relevant past performance information."</p> <p>"Only Offerors with Past performance level of confidence ratings of Satisfactory or Neutral will have their proposal proceed to Phase 3 of evaluations."</p> <p>If ratings of Satisfactory or Neutral are sufficient to proceed to Phase 3, at what point in the evaluation process does the "more favorable" past performance information affect an offeror as compared to "no relevant past performance information"/Neutral?</p>	The Solicitation has been updated in an Amendment prior to Amendment 7.
3553	Please allow headers, footers, and any graphic caption text to also be reduced to a minimum of 10-point type since headers and footers "shall not contain any proposal content to be evaluated."	See Comment 1962.
3554	For ease of readability for NASA's evaluators, please allow a sans serif font (such as Arial, Calibri, or Aptos) to be used in headers, footers, Diagrams, schedules, charts, tables, artwork, and photographs.	See Comment 2629.
3562	Please confirm that, as is allowable for past performance (per RFP section A.3.7.2(a), second paragraph, page 106), an REP may be "a single award IDIQ/ BPA at the contract/ agreement level...However, Offerors are not permitted to submit a multiple award or GWAC as an individual" REP.	See Comment 2623.
3571	Should offerors propose only the minimum required numbers of CLINs for the Technical Areas in Exhibit 3a?	See Comment 5061.
3574	If Offerors propose more than the minimum required numbers of CLINs for the Technical Areas in Exhibit 3a, how will that impact their evaluation?	See Comment 5061.
3575	Please confirm the CLINs proposed in Exhibit 3a will NOT be considered when evaluating an Offeror's "breadth and depth" in the Mission Suitability Volume.	See Comment 5061.
3584	The \$30M value for a single order is overly restrictive against mid-sized businesses and companies who just recently graduated/exceeded small business size status. Many Federal customers work with (and wish to continue to work with) such mid-size companies who are being unnecessarily prohibited from qualifying for a SEWP VI contract. Please consider reducing the REP minimum total value to \$12.5 Million.	The Solicitation will remain as stated.
3588	Contract Holders are not who determine the Government Purchase Card surcharge fees. As written, the vendor is penalized by only being able to charge the lower surcharge. To allow for surcharge changes over the 10-year life of the SEWP VI contract, please require the surcharge fee to be equal to the varying federal purchase card user platforms.	The Solicitation will remain as stated.

sewp6_rfp_all_comments

3591	Some of the "Date" column cells are populated with "*TBS." Please provide an explanation defining the asterisk.	See Comment 1869.
3595	The Mission Suitability Proposal must specifically state for which group the offeror is proposing." By "group" does the government mean task area?	See Comment 1706.
3596	Category A subject LOAs: Mandatory experience page 101 refers to any 4 of the 8. Further on the page refers to a maximum of 4 of the 8. Then on the spreadsheet exhibit 3a it makes a reference to one of the minimum of 4 proposed Technical areas. Our question is there maximum of 4, or is it a minimum of 4. Can we and should fill out CLINS for all of the categories if we can do so? Or do you only want CLINS for the 4 we have LOAs for?	See Comment 5061.
3597	Can the government please provide an example of a completed Exhibit 3 for Category B and C? It is not standard to align IT services to UNSPSC codes. Generally, IT services are priced with Labor Categories and Labor Rates. Additional CLINS like Travel, Fees, and ODCs are passed on at cost or cost + fee. It is unclear how Category C bidders are supposed to align the CLINS of A.1.23.1 to the UNSPSC codes and then include a labor category to those CLINS.	See Comment 2118.
3599	Will SEWP PMO be providing the UNSPSC codes or does every submitter need to subscribe to the UNSPSC to retrieve the codes for our submissions?	See Comment 2395.
3602	Please clarify in which volume and section offerors are to include Attachment G, DEIA Plan. Please also confirm that this is not included in the page limitations.	See Comment 1675.
3604	Please clarify in which volume and section offerors are to include Attachment L, Climate Change Risk Management Plan. Please also confirm that this is not included in the page limitations.	See Comment 1675.
3622	RFP Page 50; Attachment C Page 27 UNSPSC CODES: "A full list of all currently identified in-scope UNSPSC codes for in-scope offerings is found in Attachment C, SEWP Contract Holder User Manual. However, Attachment C states: "A full list of all currently identified in-scope UNSPSC codes for in-scope offerings will be made available for download via the Contract Holder Only Page (CHOP)." Please confirm that a full list of all currently identified in-scope CLINS and UNSPSC codes for in-scope offerings will be made available to offerors so that Offerors can correctly complete Exhibit C – Category C Solutions Spreadsheet.	See Comment 2395.
3624	With the update to Enclosure 1, reducing the list of providers to be used as Designated Providers from all incumbent SEWP V contract holders in the draft RFP down to roughly 50 in the final RFP, would the Government please extend the submission deadline 30 days to August 9, 2024?	The Comment is out of date.
3627	The Volume I instructions in A.3.7.1 follow a different order than the evaluation criteria in A.4.1 and the order of contents in the table of A.3.6(B). Please confirm which section order the government would like Volume I offeror proposals to follow: A.3.7.1, A.4.1, or A.3.6(B) Table.	The Solicitation has been updated in an Amendment prior to Amendment 7.

sewp6_rfp_all_comments

3629	NASA has communicated to industry for many months that Offerors would have at least 60 days between final solicitation release and proposal due date. Please extend the due date for proposals accordingly.	The Comment is out of date.
3631	Why are Offerors to exclude "shipping and payment charges" on determining their pricing for Exhibit 3a. Page 102.	The solicitation will be revised in an upcoming amendment.
3632	In the chart on page 96 of the RFP it says that the Mandatory Experience Letter of Authorization (LOAS) limit is 3 pages. Does this mean each letter has a 3 page limit, or is it a 3 page limit in the whole Offeror Volume	See Comment 1957.
3633	For Secondary Providers on Category A Technical Areas do they need to be on the Enclosure-1 Provider list?	See Comment 5655.
3640	Offerors require NASA's responses to questions to formulate compliant responses. Please confirm NASA will extend the due date for proposals to ensure Offerors have at least 20 business days after NASA provides answers to questions.	The Comment is out of date.
3643	NASA has communicated to industry for many months that Offerors would have at least 60 days between final solicitation release and proposal due date. Please extend the due date for proposals accordingly.	The Comment is out of date.
3653	Please confirm that firms that submit Category C bids and utilize the reduced requirements for socio-economic set-asides (HUBZone, SDVOSB, EDWOSB, 8a) will not be siloed to responding only to task orders released within their respective socio-economic category, but instead can respond to both task orders set aside for small businesses AND their respective socio-economic category.	See Comment 1881.
3669	<p>A.3.7.1 OFFER VOLUME, (b) Mandatory Experience/ Offerings, For Category B and C, page 103 AND A.1.34, pages 61-63.</p> <p>Section A.1.34.b states that for Categories B and C "Only projects with NAICS codes listed as in-scope for SEWP VI are to be submitted." Section A.1.34 provides a very limited list of in-scope NAICS codes for Categories B and C.</p> <p>Multiple Small Businesses today provide IT services, as defined in Categories B and C, as subcontractors on larger NASA engineering, scientific or research and development contracts. This work is highly relevant to and could be potentially transferred to SEWP VI. However, it does not fall under the in-scope NAICS codes as listed in Section A.1.34.</p> <p>Given the stated NASA objective of making SEWP VI the preferred vehicle to procure IT Services, would the Government consider expanding the list of in-scope NAICS codes to allow submission of Relevant Experience Projects (REP) with highly relevant IT Services that currently do not fall under the NAICS listed in Section A.1.34? We suggest adding, at a minimum, NAICS code 517111 Wired Telecommunications Carriers to Category B and C to allow access to telecommunication service providers in addition to telecommunication products under Category A.</p>	See Comment 2949.

3671	Exhibit 3a- Category A Solutions SpreadsheetInformation tab"Place an X in the 4 proposed areas"Please confirm that offerors awarded a Category A contract will be able to respond to order-level RFQs across all 9 technical areas regardless of which 4 technical areas are "proposed."	Yes. Contract Holders will be eligible to reply to all RFQs within their Category for which they match the NAICs code, any business size restriction (i.e. set-side) and any other restrictions set by the Issuing Agency,
3675	A.1.34, pages 61-63. The NAICS codes listed in Exhibit 4 do not match the NAICS codes listed in A.1.34 of the RFP. If the codes in A.1.34 are considered in-scope for Categories B and C (pg. 63), please add them to Exhibit 4.	The Solicitation has been updated in an Amendment prior to Amendment 7.
3676	RFP p. 103-4: "For Small Businesses (including prime small business offerors and first tier Subcontractor, if applicable): A total of three (3) different REPs from different mandatory experience technical areas shall be submitted." Please clarify this language. Is each REP supposed to represent one mandatory experience technical area? Do each of the 3 REPs need to represent a different technical area?	The Solicitation has been updated in an Amendment prior to Amendment 7.
3677	Exhibit +1, Part III: Project Description, Page 1. Exhibit+1-Relevant+Experience+Project+Table, Part III: Project Description states "Provide a clear and concise description of the IT service provided and identify where the supporting information/evidence is in the attached documents..." RFP Section A.3.7.1 (b) Category B and C does not require any type of supporting information related to Relevant Experience Project (REP). Please clarify which supporting information/evidence is referenced in the instructions.	The Solicitation has been updated in an Amendment prior to Amendment 7.
3682	A.3.6 (B), page 95-96 proposal table; Is there a price volume requirement? If so, can the Government provide what is specifically required?	The Solicitation has been updated in an Amendment prior to Amendment 7.
3687	Please provide a file which we can share with our customers that currently the Exhibit 2, on Page 1 is a MSWord doc on Page 2 the actual questionnaire is a picture and not document that can be filled out.	See Comment 1804.
3694	On the C-SCRM Attestation Form, could the Government please verify the Government side of the items listed are controlled by the Government relative to their locations, assets and operations?	See Comment 1675.
3704	Please explain the difference between Relevant Experience and Past Performance? As well as where in Vol 2 is this to be included?	Relevant Experience (REP) refers to what the Offeror's experience is. Past Performance (PPQ) refers to how well an offeror performed. REPs are submitted in Volume 1 by inclusion of the filled in Exhibit 1. PPQs are submitted in Volume 2 as described in the Solicitation.

3705	RFP A.3.7.2 PAST PERFORMANCE VOLUME (p. 107): "Small Business Subcontracting Plan history, if applicable: provide latest Individual Subcontract Report (ISR) and Summary Subcontract Report (SSR) (formerly known as the SF 294 and 295 reports) and supporting rationale (Excluded from the page limitation)." Our understanding is this is not required for Small Business offerors; please confirm.	See comment 1978.
3706	The offeror assumes that A.3.7.3 Technical Approach (A) numerals 2 and 3 are duplicative therefore only one paragraph response should be submitted to address technological leadership. Will the Government remove the requirement for numeral 3?	See Comment 1808.
3707	Will the Government please clarify the statement, "ii. FOR CATEGORY B and C - The Offeror shall describe ancillary products required for performance of specific tasks and corporate risks associated with SCRM (e.g., availability and security of corporate resources)." Specifically, can you please define what, "Ancillary Products" are in this statement?	See Comment 6409.
3712	The PPQ form requires details to be completed that may make it cumbersome for the CO to complete on time, especially Section 6. Is it possible to make the form easier for the CO to complete?	See Comment 1804.
3713	A.3.3(a): The SEWP VI RFP Website currently does not display a tab where Offerors can submit their bid packages. Does NASA have a projected date of when this location/tab on the website will be available to Offerors to upload their bid packages?	See Comment 3100.
3716	Section III Instructions to Offerors, (B) Proposal Content and Page Limitations, page 96 - Would the Government please consider increasing the page limit from 10 to 15 pages for Volume II Past Performance?	The Solicitation will remain as stated.
3729	A.3.6(B)(2): We recommend NASA allow Offerors to reduce the font size requirement for headers/footers to no less than 10 pt font size.	See Comment 1962.
3730	After award, are small businesses allowed to participate in Full and Open Bids as well?	See Comment 1881.
3732	Attachment 3c is not set up for services. Will the Government revise this attachment to reflect services rather than parts/products? Will the Government provide clear instructions for Category C Offerors to complete Attachment 3c, including clear instruction regarding listing/proposing labor categories? Does the Government want floor or ceiling rates for labor categories that will be listed on Attachment 3c? This is an extensive pricing exercise and up until the release of the final RFP, the Government was clear that no pricing will be submitted at the IDIQ level - to require rates now will create significant workload on Offerors and the timing of the Government's clarification of this point should (respectfully) incorporate reasonable time for Offerors to develop base or fully burdened rates if those will be required.	See Comment 2214.

sewp6_rfp_all_comments

3734	<p>RFP Language (p. 98): "Identify any consultants, generative artificial intelligence, and/or sub-contractors used in writing this proposal (if any) and the extent to which their services will be available in the subsequent performance of this effort."</p> <p>Several tools used by Offerors include elements of generative artificial intelligence, such as MS Office and its Editor tool for checking spelling, grammar, and syntax. Does NASA intend for Offerors to list every tool used in support of their proposal bids that has this type of AI capability?</p>	See Comment 2276.
3737	<p>Regarding the SEWP Provider List, and the limitation associated with an OEM we choose having to be on the list, would the government consider removing that limitation? We have a couple of large OEMs we market and represent which are not on the list and we would like to have the ability to Designate them in support of our chosen Technical Areas. EATON, in support of Technical Area 5, is one example.</p> <p>Another option for the government's consideration is to complete a SEWP Provider form for us to be able to add to the list for our offer submission.</p>	See Comment 5655.
3739	Exhibit 2-PastPerfQues-SEWP VI - Is there text missing at the end of the last sentence? If so, please provide.	See Comment 1804.
3749	RFP page 102 states "The designated provider for each of the proposed areas must be from the list of approved SEWP Providers listed in Enclosure 1" Do all OEM providers offered at proposal submission have to be on that list? If so, can you please add Nikon, Red Cinema, Sony, GoPro, Bose, DJI, Aja Video Systems?	See Comment 5655.
3752	Can the government specify the interoperability requirements for solutions provided under this contract, especially those involving cloud services and cybersecurity? Are there specific protocols or standards that must be followed to ensure seamless integration with existing systems?	The SEWP contracts are utilized by the entire Federal Government which in turn utilizes a wide range of products and services that require all forms of protocols, standard, and other factors. Specifics will be provided at the task order level.
3754	RFP page 102 states "The designated provider for each of the proposed areas must be from the list of approved SEWP Providers listed in Enclosure 1" Do all OEM providers offered at proposal submission have to be on that list? If so, can you please add Senneheiser?	See Comment 5655.
3771	Does an award given for a proposal submitted as a HUBZone or 8(a) automatically give access to Small Business task orders as well--not just the task orders set aside for the offeror's particular designation?	See Comment 1881.
3772	Will a company that qualifies as a small business under NAICS 541513 but is large under all other NAICS only be eligible to bid for task orders under 541513 if they receive a SEWP award based on their small business qualification?	See Comment 1881.

sewp6_rfp_all_comments

3775	In Cat B if a prime company is small under one NAICS and large under the rest - Can they provide one bid as small and automatically be eligible for task orders as large for the other NAICS? What past performance thresholds would we need to comply with large or small?	See Comment 1881.
3781	For the Exhibit 1 Relevant Experience Project Table, the form is in Arial and indicates that the response should be made in Arial. This conflicts with the RFP's requirement to use Times New Roman font. Please clarify which font should be used in this form.	See Comment 2629.
3782	There is a mention of supporting documents and the risk of redactions. What supporting docs is this referring to specifically and for what purpose?	The Solicitation has been updated in an Amendment prior to Amendment 7.
3794	Can a small business offeror reference REPs or past performance from a contract with a NAICS 541611 where the contract documents and SOW directly demonstrate a relevant and substantial IT requirement?	See Comment 2669.
3811	A.3.7.2(a) Information from the Offeror: "An Offeror may submit a single award IDIQ/ BPA at the contract/ agreement level for as a single past performance reference. However, Offerors are not permitted to submit a multiple award or GWAC as an individual past performance reference." Does this mean that an Offeror cannot use an IDIQ contract as a past performance reference if there were multiple IDIQ contracts awarded for the same customer program?	See Comment 2623.
3814	A.3.7.1(b) Category A - Letter of Authorization: Are Letters of Authorization and Points of Contact to be provided for the "additional provider(s)" as well? Should they be provided for all proposed providers under each technical area or just for one "designated provider" under each technical area?	See Comment 1874.
3816	ATTACHMENT J- C_SCRM Attestation Form: We have encountered technical issues with ATTACHMENT J - C_SCRM Attestation Form. When selecting Yes/No for one question, the response disappears upon answering the subsequent question. Additionally, when providing a summary explanation, the explanation is duplicated in all of the boxes for other questions. Can you please provide guidance on how to resolve these issues, or could you supply a corrected version of the form that allows for independent responses and individual summary explanations for each question?	See Comment 1675.
3818	A.3.6 Proposal Preparation - General Instructions: Can the government increase the page count for Volume III: Mission Suitability Volume to 25 pages?	The Solicitation will remain as stated.
3822	Exhibit 5 C-SCRM and Attachment J require a Y/N answer to each question. For example, virtual companies have no physical facility such that the following question is not applicable. "Does your organization escort visitors and monitor visitor activity; maintain audit logs of physical access; and control and manage physical access devices?" For such instances, will NASA permit an answer of "NA" with an explanation?	See Comment 3529.

sewp6_rfp_all_comments

3824	A.3.7.1(a) ISO Certification: If Offerors are not allowed to utilize the ISO certificates of a parent company, will NASA allow both large and small businesses up to 12 months to explore whether an ISO certificate can be obtained?	The Solicitation has been updated in an Amendment prior to Amendment 7.
3826	A.1.22 UNSPSC Codes: "A full list of all currently identified in-scope UNSPSC codes for in-scope offerings is found in Attachment C, SEWP Contract Holder User Manual." Please provide the attachment which includes the UNSPSC codes as it was not provided in the final RFP. Since these are the "currently identified in-scope" codes, may other UNSPSC codes be offered that are not included on the list?	The Solicitation has been updated in an Amendment prior to Amendment 7. The UNSPSC list will be updated as needed post-award.
3832	For Categories B and C, if we submit as an 8(a) or SDVOSB, will we automatically inherit the Small Business award as well? For example, the Small Business requirements for REPs have a higher total contract value minimum. If we want to ensure we get the Small Business track and 8(a) and SDVOSB tracks, do we need to adhere to this?	See Comment 1881.
3836	Is generic letter of authorization from provider is acceptable or is there any specific format for the same.	See Comment 1799.
3840	A.3.6.(B) table: Please confirm that Mandatory Experience Letter of Authorization is only for Category A Offerors, and that Offerors submitting in Categories B/C will not have this in their submission package.	See Comment 1782.
3843	<p>Page 96, Section A.3.6 (B) states: "using not smaller than 12-point type Times New Roman font inclusive of headers, footers, and any graphic captions."</p> <p>Would NASA consider allowing Headers, Footers and Graphic Captions (similar to the text requirement of diagrams, schedules, charts, tables, artwork and photographs) at no smaller than 10-point type Times Roman font?</p> <p>Body text would remain at no smaller than 12-point Times New Roman, for that most readable manner practicable.</p>	See Comment 1962.
3854	RFP A.3.7.3(b)(1)(v), RFP pg. 112: The Government provides two attachments denoted as C-SCRM Attestation Forms (both ATTACHMENT_J-C_SCRM_Attestation_Form.pdf and Exhibit_5_C-SCRM_Attestation_Form.pdf). Which form is to be used to satisfy the requirements of A.3.7.3(b)(1)(v)?	See Comment 3479.
3855	The RFP States: "If the CLIN is for an hourly labor rate, then the associated labor category shall be provided in Column G (Labor Category if Hourly Rate). The information including pricing in these spreadsheets will not be reviewed or evaluated and will only be utilized to establish the initial Contract Database of Record upon Contract award." Will the Government provide a list of LCATs associated with each Category?	See Comment 2285.

sewp6_rfp_all_comments

3857	<p>A.3.7.2.(a)(12), RFP pg. 109: Instructions state that “Offerors identified as an Other Than Small Businesses in Category B shall provide past performance references showcasing relevant work in at least four (4) content representative areas for content to be rated relevant (Pertinent)”.</p> <p>Our past performance contracts span relevancy in ALL content representative areas. With the font limitation set at TNR 12, it is very difficult to provide detailed description of our past performance in the 10-page limitation. Would the Government consider responses in table form using TNR 10?</p>	The Solicitation will remain as stated.
3863	A.3.7.1(b) For Category B & C, RFP pg. 103: Can the Government please clarify what types of labor categories for services they are seeking for Category B?	See Comment 2285.
3864	Within an awarded contract category (A, B, or C), can specialty small businesses bid all small business delivery order RFPs and all unrestricted delivery order RFPs?	See Comment 1881.
3870	Many of the designated providers use distributors to sell their products, and these distributors establish reseller agreements directly with government contractors to sell designated provider products. Is it acceptable for a bidder to obtain a letter of authorization from a distributor of a designated provider for the designated provider’s products?	The Solicitation will remain as stated. "the POC that signed the LOA must be the POC from the company of the designated provider identified in Exhibit 3a- Category A Solutions Spreadsheet, Point of Contact (POC) Info Tab. "
3871	Section A.3.7.2 states, “For Small Businesses proposing in Categories A- the past performance provided shall be for similar scope efforts with a minimum average annual cost incurred of \$150,000 (One Hundred-Fifty Thousand) for size to be rated relevant (pertinent). Section A.4.3 states, “Small Businesses - In Category A and C, shall furnish the past performance for similar scope efforts with an average annual cost/fee incurred of \$500,000.” For Category A, please clarify the minimum average annual cost value for small businesses for past performance.	See Comment 1709.
3873	In accordance with DRD #3, a C-SCRM Plan must be submitted to the SEWP Program Management Office no later than 60 calendar days prior to the Contract award date. When will bidders be informed of the actual Contract award date or should bidders use May 1, 2025 as the Contract award date (which would make the C-SCRM Plan due on March 2, 2025)? If a bidder submits proposals for multiple categories, is it acceptable to submit one C-SCRM Plan? Does the C-SCRM Plan have to be approved by the SEWP Program Management Office prior to receipt of a delivery order award?	The Solicitation has been updated in an Amendment prior to Amendment 7.
3878	Can offerors propose any labor categories appropriate for the specified contract category (i.e., A, B, or C)? Also, please confirm that labor category descriptions do not need to be submitted with the proposal.	See Comment 2285.

sewp6_rfp_all_comments

3884	A.3.7.1.(a) The scalability and extensibility of the offeror's capabilities that demonstrates the offeror's ability to deliver the fullest range of ITC/AV Solutions and/or Services. Can you please give examples of what demonstrates scalability for Category C? Also examples of what demonstrates extensibility of offeror's capabilities for Category C? These requirements are not aligned with the evaluation criteria in A.4.4 which will assess effectiveness, reasonableness, and efficiency.	The Solicitation has been updated in an Amendment prior to Amendment 7.
3887	The NAICS Code size standard for Socio-Economic small businesses is under \$7 Mil over several years, yet the RFP is requiring a minimum of two or three contract project experiences valued at \$4 Million and \$5 Million Total Contract Value for Category B, which would bump a small business out of that NAICS code - this seems to be a contradiction, opens up the possibility for protest, and limits potential competition of small business Socio-Economic groups, would the Government revisit these numbers and lower those minimum contract values to \$2 Mil or \$3 Mil TCV for Category B Socio-Economic groups?	The solicitation will remain as stated.
3888	Pg 106 & 116 differ on the dollar amount threshold of what past performance is considered relevant for Small business in Category A: \$150,000 vs. \$500,000. Which relevant minimum dollar threshold should be used?	See Comment 1709.
3893	Will you please consider adding NAICS 541519e (footnote18) to Categories B and C? This allows a small business VAR, based on employee size standard (less than 150 people), to participate with services utilizing their boutique service offerings.	The Solicitation has been updated in an Amendment prior to Amendment 7.
3902	The Category C - Mandatory Experience Sub-Areas listed on page 104 do not match the Category C technical areas listed A.2 Scope of work Category C. Could the government please advise how we are to judge which technical area a REP falls under if we don't have any description of the scope elements of each sub area?	The Solicitation has been updated in an Amendment prior to Amendment 7.
3904	The Category C Content Representative Areas listed on pages 108-109 do not match the Category C technical areas listed A.2 Scope of work Category C. Could the government please advise how we are to judge which content representative areas a past performance reference falls under if we don't have any description of the scope elements of each sub area?	The Solicitation has been updated in an Amendment prior to Amendment 7.
3914	For A.3.7.3 (a), items 2 and 3, can the government please clarify if items 2 and 3 are the same requirement?	See Comment 1808.
3917	What is the planned approach of the C.O. for bids/RFQs post-award regarding NAICS codes? Are awardees only able to bid opportunities for the NAICS codes they specifically bid during the proposal phase?	See Comment 1881.
3920	A.1.22 states "A full list of all currently identified in-scope UNSPSC codes for in-scope offerings is found in Attachment C, SEWP Contract Holder User Manual." However, there is no list of UNSPSC Codes contained in the reference document. Will the Government provide a list of all in scope UNSPSC codes?	See Comment 2395.

sewp6_rfp_all_comments

3928	Do we need to provide Letters of Authorization (LOA) for all the manufacturers listed in Enclosure I of the RFP/RFQ?	See Comment 1874.
3931	Will there be designations for set-aside capabilities of Small Businesses within the Categories, particularly in Category C, which is a complete Small Business set-aside?	See Comment 1881.
3936	<p>A.2.1 GSFC 52.211-101 LIST OF ATTACHMENTS. (NOV 2022) pg88. Please clarify when each of the “*TBS” items are to be submitted - Some of the “*TBS” items submitted dates appear to be provided in Attachment D- Contract Data Requirements Descriptions (DRD) List. Please confirm the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •DEIA Plan – DRD list states “within 30 days of contract award,” not due with the proposal– yes or no? •SEWP C-SCRM Plan – DRD states “no later than 60 calendar days prior to contract award date” – do we submit with proposal, yes or no? How do we know when 60 days prior to contract award date is? •Climate Change Risk Management Plan – DRD states within 12 months of contract award – submit with proposal, yes or no? Proposal seems to call for it? 	See Comment 1675.

<p>3943</p>	<p>RFP Language:</p> <p>(Page 104) Category B- Mandatory Experience Technical Areas:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Enterprise- Wide Net 2. IT Managed Services 3. Enterprise-Wide Innovation Services 4. IT Service Management 5. Enterprise Service Program Integration 6. Enterprise-Wide Information and Data Analytics Services (IDAs) 7. Enterprise-Wide Application Services/Software Development 8. Enterprise-Wide Cybersecurity Services 9. Enterprise-Wide Cloud Services 10. Enterprise-Wide Digital Multimedia and Technical Communications Services <p>(Page 108) CATEGORY B Content Representative Areas</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. IT Managed Services 2. Enterprise-Wide Network Services 3. Enterprise-Wide Innovation Services 4. IT Service Management 5. Enterprise Service Program Integration 6. Enterprise-Wide Information and Data Analytics Services (IDAs) 7. Enterprise-Wide Application Services/Software Development 8. Enterprise-Wide Cybersecurity Services 9. Enterprise-Wide Cloud Services 10. Enterprise-Wide Digital Multimedia and Technical Communications Services <p>Question: The order and titles of the Category B Mandatory Experience Technical Areas on Page 104 vary slightly from the Category B Content Representative Areas on page 108. Would the Government consider making these lists match to simplify the mapping of these areas to selected projects?</p>	<p>The Solicitation has been updated in an Amendment prior to Amendment 7.</p>
<p>3947</p>	<p>RFP Language: The Government provided spreadsheet indicates that the offerer should provide CLIN numbers in column A.</p> <p>Question: Will the Government clarify the source of the CLIN numbers? Will they be provided by the Government?</p>	<p>See Comment 2214.</p>
<p>3948</p>	<p>Question: Will the Government confirm that for offerors who are only proposing services, they only need to fill in columns A, D & G (CLIN, Description, Hourly Rate)?</p>	<p>See Comment 2214.</p>

sewp6_rfp_all_comments

3949	<p>RFP Language: "Failure to submit at least one quote quarterly or be awarded at least one task/delivery order against the Contract Holder's SEWP contract within two calendar years will result in dormant status."</p> <p>Question: Does the Government have a projected Task Order (TO) through-put / forecast for Category B-1 that can support a high number of vendors receiving an award in two calendar years, or to support at least quarterly submissions? The concern is that the TO throughput may not support the ability for all companies to submit proposals quarterly, or that heavy competition does not produce an award at least every two years.</p>	<p>The Solicitation has been updated in an Amendment prior to Amendment 7 to remove the wording "submit at least one quote quarterly or be awarded at least one task/delivery order against the Contract Holder's SEWP contract within two calendar years".</p>
3950	<p>Both Attachment J and Exhibit 5 are named "C-SCRM Attestation Form". Would the Government please clarify the expected use of the two different forms since both of them are named "C-SCRM Attestation Form"?</p>	<p>See Comment 3479.</p>
3951	<p>The RFP refers Offerors to the CHUM for a list of in-scope UNSPSC codes, and the CHUM only states a full list will be made available via the CHOP. Is this list currently available somewhere on the SEWP V CHOP or the SEWP VI information site?</p>	<p>See Comment 2395.</p>
3952	<p>What do the asterisks indicate in the items marked *TBS in the List of Attachments table on page 88?</p>	<p>See Comment 1869.</p>
3957	<p>For Exhibit 3a, technical solution tabs: Will Offerors be evaluated more favorably if they have a greater number of providers/OEMs in addition to the designated OEMs?</p>	<p>See Comment 5061.</p>
3958	<p>Please confirm that an LOA naming a prime offeror's parent company as the authorized reseller is acceptable when the prime SEWP VI offeror is a subsidiary or affiliate company? Many reseller agreements are between the OEM and the parent company and extend to the subsidiary/affiliate companies. Example: "Company A Federal," a wholly owned subsidiary of Company A Corporation, is submitting a proposal for SEWP VI. An LOA from an OEM states "Company A Corporation" is an authorized reseller of all their products for SEWP VI.</p>	<p>See Comment 2305.</p>
3966	<p>RFP Section: Attachment J Question: Will the Government please confirm that Attachment J is NOT to be submitted with a proposal?</p>	<p>See Comment 1675.</p>
3968	<p>RFP Section: Exhibit 4 Question: Can an Offeror participate in procurements for all NAICS post-award or only those that are included in Exhibit 4 in the proposal and consistent with the Offerors SAM registration?</p>	<p>See Comment 1881.</p>
3969	<p>RFP Section: RFP A.1.34 Category B and C Tables; Exhibit 4 Question: What size standard applies to NAICS 519190 "All other information services" as it is not listed in the SBA NAICS code "Table of Small Business Size Standards"?</p>	<p>See Comment 1777.</p>

sewp6_rfp_all_comments

3970	Post-award, will Offerors receive RFQs for all procurements (LB, SB, all NAICS) or only those for which they qualify at the time of the RFP release?	See Comment 1881.
3971	Post-award, will offerors awarded a contract as a small business be able to bid on unrestricted RFQs, or are they limited to small business set-asides?	See Comment 1881.
3978	RFP Section: RFP A.1.22; Attachment C, p 27, UNSPSC Codes; Exhibit 3s Question: Please confirm that the available UNSPSC codes for in scope services for use in Exhibit 3 will be provided. The RFP indicates they are in Attachment C which notes they "will be made available for download via the Contract Holder Only Page (CHOP).	See Comment 2395.
3985	RFP Section: PPQ Template Question: The PPQ template has coding problems in several of the blue fill-in cells. If a revised template will be distributed, will the Government extend the proposal due date to allow the same amount of preparation time as originally given from the original RFP/PPQ template release to the final proposal due date?	The Solicitation has been updated in an Amendment prior to Amendment 7.
3991	There appears to be duplications in these two Technical areas 1a and 2a. Sub-areas Optical storage technology, Storage management systems / file servers, Media storage technology and Storage virtualization system are in both Technical Area 1a: IT COMPUTER SYSTEMS / COMPUTE FACILITIES and Technical Area 2a: IT Storage Systems. We recommend that Technical Area 1a: IT COMPUTER SYSTEMS / COMPUTE FACILITIES sub-areas Optical storage technology, Storage management systems / file servers, Media storage technology and Storage virtualization system be deleted so it is only in Technical Area 2a: IT Storage Systems. These sub-areas are typically proposed with storage solution.	See Comment 4028.
3992	Subcontracting requirements for small businesses makes it difficult for small businesses to remain competitive. Will the government consider waiving the AbilityOne subcontracting requirement for small businesses responding to Category C?	The solicitation will remain as stated.
3998	We respectfully request a 30-day extension of the proposal due date to allow offerors to update/modify their proposal based on changes and clarification provided from the submitted Q&A.	The Comment is out of date.
4001	Section 2 of Exhibit 2 has checkboxes for Prime Contractor, Significant Subcontractor, and Team Member. However, when trying to check any one of those boxes, all three boxes are automatically checked. There is no way to accurately indicate our role on the project. Will NASA please send out a revised Exhibit 2 that corrects this issue?	See Comment 1804.
4003	In the event an offeror is awarded a small business contract (e.g., Category A2), will this offeror be able to see unrestricted SEWP Category A1 task order opportunities, and will they be allowed to bid on them as a Prime?	See Comment 1881.

sewp6_rfp_all_comments

4006	In the event an offeror is awarded an Unrestricted contract (e.g., Category A1), and has reflected on their Exhibit 4 NAICS Size Standard Crosswalk they are a SB for a given NAICS (for example 541533), will this offeror be able to see SB SEWP Category A2 task order opportunities under 541533, and will they be allowed to bid on those opportunities as a Prime (so long as they are still classified as small against that relevant NAICS at time of proposal submission)?	See Comment 1881.
4008	Will the Government please clarify the pricing instructions on page 103? In Exhibit 3, Category C Solutions Spreadsheet, there are columns for the SEWP Catalog Price and the Labor Category (if Hourly Rate). Is it the Government's intention that offerors insert a list of proposed labor categories and their hourly rates for these categories in Columns F and G? If so, is it the Government's expectation that offerors would be using already accepted schedule prices for these labor categories, or submit a separate pricing file with labor category pricing? If this is NOT the Government's expectation, what pricing information is required with the July 11 submission? Or is it the Government's expectation that each task order will include a detailed pricing volume?	See Comment 2214.
4011	We respectfully request a 30-day extension of the proposal due date to allow for the volume of requests for AbilityOne Commitment Letters.	The Comment is out of date.
4016	Please confirm that for Section A, an LOA is only required for the 1 Designated Primary and 3 non-Primary providers and is not required for the 4 Secondary Providers that are to be submitted.	See Comment 1874.
4018	We would request an extension to the July 11th due date due to the changes in the DRFP and FRFP and the time to address some of these changes. This includes working with the Mandatory Vendor list and the time it takes to gather their documentation (LOA's included).	The Comment is out of date.
4019	After SEWP VI award, will the contract holder ONLY be able to utilize the 4 technical areas they choose when submitting their proposal? Or will the contract holder be able to add technology to any of the technical areas post award?	See Comment 1881.
4020	Enclosure 1 – Will the PMO require LOA's and vendors from the SEWP VI Providers Enclosure 1 list for both the Main and secondary vendors being offered?	See Comment 1874.
4021	A.3.7.1 Offer Volume - Exhibit 3a- Category A Solutions Spreadsheet- Technical Area Tabs – Page 102: Will SEWP allow the 50 CLIN's from other vendors than those listed in Enclosure 1 in the Technical Solution Tabs or will the government consider alternate Vendors that meet the same criteria?	See Comment 5655.
4022	A.3.7.1 Offer Volume – Exhibit 3a- Category A Solutions Spreadsheet- Technical Area Tabs – Page 101- Would an Offeror be able to submit more than 4 Mandatory Vendors in the response or is it limited to 4?	See Comment 5061.

sewp6_rfp_all_comments

4028	<p>There appears to be duplications in these two Technical areas. Sub-areas Anti-fatigue mats, Bags and cases for ITC/AV products, and ITC/AV Shipping Products and Supplies are in both Technical Area 1a: IT COMPUTER SYSTEMS / COMPUTE FACILITIES and Technical Area 4a: Imaging Equipment and Supporting Technology.</p> <p>Please clarify whether the duplication is correct? Sub-areas Anti-fatigue mats, Bags and cases for ITC/AV products, and ITC/AV Shipping Products and Supplies are supportiing peripherals so they probably belong in Technical Area 4a: Imaging Equipment and Supporting Technology.</p>	<p>The definitions are correct. Technical Areas are examples of in -scope offerings and may overlap across different areas. Therefore Anti-fatigue mats, Bags and cases can fit within multiple Technical Areas.</p>
4029	<p>Can a company that was acquire provide an LOA for the products/solutions of its parent company? For example, Ricoh Company which is on Enclosure 1 - SEWP VI Providers List owns PFU America. PFU America is the seller of Ricoh products but is not on Enclosure 1 - SEWP VI Providers List. Is an LOA from PFU America acceptable since they are owned by Ricoh Company that is on Enclosure 1 - SEWP VI Provider List?</p>	<p>See Comment 2305.</p>
4033	<p>There is no information on how to complete Exhibit 3b meaningfully, and customer requirements for enterprise-wide services will only be determined at the task order level. Should Offerors simply provide a list of labor categories relevant to Category B scope? Or, should Offerors develop new CLINs for products and services that represent hypothetical task orders within the technical areas of Category B? Or, should Offerors use their proposed REPs, broken down into product and service line items and UNSPSC codes?</p>	<p>See Comment 2214.</p>
4034	<p>"While the exact wording and format of the LOA can vary, the Point of Contact (POC) signing the LOA must include the name of the offeror, a reference to SEWP VI, and the POC's position in the company."</p> <p>Some of the providers on the Enclosure 1 are refusing to provide LOAs to authorized resellers with the SEWP VI reference. They will only provide General LOAs and will not change their template. These companies include some of the Government's largest technology providers like HP/HPI. Recommendation: Please remove the requirement for LOAs to include a SEWP VI reference or remove the providers from Enclosure 1 who are unwilling to change their LOA template.</p>	<p>See Comment 1799.</p>
4037	<p>Considering the issues embedded in Exhibit 2, the Past Performance Questionnaire, which requires NASA correction before we can send the questionnaire to our customers who also have Federal holidays and potential summer leave, can you extend the submission out 4 weeks after the corrected form has been released? This will give our government customers time to complete and return the forms.</p>	<p>The Comment is out of date.</p>
4038	<p>Will you please consider adding NAICS 541715 Research and Development in the Physical, Engineering, and Life Sciences (Footnote 11) to Category B and C? This allows a small business, based on employee size standard (less than 1000 people), to participate with services utilizing their boutique service offerings.</p>	<p>See Comment 1671.</p>

sewp6_rfp_all_comments

4039	<p>Exhibit 1, Relevant Experience Project Table: the PDF file, PART III Project Description, instructs Offerors to provide a description in the text field below, in Arial 10 point, and not to exceed three (3) pages of text. However, the text field does not carry over to additional pages therefore limiting writing to the first page only. Additionally, the text field is pre-set to modify the text size automatically.</p> <p>Question: Will the Government modify this form, specifically, to create additional text fields for the 2 additional pages so Offerors can access the full 3-page limitation in compliance with this requirement? Or would it be acceptable to Offerors submitting their Relevant Experience Project write-ups as a separate word file?</p>	The Solicitation has been updated in an Amendment prior to Amendment 7.
4041	<p>Reference Page 59 - As a prime contractor operating in the federal space with greater than 90% of our subcontracting going to services versus commercial items, we do not operate under a commercial plan. We utilize an Individual Subcontracting Plan (ISP) that is specific to each opportunity that includes both traditional subcontractors, vendors/suppliers who provide products and/or services, individual consultants, and other direct charges.</p> <p>Question: Therefore, will the Government allow submission of an ISP that meets the requirements of FAR 19.704 and FAR 52.219-9 that will include any commercial item spend?</p>	See comment 1978.
4042	<p>Reference Page 88 - Diversity, Equity, Inclusion, and Accessibility (DEIA) Plan- Applicable for Categories B & C: Table provided in section A.2.1 (Attachment, row G) shows a DEIA Plan is to be submitted for categories B&C.</p> <p>Question: Will the Government confirm this requirement and provide instructions on how it should be submitted; as well as the depth and level of content the Government would like to receive?</p>	See Comment 1675.
4044	<p>Section A.3.6(B) Pg. 96 Mandatory Experience Letter of authorization (3 pages) with 4 technical areas being requested should this allow for 4 pages to match the number of potential OEMs utilized for the respective technical areas?</p>	See Comment 1957.
4046	<p>How does the SCRM being requested as part of the management volume differ from the requested Attachment J SCRM Attestation that is due separately?</p>	<p>Section A.1.30.1. Cybersecurity-Supply Chain Risk Management (C-SCRM) Plan (Attestation Form) defines post award submissions with regard to Attachment J; Section A.3.7.3 MISSION SUITABILITY VOLUME (1) Commitment to Supply Chain Management defines proposal submission with regard to Exhibit 5.</p>
4047	<p>Section A.3.7.1 What is considered generative artificial intelligence (GAI) (only AI programs or applications i.e. Chat GPT, or could base functionality within Microsoft Word be considered GAI like the generation of a Table of Contents.)</p>	See Comment 2276.

sewp6_rfp_all_comments

4048	Exhibit 4 NAICS Size Standard Crosswalk – NAICS code 518210* is indicated with an * was this a typo or is there a footnote associated with this code? As we are not able to find that information.	The Solicitation has been updated in an Amendment prior to Amendment 7.
4049	Post award, will small business Task Order Request for Proposals be issued/reserved for specific socio-economic designations (e.g., HUBZone, 8(a)) only so that a General Small Business may NOT bid on them (or even see them)?	See Comment 1881.
4051	If an offeror is awarded a contract as a HUBZone (or other socio-economic designation), we they be able to bid on all General Small Business Task Order Request for Proposals or do you have to win that Small Business category award separately?	See Comment 1881.
4052	Reference Pages 95, 96, and 101 - RFP States: (B) PROPOSAL CONTENT AND PAGE LIMITATIONS - Volume 1 (Offer Volume) now has a requirement to provide a Mandatory Experience Letter of Authorization (LOA) with a 3-page limit.; Further, RFP States: A.3.7.1 OFFER VOLUME/(b) Mandatory Experience/ Offerings - Provides detailed instructions for Category A- Letter of Authorization. There are no instructions for a Category B-Letter of Authorization. Question: Will the Government confirm the LOA is only required for Offerors bidding Category A?	See Comment 1782.
4054	How will the subcontractor files be linked to the main offerors' file in the application? Is this covered in the instructions or a user guide somewhere? How will the offeror know that the subcontractor's files were uploaded and accepted successfully?	The Solicitation has been updated to remove the reference.
4055	Small Business past performance annual cost/fee criteria has been set at two different levels: is the requirement at \$150,000 as stated in section A.3.7.2 (a) or at \$500,000 as stated in section A.4.3.	See Comment 1709.
4056	Post award, will small business awardees be able to see ALL small business Task Order Request for Proposals or only those for their awarded socio-economic designations?	See Comment 1881.
4058	If an offeror is awarded a contract as a HUBZone (or other socio-economic designation), we they be able to bid on all General Small Business Task Order Request for Proposals or do you have to win that Small Business category award separately?	See Comment 1881.
4060	Post award, will small business awardees be able to see ALL small business Task Order Request for Proposals or only those for their awarded socio-economic designations?	See Comment 1881.
4062	PPQ and REP forms text boxes don't expand but instead reduce the size of the font to fit within the box. This can make it virtually unreadable for editing within the box.	The Solicitation has been updated in an Amendment prior to Amendment 7.

sewp6_rfp_all_comments

4082	<p>Reference Pages 33 and 104 - A.3.7 PROPOSAL VOLUMES: on page 104, (section A.3.7.1 OFFER VOLUME) the Category B- Mandatory Experience Technical Areas lists 10 areas; Item 1 - Has a typo (Enterprise- Wide NET). Additionally, on page 33 in section A.1.2 GSFC 52.211-91 SCOPE OF WORK (FEB 2016) also lists the technical areas for Category B- Enterprise-wide ITC/AV Service Solutions – NAICS 541512, however, the areas are listed in a different order; and shows "Technical Area 1b: ENTERPRISE-WIDE NETWORK SERVICES", not "Enterprise-Wide NET" as it states later on page 104.</p> <p>Question: Items 1b and 2b are in different order on page 104 and page 108; 104 and the list starting on page 33 match, but page 108 reverses the order of these 2 Technical areas. Will the Government provide the correct order for Category B Technical Areas?</p>	The Solicitation has been updated to correct the order.
4086	<p>All three exhibits have a product orientation, however Category B and C are customized for IT services, not products. Our company provides customized IT services that are tailored and bid based on a Level of Effort assessment corresponding to a government-provided PWS or SOW. Based on this, we do not understand how to complete Exhibit 3b and 3c. Column A (CLIN), Column B (Provider), Column C (Part Number), and Column F (SEWP Catalog Price) seem to infer only "productized" services. This is not our understanding of the intent of Category B & C. How does the government want us to complete Exhibit 3b and 3c with IT services in mind (not products like in Category A)? We recommend the government either remove pricing altogether for Category B & C or request the offeror provide a minimum number of Labor Categories and associated onsite labor ceiling rates for those corresponding categories similar to other large IT service-based IDIQs.</p>	See Comment 2214.
4099	<p>If a small business has past performance in NAICS 541611 with significant IT components, can they use it as relevant experience for IT projects under a different NAICS code?</p>	See Comment 2669.
4116	<p>Attachment D - Contract Data Requirements ListAllPlease confirm that compliance with Attachment - D Contract Data Requirements List is a post-IDIQ requirement.</p>	Yes. Contract Data Requirements are post-award requirements.
4117	<p>Pg 13 of DRFP, FAR 52.212-4 - Considering the draft RFP stipulates a minimum response time of 60 days post-release, would you be open to extending the deadline to July 23rd or later?</p>	The Comment is out of date.
4120	<p>A.2.1 List of Attachments; p.88Please confirm Attachment G: DEIA Plan should be part of the Offeror's proposal submission. If so, will the Government provide a template? And in which volume should Attachment G be included?</p>	See Comment 1675.
4121	<p>A.1.51 Climate Change Risk Management;p.76:Please confirm Attachment L: Climate Change Risk Management Plan should be part of the Offeror's proposal submission. If so, will the Government provide a template? And in which volume should Attachment L be included?</p>	See Comment 1675.

4125	p.57; RFP states "In accordance with DRD #3, a C-SCRM Plan must be submitted to the SEWP Program Management Office annually and no later than 60 calendar days prior to the Contract award date." Please clarify when the C-SCRM Plan should be submitted.	The Solicitation has been updated in an Amendment prior to Amendment 7.
4137	In Section A.1.2 GSFC 52.211-91 SCOPE OF WORK, Category B is divided into Group B1 – Unrestricted, and Group B2 – Small Business Set Aside, and Category C is divided into Group C1 - Small Business Set Aside, and Group C2 – Reserved. Can the government confirm that companies that meet just the socioeconomic (HUBZone, VOSB, SDVOSB, WOSB, EDWOSB, 8a) thresholds for the Relevant Experience Projects and Past Performance will have the same access to all opportunities in the Small Business Groups B2 and C1?	See Comment 1881.
4139	Sections A.1.2,A.3.7.1 and A.3.7.2 // In the Solicitation, there is a discrepancy with regards to Category B Technical Area 1b and 2b. For example, on pages 33 and 104, Technical Area 1b is Enterprise-Wide Network Services and Technical Area 2b is IT Managed Services. However, on page 108, Technical Area 1b is noted as being IT Managed Services and 2b as being Enterprise-Wide Network Services. Please confirm which technical area allocation is correct?	The Solicitation has been updated in an Amendment prior to Amendment 7.
4141	In A.3.5 states on page 95, "The following table contains the page limitations for each portion of the proposal submitted in response to this solicitation." and shows for Volume I - Offeror Volume, (b) Mandatory Experience Exhibit is excluded from page count. However, in Exhibit 1 - REP, it states that, "The completed REP Template may not exceed a total of three (3) pages." Please clarify.	The Solicitation has been updated in an Amendment prior to Amendment 7.
4143	Will the Government extend the current proposal submission deadline of July 11, 2024? Due to the limited resources typically available to small businesses, particularly during the July 4th holiday period, we propose that an extension would be mutually beneficial, allowing for more comprehensive and thoughtfully prepared responses from industry participants.	The Comment is out of date.
4144	<p>The Solicitation states "not smaller than 12-point type Times New Roman font inclusive of headers, footers, and any graphic captions... The excel exhibits provided are formatted using 9-12-point type Times New Roman font... Diagrams, tables, artwork, and photographs may be reduced and, if necessary, run landscape to eliminate oversize pages. Text in Diagrams, schedules, charts, tables, artwork, and photographs shall be no smaller than 10-point type Times New Roman font. Diagrams, tables, artwork, and photographs shall not be used to circumvent the text size limitations of the proposal."</p> <p>1) Can any of the required past performance information (e.g., contract number, points of contact, period of performance) be placed in a 10-point type Times New Roman font?</p> <p>2) Not all provided exhibits are in excel. Should the fill-in narrative information use whatever pre-formatted font is provided or adjust to 12-point type Times New Roman font?</p>	See Comment 1962.

sewp6_rfp_all_comments

4148	<p>Will the government please advise if there is a preferred or mandated method for determining the appropriate UNSPSC code for each item? Can you provide guidance or resources for selecting the correct codes? Per "The UNSPSC codes must accurately match the proposed services/technology in each row and must be the full 8-digit UNSPSC code. If the CLIN is for an hourly labor rate, then the associated labor category shall be provided in Column G (Labor Category if Hourly Rate). The information including pricing in these spreadsheets will not be reviewed or evaluated and will only be utilized to establish the initial Contract Database of Record upon Contract award. " on page 103.</p>	See Comment 2395.
4150	<p>For Exhibit 3x, For the 'Labor Category (if Hourly Rate)' column, should we include only predefined labor categories, or can we define new categories if they are more appropriate? If predefined, can you provide a list of acceptable labor categories?</p>	See Comment 2285.
4152	<p>How frequently can we update the pricing information in Exhibit 3C SEWP Catalog after the initial submission? What is the process for doing so?</p>	<p>Contract Holders can submit technology refreshment requests at any time. See Section A.1.23 TECHNOLOGY REFRESHMENT and further defined in defined in Attachment C- Contract Holder User Manual for details on the process for doing so.</p>
4163	<p>For Exhibit 3c, for the 'Labor Category (if Hourly Rate)' column, should we include only predefined labor categories, or can we define new categories if they are more appropriate? If predefined, can you provide a list of acceptable labor categories?</p>	See Comment 2285.
4164	<p>How frequently can we update the pricing information in the SEWP Catalog after the initial submission? What is the process for doing so?</p>	See Comment 4152.
4165	<p>Is there a preferred or mandated method for determining the appropriate UNSPSC code for each item in Exhibit 3c? Can you provide guidance or resources for selecting the correct codes?</p>	See Comment 2395.
4166	<p>Will the Government please clarify which volume Attachment J needs to be included or how?</p>	See Comment 1675.
4169	<p>The provided document for Attachment J - C-SCRM Plan PDF file has radio buttons for the "Vendor Response (Yes/No)" that won't allow discrete selections for each row. Can the Government please allow the document a selection for each row?</p>	See Comment 1675.

4171	<p>“For Category B and C” beginning on page 103 “single contracts or task orders” are specified for Mandatory Experience and refers to Exhibits 3b and 3c.</p> <p>1) Are three projects required from each member of a JV or CTA? 2) How should an Offeror determine NAICS for federal subcontracts and commercial contracts where a NAICS is not assigned? 3) Are MRCLs required for subcontractors in a CTA and the members of a JV? 4) Will the Government provide detailed instructions for Exhibits 3b and 3c similar to those provided for Category A’s Exhibit 3a? 5) Will the Government provide the UNSPSC codes as an attachment to the final Solicitation?</p>	The Solicitation has been updated to remove this language.
4173	Regarding the proposal content, the Proposal Submission Table reflects a 3-page limitation for LOAs, but the Offer volume instructors state there must be 1 LOA submitted for each technical area. Please confirm if the limit is 3 or 4?	See Comment 1957.
4176	We tested the use of the Past Performance questionnaire (Exhibit 2, PDF) and discovered that it would NOT expand the “data entry box”; instead it reduced the font size of the inputted information. Would the government provide an MS Word version of the Past Performance questionnaire?	See Comment 1804.
4178	In the Solicitation Documentation, downloaded from SAM, Attachment J and Exhibit 5 refer to the same document “C-SCRM Attestation Form”. Attachment J is a C-SCRM Plan template.	See Comment 3479.
4182	We respectfully request that the government provide a 60-day extension to the Proposal Due date in order to answer the numerous questions, the SBA requirement and this will allow us to restructure our positioning / teaming based on the new ability to use CTA and JV qualifications as well as in consideration for bidding an additional Category.	The Comment is out of date.
4187	Regarding the definition of 1a, 2a, 3a, etc... 1a does NOT include 541519 as an appropriate NAICS, whereas the other Cat “A” task areas do. 1a also does NOT include any reference to UNSPSCs where the others do. Task Area 8a also excludes 541519. Should they all refer to the 541519 AND the UNSPSC requirement?	See Comment 2009.
4188	What exactly needs to be seen to prove a certification is in process?	See Comment 2646.
4189	<p>Regarding the SEWP Designated Provider list, there are a number of significant providers omitted. Lenovo is not included; GOOGLE is not included; LG is not included; EATON is not included. Our firm has specifically chosen LG and EATON as significant providers just to provide a competitive alternative to some of the other providers on the list.</p> <p>1) Would the government please expand the Designated Provider list to include the above providers? 2) Would the government consider allowing industry to add a manufacturer to the during its submission?</p>	See Comment 5655.

4192	For Category A, a single Letter of Authorization from an OEM provider is needed for each of the 4 technical areas. However, each technical area may have multiple OEM providers. So please confirm that only one OEM LOA is needed for each technical area despite each area having multiple OEM providers.	See Comment 1874.
4202	A.4.3 For phase 2, the solicitation makes clear that an offeror for whom past performance information is unavailable may not be evaluated favorably or unfavorably and will receive a confidence rating of Neutral, which is sufficient for the offeror's proposal to proceed to phase 3 of evaluations. Presumably, this means that an offeror who does not provide any relevant experience (either for itself or for first-tier subcontractors) as part of the phase 1 proposal submission will be assigned a Pass rating and its proposal will proceed to phase 2 of evaluations. Is our interpretation correct?	The Solicitation has been updated in an Amendment prior to Amendment 7.
4213	A.4.3 This section states: An Offeror shall not be rated favorably or unfavorably if the offeror does not have a record of "recent" and "relevant" past performance or if a record of past performance is unavailable. In such cases the offeror will receive a "Neutral" rating. However, an offeror with favorable, recent, and relevant past performance that meets the average value as specified in A.3.7.2 may be considered more favorably than an offeror with no relevant past performance information.- Section A.4.1 states that an offer with no past performance will receive a neutral rating and pass phase 2 evaluation. Please confirm that a company with no past performance will be rated neutral and pass Phase 2.	The Solicitation has been updated in an Amendment prior to Amendment 7.
4214	<p>This section states: An Offeror shall not be rated favorably or unfavorably if the offeror does not have a record of "recent" and "relevant" past performance or if a record of past performance is unavailable. In such cases the offeror will receive a "Neutral" rating. However, an offeror with favorable, recent, and relevant past performance that meets the average value as specified in A.3.7.2 may be considered more favorably than an offeror with no relevant past performance information.-</p> <p>Please confirm that a lack of past performance, i.e. a neutral rating will impact negatively the Phase 3 evaluation.</p>	The Solicitation has been updated in an Amendment prior to Amendment 7.
4223	Section A.3.7.1 (b), p. 103 - Question about Exhibit 3b – how to fill out the Provider Part number; UNSPSC Codes (Services). What is the official UNSPSC reference of record. Where can it be found?	See Comment 2395.
4237	Exhibit 1 Relevant Experience Project Table: The provided Exhibit 1 pdf template for Relevant Experience Project (REP) limits the project description to the 1st page and thus does not allow text to extend to a second and third page. Will the Government provide a working template or should bidders recreate the table?	The Solicitation has been updated in an Amendment prior to Amendment 7.
4245	Regarding Attachment 3c, the Govt seems to be asking small businesses to list LCats that would be used in the execution of task orders. Since Category C is new, we are using probabilities to ascertain SEWP customers who will be using the vehicle to purchase services under Category C. Will there be an opportunity, post-award, to add Labor Categories to staffing requirements at the task order RFQ level?	See Comment 4152.

sewp6_rfp_all_comments

4248	Page 103 doc RFP A.3.7.1 Exhibit 3b and 3c for Categories B & C. The requirement to use UNSPSC codes. The Excel Code Download cost is \$275.00, Will the Government provide this file?	See Comment 2949.
4249	page 103 RFP A.3.7.1 Exhibit 3b for Categories B & C. Please provide instructions for each column with the information the Government requires	See Comment 2214.
4250	Page 105 RFP A.3.7.1(c)Exhibit 4 NAICS Size Standard Crosswalk - Are there any limits to SEWP VI Task Order opportunities based on selected NAICS Codes, will Awardees have the opportunity to bid all task orders for the Category awarded?	See Comment 1881.
4257	Page117DocumentRFPA.4.3An Offeror shall not be rated favorably or unfavorably if the offeror does not have a record of "recent" and "relevant" past performance or if a record of past performance is unavailable. In such cases the offeror will receive a "Neutral" rating. However, an offeror with favorable, recent, and relevant past performance that meets the average value as specified in A.3.7.2 may be considered more favorably than an offeror with no relevant past performance information. This statement is in conflict with A.4.1 2) Phase 2, please clarify. Request clarification of evaluation process for past performance. Are there any limits to the number of SEWP VI awards? Is the Gov't going to work against a set number of awards evaluating "competing" proposals?	The Solicitation has been updated in an Amendment prior to Amendment 7.
4263	PageDocumentGeneralWill a SB SocioEconomic or 8(a) Offeror be able to compete for all Small Business Task Order opportunities? Or, will the SocioEconomic or 8(a) status limit the Offeror to only the Task Orders with the specific Set-Aside?	See Comment 1881.
4268	Industry DayComment about removing bullet #3 on page 120/ did the Govt mean page 111	The Solicitation has been updated in an Amendment prior to Amendment 7.
4272	Page103DocumentRFPA.3.7.1How are a contract holder's CLINs established for services? Do we put into Exhibit 3c labor categories we wish to sell? If so, then every contract holder's CLINs/LabCats will be different. How will buyers evaluate offers from multiple bidders with cost buildups that bear no resemblance to each other?	See Comment 2214.
4274	Page103DocumentRFPA.3.7.1would the establishment be up to the contractor or the govt?	See Comment 2214.
4275	Any insights in to the relevant NAICS code mapping requirements for both Mandatory Experience (REP) and Past Performance references? There is a lot of ambiguity around what NAICS codes offerors should reference and how the Government will validate project references back to SEWP Category NAICS.	The Solicitation has been updated for further clarification

4287	The Exhibit 3c – Category C Solutions Spreadsheet is required with Offeror proposals. Since Category C is services only (no products), how are Offerors supposed to fill in Exhibit 3c since the spreadsheet asks for product-specific information?	See Comment 2214.
4288	For Category C Mandatory Experience/Offerings, WOSB and VOSB are included in the list of set-aside companies that are required to submit a total of two (2) different Relevant Experience Projects (REPs) from different mandatory experience technical areas. However, for Category C Past Performance, WOSB and VOSB are not included in the list of set-aside companies that are required to provide past performance references showcasing relevant work in at least two (2) content representative areas. Were WOSB and VOSB left out in error? If so, please fix.	See Comment 1697.
4294	Attachment J C-SCRM Attestation Form - Some of the fields in the Attachment J template automatically duplicate entries into other fields. Will the Government reissue this attachment?	See Comment 1675.
4296	The two requirements below under A.3.7.3.(a) seem to be almost identical. From the Government's perspective, what is the difference between the two statements? Was one included in error? "2. The offeror shall describe their ITC/AV-based solutions and/or services and how the proposed features provide technological leadership in allowing for the next generation of technology in terms of both solutions and services." "3. The offeror shall describe their ITC/AV-based solutions and services and how the proposed architectural features provide technological leadership in allowing for the next generation of technology."	See Comment 1808.
4297	Section A.3.7.3.(b).(1).v mentions a requirement to fill out and submit Exhibit 5: C-SCRM Attestation Form, but the Government also provided Attachment J-C-SCRM Attestation Form, and the two forms are different. Do offerors need to submit Exhibit 5 AND the Attachment J form? Or just Exhibit 5?	See Comment 3479.
4299	Attachment J and Exhibit 5 C-SCRM Attestation Form - Filenames for both Attachment J and Exhibit 5 indicate they are C-SCRM Attestation Forms; however, when opened Attachment J indicates it is a C-SCRM Plan. Will the Attachment J filename be updated to reflect a different type of document from Exhibit 5?	See Comment 1675.
4300	Section A.3.7.3.(b).(4).vi states: "The offeror shall describe how their current corporate infrastructure and future enhancements will support the responsibilities laid out in Attachment A: SEWP Statement of Work; Section A.5. Contractor Responsibilities." There are specific evaluation criteria associated with all other elements under Program Management, but there is no evaluation criteria listed for A.3.7.3.(b).(4).vi. Was this intentional?	See Comment 2494.
4301	Exhibit 2 Past performance Questionnaire - Some of the fields in the Exhibit 2 template automatically duplicate entries into other fields. Will the Government reissue this exhibit?	See Comment 1804.

sewp6_rfp_all_comments

4303	Section A.3.6 (B) (2), p. 96 - Will the Government consider allowing 10-point type Times New Roman font in the heads and footers since the minimum size text in diagrams, schedules, charts, tables, artwork, and photographs is 10-point type Times New Roman?	See Comment 1962.
4307	Technical Area 8: Software and Cloud Technology-Due to the scope of the SEWP contract, and the inability to provide details on potential Task Orders, will the government allow industry averages to be used to calculate costs associated to this category?	See Comment 2673.
4311	On Page 96 ,A.3.6 Proposal Preparation—General Instructions, B. Proposal Content and Page Limitations: We understand that Mandatory Experience Letter of Authorization (LOAs) are for only contractors bidding on Category A. Is our understanding correct?	See Comment 1782.
4312	Technical Area 8: Software and Cloud Technology-Seeing as several of the Sub-areas, such as Software as a service (Cloud based services), are typically designed for a specific environment, and not priced in a similar manner to hardware. Can the government provide a standard model to be used so that industry can provide an accurate SEWP Catalog price?	See Comment 2673.
4314	Section A.1.30.1, C-SCRM Plan, Attachment J, p. 57 - Please confirm that Attachment J is not required to be submitted with the proposal. If it is to be submitted with the proposal, please advise as to where this attachment should be included.	See Comment 1675.
4317	Section A.3.6 (B)(2), p.96 - Will the Government please allow Offerors to use 10-point TNR font for graphic captions?	See Comment 1962.
4328	Will a signed reseller agreement suffice as a LOA, or will we need standalone LOA document?	See Comment 1799.
4336	Will the Government please correct the solicitation number identified in the ZIP file naming convention for submissions from the draft solicitation number to the final solicitation number?	The Solicitation has been updated in an Amendment prior to Amendment 7.
4337	Will the Government please clarify that socioeconomic disadvantaged Offerors are only required to submit two (2) different REPs from two different mandatory experience technical areas, not for all ten (10) as it is currently worded?	The Solicitation has been updated in an Amendment prior to Amendment 7.
4340	Regarding Attachment J, page 57 states, "In accordance with DRD #3, a C-SCRM Plan must be submitted to the SEWP Program Management Office annually and no later than 60 calendar days prior to the Contract award date and will be incorporated into the contract as Attachment J." The Final RFP Cover Letter lists the award date as "October 2024." Please clarify: what is the due date for Attachment J? Is it to be submitted after volumes I, II, and III but before contract award?	See Comment 1675.
4341	Both Exhibit 5 and Attachment J from the solicitation package are labeled "C-SCRM Attestation Form". Per RFP page 112, Exhibit 5 is required as part of Volume III, Subfactor B. Please clarify: Is the Attachment J PDF also required to be submitted? If so, with which volume should it be included?	See Comment 3479.

sewp6_rfp_all_comments

4348	Exhibit 2-PastPerfQues-SEWP VI.pdf, has glitches in two sections. The first one is the area for checking either "Prime Contractor", "Significant Subcontractor", or "Team Member". When you select one, they all get checked. Could the government please fix the form, so the offerors can select the one (1) that is correct for their contract?" And the second is the "Evaluator information", it automatically populates all the cells with any text entered across all of the cells/rows. Could the government please fix that section as well as send a new form out to the offerors?	See Comment 1804.
4352	Page 113 - The offeror shall describe how their current corporate infrastructure and future enhancements will support the responsibilities laid out in Attachment A: SEWP Statement of Work; Section A.5. Contractor Responsibilities. - will the government will be adding evaluation criteria for A.3.7.3 (b) (4) vi 9 supporting section A.5. Contractor Responsibility Attachment A	See Comment 1808.
4354	Page 103 and Exhibit 3b- Category B Solutions Spreadsheet. For Hourly Rate CLINS, please confirm that the hourly rate provided is a ceiling rate that can be discounted for specific RFQs.	See Comment 2562.
4355	Page 103 and Exhibit 3b- Category B Solutions Spreadsheet. For Hourly Rate CLINS, please clarify instructions for UNSPSC Codes, which may be new to most Category B and C bidders. For example, a Senior Project Manager may be mapped to "80101600 Project management" and a Jr. Software Developer may be mapped to "81111500 - Software or hardware engineering"?	See Comment 2118.
4357	Page 103 and Exhibit 3b- Category B Solutions Spreadsheet. For Hourly Rate CLINS, please confirm that after award vendors may update their labor rates and add new categories rates as needed via the SEWP systems.	See Comment 4152.
4362	Page 120. On page 113, proposal instructions for Category B and C Management, a new item "vi." was added in the Final RFP regarding "Corporate Infrastructure and Future Enhancements." On the related evaluation criteria, page 120, a corresponding item vi. was not added. We recommend adding item vi to page 120 to align evaluation criteria with instructions.	The Solicitation has been updated in an Amendment prior to Amendment 7.
4363	The RFP states that "If an offeror is a small business that is not certified to the standard at the time of proposal submission, proof that the certification approval is in process is acceptable and shall be provided at the time of proposal submission." By including this statement, the government is acknowledging that the minimum requirement to win an award is simply to provide proof that the offeror's process for gaining approval is initiated. If that minimum requirement is acceptable for some (small) bidders, it should be acceptable for all bidders. Would the government please change this statement so that it applies to all bidders instead of only small businesses?	The Solicitation has been updated in an Amendment prior to Amendment 7.
4367	Considering that there is a high number of contracts in NAICS Code 541611 that have a preponderance of ITC and A/V work, would the Government consider adding NAICS Code 541611 to the Category B & C NAICS table for HUBZone, VOSB, SDVOSB, WOSB, EDWOSB, 8a offerors?	See Comment 2669.
4368	Considering that the Government has already included 541618-Other Management Consulting Services, will the Government consider the addition of NAICS Code 541611-Administrative Management and General Management Consulting Services which can include scope of ITC and A/V work to Categories B and C?	See Comment 2669.

sewp6_rfp_all_comments

4375	Will the Government confirm that the "Offeror's subcontracting plan" required in the third bullet of section A.3.7.1 is the "Small Business Subcontracting Plan" and is not required for small businesses?	See Comment 2207.
4376	For Past Performance if the offeror showcases performance in just 3 of the 10 Content Representative areas, and if awarded a spot on the contract, are they limited in bidding for task orders only in those 3 areas or are they able to bid on any task order released?	See Comment 1881.
4377	<p>The wording "For HUBZone, VOSB, SDVOSB, WOSB, EDWOSB, 8a offerors (inclusive of first- tier subcontractors, if applicable): A total of 2 different REPs for each of the mandatory experience technical areas shall be submitted." requires HUBZone, VOSB, SDVOSB, WOSB, EDWOSB, 8a offerors to submit 20 REPs (2 for each of the 10 mandatory experience technical areas).</p> <p>To be consistent with the Small Business and Other than Small Businesses offerors and in alignment with what was presented in the NASA SEWP VI Informational WebEx on June 4, would the Government change the wording to, "For HUBZone, VOSB, SDVOSB, WOSB, EDWOSB, 8a offerors (inclusive of first- tier subcontractors, if applicable): A total of 2 different REPs from different mandatory experience technical areas shall be submitted"?</p>	See Comment 1697.
4379	<p>In section 5 of the Exhibit 2 Past Performance Questionnaire, the respondent is asked to 'Please circle/Highlight' the rating. This section does not have check boxes or radial buttons for rating selection. Adding a fillable option to this section of the form would increase the likelihood that the customer will complete this section correctly, and would be consistent with the rest of the questionnaire. The lack of buttons/boxes has a high probability of being left uncompleted. Please update form to include fillable/selectable options.</p>	See Comment 1804.
4382	Would Government change the page count for the Mandatory Experience Letter Authorization from three (3) pages to four (4) pages given the requirement to submit four letters of authorization?	The Solicitation has been updated in an Amendment prior to Amendment 7.
4383	RFP page 101 states that Category A Offerors are to choose four of the eight Technical Areas. Can Offerors also provide CLINs for the additional four non-evaluated Technical Areas?	See Comment 5061.
4384	<p>Exhibit 3a states that offerors must provide "at least 1000 distinct and relevant CLINs" from the designated provider for the primary proposed Technical Area, and 50 CLINs from at least one other provider.</p> <p>Should Category A bidders submit ALL of the CLINs they can offer from the provider for the primary proposed Technical Area, which could be much more than 1000?</p>	See Comment 5061.
4385	Page 98, paragraph 4 in A.3.7.1 - The offeror must provide relevant experience as it relates to the NAICS code being used for competition. Can the government please clarify what type of information is requested here? Is this covered by the Volume I mandatory experience requirements?	See Comment 2092.

sewp6_rfp_all_comments

4390	SF 1449 - A.3.7.1 states: "The Offeror shall complete SF1449 Blocks 12 (if applicable), 17, and 30 and the indicated Offeror required fill-ins in the clauses, provisions, and attachments." However, block 12 (Discount Terms) of all three SF 1449 forms for Cats A, B, and C are already pre-populated with "Net 30". Should offerors alter the information in block 12?	The Solicitation has been updated in an Amendment prior to Amendment 7.
4393	A.3.7.1 bullet #2 states: "The offeror must provide relevant experience as it relates to the NAICS code being used for competition." Please confirm that this requirement will be satisfied by providing the information described in A.3.7.1 (b) Mandatory Experience/ Offerings? This is NOT a separate requirement?	See Comment 2092.
4395	A.3.6 (B) Proposal Submission Table shows a 3 page limit for the Mandatory Experience LOAs. However, up to 4 LOAs are required for Category A proposals, and each LOA could be more than 1 page. Will the government please remove the page limit for the LOAs? Or, is the "3 page limit" per LOA?	See Comment 1957.
4398	For Exhibit 3b - Category B Solutions Spreadsheet, the RFP does not list CLINs related to Services. Is the CLIN numbering scheme assigned by the offeror? If so, is there a particular format requested by the Government?	See Comment 2214.
4403	It is unclear what the Government is requesting in the Offeror Volume for this requirement: "The offeror must provide relevant experience as it relates to the NAICS code being used for competition." Please provide additional instructions as it is unclear for Category A what an offeror needs to provide for this instruction, since Category A appears does not have an REP requirement.	See Comment 2092.
4407	Given the broad scope of the solicitation as a GWAC and the NAICS Crosswalk, we recommend not adding a NAICS-based restriction to past performances.	The Solicitation will remain as stated.
4411	The RFP states "No additional information is requested in support of the Exhibit 1 REP template." However, within Exhibit 1, Part III references including supporting documents to support the narrative. Please clarify if those supporting documents are required.	The Solicitation has been updated in an Amendment prior to Amendment 7.
4419	Page 109, under Section 3.7.2(a), indicates that HUBZone, SDVOSB, EDWOSB, and 8a require only two content areas to be rated relevant. WOSB is not listed in this group in this section, however, it is included in this group in other areas of the RFP. QUESTION: Can NASA confirm that WOSB businesses also require only two content areas to be rated relevant?	See Comment 1697.
4430	A.2.1 GSFC 52.211-101 LIST OF ATTACHMENTS indicates documents that are "To Be Submitted" (TBS) and includes items that are clearly defined in Section L as part of the proposal submission, as well as others for which the intended timing of submission is unclear. QUESTION: We assume that the Climate Change Risk Management Plan is to be submitted after award per Section A.1.51. Is our assumption correct?	See Comment 1675.
4431	Per Attachment C, SEWP User Manual, the Government can request a Technology Refresh, but can the Contract Holders themselves initiate a Technology Refresh to update offerings? If yes, can the Contract Holders initiate a Technology Refresh at any time based on their own requirements?	See Comment 4152.

4432	A.2.1 GSFC 52.211-101 LIST OF ATTACHMENTS indicates documents that are "To Be Submitted" (TBS) and includes items that are clearly defined in Section L as part of the proposal submission, as well as others for which the intended timing of submission is unclear. QUESTION: We assume that the Diversity, Equity, Inclusion, and Accessibility (DEIA) Plan relevant to Categories B & C is to be submitted after award. Is our assumption correct?	See Comment 1675.
4435	Exhibit 2 Past Performance Questionnaire automatically pre-populates ALL contracting role boxes with checkmarks (Prime Contractor; Significant Subcontractor; Team Member). QUESTION: Would the Government please provide an updated version of Exhibit 2 that allows Offerors to select a single role description box?	See Comment 1804.
4436	Could Government clarify the annual expenditure requirement for Small Business Past Performance in Category A? The evaluation factors in A.4.3 states that small businesses need to have \$500,000 for categories A and C whereas A.3.7.2(a) has \$150,000.	See Comment 1709.
4446	The last sentence of '(C) Offeror NAICS Size Standard Crosswalk (Exhibit 4)' says "An Offeror will be grouped within a scope category based on the size standard associated with NAICS code identified on Exhibit 4." If an offeror submits a bid as Small Business under only one NAICS code from the list within a Category and is awarded a SEWP VI contract, will they be eligible to bid as a large business under the rest of the NAICS codes in the Category? Or will the awardee only see RFQs for Small Business Set-Asides for the single NAICS code that was included in their proposal?	See Comment 1881.
4447	The Scope of Work description for Category A states "Each technology area includes specific mandatory technology that must be supplied; however, offerings shall not be limited to those specific mandatory areas." None of the Technical Areas specify mandatory areas. Are the sub-areas listed intended to be the "Mandatory Areas" that will be referenced only in execution of the contract?	The Solicitation has been updated to remove references to Mandatory Areas.
4449	"The following documents are attached hereto and made a part of this contract (Table)" Please confirm the following Attachments are NOT to be submitted with the proposal: -Attachment G: DEIA Plan -Attachment H: AbilityOne Formal Agreement -Attachment J: SEWP C-SCRM Annual Plan -Attachment L: Climate Change Risk Management Plan	See Comment 1675.
4450	In the table in Section A.2.1, attachments G, H, J, and L have asterisks. Will NASA please define the meaning of the asterisks in this table?	See Comment 1869.
4464	Section states: "In accordance with DRD #3, a C-SCRM Plan must be submitted to the SEWP Program Management Office annually and no later than 60 calendar days prior to the Contract award date and will be incorporated into the contract as Attachment J. Refer to NIST SP 800-161(most current version) for additional guidance." Can the government please clarify the requirement and due date of the C-SCRM Plan. 1.) Is the C-SCRM Plan required to be submitted as part of the current submission due on July 11, 2024? 2.) Or alternatively, is the C-SCRM Plan due 60 calendar days prior to the Contract award date, which is currently unknown and difficult to predict?	See Comment 1675.

sewp6_rfp_all_comments

4472	Are all phases due by July 11th 2024?	The Comment is out of date.
4473	Regarding the providers listed in Enclosure 1, please confirm they include the subsidiaries for the Solution Spreadsheet. For example, would a letter of authorization from HPI cover Poly products, as HPI owns Poly. We highly recommend allowing Letter of Authorization from OEMs to also cover their subsidiaries and therefore include their products in the Solution Spreadsheet.	See Comment 2305.
4474	The formatting of the past performance questionnaire does not allow you to enter the name, title, agency etc of the evaluator. It automatically prefills with the top line and duplicates it. Also, it does not allow you to choose more than one "basis of selection." When putting an X in the performed or Did not perform, it duplicates that in the other box and doesn't allow you to delete it. Duplicates all fill in the blank answers at the bottom of it also.	The Solicitation has been updated in an Amendment prior to Amendment 7.
4478	Would the Government confirm if a DEIA Plan is required as part of the proposal? If yes, please provide Attachment G to be submitted. Also, please confirm the Volume that this Attachment should be included under.	See Comment 1675.
4482	Would the Government confirm if a Climate Change Risk Management Plan is required as part of the proposal? If yes, please provide Attachment L to be submitted. Also, please confirm the Volume that this Attachment should be included under.	See Comment 1675.
4485	Given that the Management Volume (III-B) includes SCRM, Supplier Diversity, and Program Management sections, and each section includes detailed requirements, would the Government consider changing the Volume page limit to 40 pages?	The Solicitation will remain as stated.
4490	Are cover letters allowed and/or counted against our page limits?	The Solicitation has been updated in an Amendment prior to Amendment 7.
4493	Items 2 and 3 appear to be nearly identical. Please eliminate any unintended duplication. If these are as intended, please clarify the difference - what is NASA looking for in offeror responses to each of these two items?	See Comment 1808.
4515	DRDs 1-5 appear in the CDRL list. Please clarify: are any of these documents required to be submitted with the proposal? (i.e., prior to award?) If so, which ones?	See Comment 1675.
4519	For Category A, "There shall be an LOA for each different designated provider for a maximum of four (4) LOAs." The table on page 96 specifies a 3 page limit. Request page limit for Experience LOAs be increased to at least 4 or be set to "excluded" from page count.	See Comment 1957.

sewp6_rfp_all_comments

4521	Reference Final RFP, Section A.3.7.1, page 103, Category B and C. This section states "Only projects [REPs] with NAICS codes listed as in-scope for SEWP VI are to be submitted". The addition of NAICS codes was a substantial change to the final RFP from the previous draft RFPs. Offerors were preparing REPs based upon the draft RFPs and some of these can no longer be used as the exact NAICS code is not listed. In particular, Exhibit 4 lists NAICS 517111 for Category A but that NAICS is not listed for Categories B or C. Some large government ID/IQs were awarded with this specific NAICS and all task orders under them were done under this NAICS. The task orders involved solutions and services, often at the enterprise-level and these task orders fall completely within the defined scope of SEWP VI and the broader ITC/AV umbrella. Please add NAICS code 517110 to Categories B and C so that these recent and relevant project experiences may be used.	See Comment 2949.
4523	Exhibit 2 Auto fills Section 2 check boxed under "the company was" Please remove the auto fill.	See Comment 1804.
4525	Exhibit 2 Auto fills Section 3 with the data entered in all cells. Please remove the auto fill.	See Comment 1804.
4526	Exhibit 5, Exhibit+5+C-SCRM+Attestation+Form ATTACHMENT+J+C_SCRM+Attestation+Form. Please confirm that Offerors are required to fill out and submit Exhibit 5 and not Attachment J with their proposals.	See Comment 3479.
4530	Exhibit 2 Auto fills Section 4 check boxes with the data entered in Performed and did not preform. Please remove the auto fill.	See Comment 1804.
4533	Please note that this pdf form (exhibit 2), along several other forms, have errors with both radio buttons, check boxes and text areas. Will the government correct these and issue new ones with an amendment?	See Comment 1804.
4534	Exhibit 1 REP Template - Do we need to highlight the specific sections of PWS or SOW for relevant/mandatory content representative areas while submitting as supporting documents/evidence for relevant past performance?	The Solicitation has been updated in an Amendment prior to Amendment 7.
4535	A.3.7.1 Offer Volume, (b) Mandatory Experience / Offerings, Category B p.103Please confirm that the Offeror has full discretion to provide a list of Labor Categories that they anticipate utilizing for this vehicle.	See Comment 2285.
4537	Due to multiple RFP conflicts and missing components of the the instructions to offerors, as well as the July 4 holiday mid-week, we request an extension of 30 days after all questions have been answered and clarifying amendments issued. It is difficult to draft a proposal in response to many of the requirements or send past performance questionnaires out to customers until those questions are resolved.	The Comment is out of date.

4539	Section A.3.7.a, Offeror Volume Page 103, can the Government please clarify the requirements for the submission of hourly labor rates within Exhibit 3?	See Comment 3462.
4543	A.3.7.1 Offer Volume, (b) Mandatory Experience / Offerings, Category B p.103Please confirm that any Labor Category rates that are submitted in conjunction with this response will be ceiling rates for the life of the vehicle?	Labor Categories submitted in conjunction with this response will be the ceiling rate at the start of the Contract period. The Offeror can update their offerings including labor categories and labor rates post award utilizing the process described in A.1.23 TECHNOLOGY REFRESHMENT.
4544	The RFP came out May 23rd due July 11 providing the offerors 49 days to respond, Due to the fact that we cannot send out Past Performance questioners due to the auto fill issues with attachment 2. The offeror assumes a new attachment 2 will be issued with the Amendment, will the government extend the due date of the RFP to 49 Days from the date the amendment is issued?	The Comment is out of date.
4545	<p>There are several coding issues with Exhibit 2-PastPerfQues-SEWP VI.</p> <p>(1)Page 1, paragraph 1 is incomplete.</p> <p>(2)On page 1 of the form, the contractor is asked to check a box to delineate whether the company performs/ed as a Prime Contractor, Significant Subcontractor, or Team Member. Upon clicking the appropriate selection, the PDF coding causes all boxes to be checked.</p> <p>(3)Section 2: Description of Contract does not allow for pasted text.</p> <p>(4)Section 2: The statement "Does a corporate or business relationship exist between the firm being evaluated and your organization?" is unclear. Does this question require an answer if our organization IS the firm being evaluated?</p> <p>(5)Section 3: Upon entering a name under "Section 3. Evaluator Information" the name is duplicated in the following four fields as well.</p> <p>(6)When a box is 'checked' on page 2 under "Performed," the "Did Not Perform" box is automatically checked as well.</p> <p>(7)Section 5: General Performance Survey: there is no way to make a performance rating selection.</p> <p>(8)Section 5: Copy/paste is not available in the comment cells.</p> <p>(9)Section 6: In filling out the contract value, the value is duplicated into the Fee and Total Value cells as well.</p> <p>(10)Section 6: An amount typed into the Initial Value cell is automatically duplicated into the Current Value cell.</p> <p>(11)Section 6: In entering text in the cell requiring an explanation for a cost overrun, the text is duplicated into the subsequent four cells as well.</p> <p>(12)Section 6: There is no way to easily select an Overall Contract Performance Rating selection.</p> <p>(13)There is no cell to accommodate the rater's signature. We ask that the form be provided in an MS Word format?</p>	See Comment 1804.

sewp6_rfp_all_comments

4546	A.3.7.1 Offer Volume, (b) Mandatory Experience / Offerings, Category B p.103Is it the Government's intent that Offerors will have the ability to propose additional Labor Categories if and when appropriate at the Task Order level?	See Comment 2285.
4547	For Category B, Exhibit 3b- Solutions Spreadsheet should the CLIN for labor be L-1, L-2, etc. with the "L" representing labor and the number representing a number assigned to the Contract Holder's designated labor category?	See Comment 2214.
4548	A.3.7.1 Offer Volume, (b) Mandatory Experience / Offerings, Category B p.103Please confirm Column C In Exhibit 3b is not applicable for Group B1.	See Comment 2214.
4549	For Category B, Exhibit 3b- Solutions Spreadsheet should the CLIN for labor be L-0001, L-1001, etc. with the "L" representing labor and the number representing the SEWP Contract Year with an escalated labor rate.	See Comment 2214.
4550	34A.3.7.1 Offer Volume, (b) Mandatory Experience / Offerings, Category B p.103Will the government provide a list of in scope USNSPC codes (available via Contract Holder Only Page (CHOP)) for offerors to utilize in mapping LCATs in Exhibit 3b?	See Comment 2395.
4562	Does the government intend to establish specific labor categories for each category area, or is the government seeking a contractor to supply labor categories for each particular task area being proposed?	See Comment 2285.
4564	Section A.3.7.a, Offeror Volume Page 103, can the Government please clarify the requirements for the submission of hourly labor rates within Exhibit 3?	See Comment 2562.
4571	For Exhibit 3c, Proposed Offerings, can the Government please confirm what information is to be provided in the column "Provider Part Number" if an Offeror is proposing an hourly labor rate? Is this to be left blank, is this the labor category name, is this something else? Is this field intended to be a unique within the spreadsheet?	See Comment 2214.
4574	For Exhibit 3c, Proposed Offerings, can the Government please confirm what information is to be provided in the column "Description" if an Offeror is proposing an hourly labor rate? Is this the labor category name, is the labor category description, is it something else.	See Comment 2214.
4576	For Exhibit 3c, Proposed Offerings, can the Government please confirm what information is to be provided in the column "Labor Category (if Hourly Rate)" if an Offeror is proposing an hourly labor rate? Is this the labor category name, is this a yes/no field, is it something else.	See Comment 2214.
4582	If Category A offerors are only supposed to pick 4 of 9 Technical Areas for the proposal, at what point are an AWARDEE'S catalogs established for the remaining Technical Areas? What is the procedure to expand/refresh a catalog?	See Comment 4152.
4583	For Category B and Category C, are offerors allowed to add labor categories to their contract post-award? Or must Exhibit 3b/3c contain all labor categories they will ever want to use for the life of the SEWP VI contract?	See Comment 2285.

sewp6_rfp_all_comments

4590	NAICS 517111 (formerly 517110) is commonly used in the Federal Government for services including engineering, telecommunications, that are in scope for SEWP VI. As it is currently included in Category A, please add 517111 and its predecessors to the crosswalk for Category B and C.	See Comment 2949.
4595	A.3.7.1(b) Category B and C states: "The UNSPSC codes must accurately match the proposed services / technology in each row and must be the full 8-digit UNSPSC code." The list of UNSPSC codes (version 26) only covers products, yet Categories B and C are services contracts. Is there a separate list of UNSPSC codes for services? If so, will the government please provide the link to that information? Or, should this requirement be removed for Category B and C proposals?	See Comment 2118.
4596	For Exhibit 3c, Proposed Offerings, can the Government please provide guidance on which columns are required if an Offeror is proposing hourly labor rates?	See Comment 2214.
4603	Will the government please provide Attachments G, H, I, K & L as they are listed in section A.2.1	See Comment 1675 and note: The AbilityOne commitment letter is to be submitted as part of the proposal and will be incorporated into the contract as Attachment H. Attachment I refers to the Small Business Subcontracting Plan.
4604	A.2.1 - The RFP lists Attachments A through L, however only Attachments A, B, C, D, and J have been provided on sam.gov. Attachments E and F are reserved. Will the government please provide Attachments G, H, I, K, and L?	See Comment 4603.
4605	A.2.1 - The RFP lists Attachments A through L, however only Attachments A, B, C, D, and J have been provided on sam.gov. Attachments E and F are reserved. Will the government please provide Attachments G, H, I, K, and L?	See Comment 4603.
4606	A.3.7.1(a) states: "If an offeror is a small business that is not certified to the standard at the time of proposal submission, proof that the certification approval is in process is acceptable and shall be provided at the time of proposal submission." Please confirm that an agreement with a CMMI Lead Appraiser would meet this requirement for CMMI?	See Comment 2646.
4611	For Exhibit 3b- Category B Solutions and Exhibit 3c- Category C Solutions Spreadsheets the CLINs will provide pricing for services. For services should we leave the "Provider" and "Provider Part Number" columns blank?	See Comment 2214.
4625	A.3.7.1 Offer Volume (b) Mandatory Experience/ Offerings - Page 102 states: "A minimum of 50 distinct and relevant CLIN's from these secondary providers must be proposed in each of the four Technical Areas." Can Offerors include additional providers beyond the designated and secondary providers?	See Comment 5061.

sewp6_rfp_all_comments

4631	A.1.30.1 and A.3.7.3 (b) (1) - Can the government please confirm that Exhibit 5 is required with proposal submission, but Attachment J is not required until 60 days prior to award?	See Comment 3479.
4634	A.1.30.1. Cybersecurity-Supply Chain Risk Management (C-SCRM) Plan (Attestation Form) - The RFP States, "... a C-SCRM Plan must be submitted to the SEWP Program Management Office annually and no later than 60 calendar days prior to the Contract award date". Is 60 calendar days "prior" to contract award correct or should this be 60 calendar days after contract award?	See Comment 1675.
4637	In addition to other issues pointed out for Exhibit 2, Past Performance Questionnaire, none of the boxes for 3a, 4a, 5a, 8a, 1b, 3b, 4b, 6b, 8b, 9b, 1c, 2c, 3c, 5c, 6c, 7c, 9c, or 10c allows "N/R" to be inserted, it only gives space for "N/" and the font size can't be changed. A recommendation for the performance ratings on the right side on page 8 would be to put "VH, H, M, L, VL, N/R" as column headers and provide radio buttons in all the rows below to create an easier method for evaluators to fill out the form. Can the government please provide a working Exhibit 2, Past Performance Questionnaire with these issues fixed as well?	See Comment 1804.
4641	What should an offeror do if an OEM does not adhere to the requirements laid out by the SEWP PMO for LOAs, and instead provides the same generic letter to everyone? Would the Government accept such an LOA that does not mention SEWP VI specifically?	See Comment 1799.
4644	Enclosure 1- SEWP VI Providers - Will the Government please clarify if offerors are permitted to provide LOAs from subsidiary companies of the companies listed on the designated provider list (e.g., AMX is a subsidiary of Harman, which in turn is a subsidiary of Samsung Group)?	See Comment 2305.
4646	Enclosure 1- SEWP VI Providers - Many of the companies on the list do not sell directly, and most of their sales are through one or more levels of subsidiaries. Will the Government please confirm that subsidiaries of the companies listed in Exhibit 1 will be considered Designated Providers for LOAs and proposal evaluation purposes? For example, the Samsung Group sells video switching and control devices under the AMX brand, which is a subsidiary of Harman International, which is a wholly owned subsidiary of Samsung Electronics, which is owned by the Samsung Group. A reseller of AMX equipment would have a reseller agreement and LOA from AMX rather than the Samsung Group.	See Comment 2305.
4657	Will NASA provide a copy of the UNSPCS codes NASA used when creating the solicitation so Offerors don't have to pay for the list on UNSPCS.org and to ensure we're using the same version as NASA?	The Solicitation has been updated in an Amendment prior to Amendment 7.
4662	The RFP States that, "the Categories are self-contained, and requirements will be provided for quoting and fulfillment at the order level in one category. "It also states, "The contracts will be awarded by Category and classified by Group..." The Government has established Groups A2, B2, and C1 as small business set asides. Would the Government please clarify the relationship between the small business and unrestricted groups (A1 and B1)? Post-award, will successful A2 and B2 offerors be able to view and to submit proposals for orders that have been designated as "unrestricted?"	See Comment 1881.

sewp6_rfp_all_comments

4664	For Category B Service Providers, can Offerors add additional Labor Categories for the services provided post-contract-award as new capabilities are added to the Offeror's service offerings?	See Comment 4152.
4667	Are the three (3) Relevant Experience Project (REP) references for Categories B and C required to have been performed under the NAICS code of the SEWP VI solicitation, 541512, or could they have been performed under any of the NAICS codes listed in the table from Section A.1.34, Page 63 of the RFP?	See Comment 1886.
4672	Exhibit 3B – Category B Solutions Spreadsheet – For Category B Service Providers, Column F is for the SEWP Catalog Price. Would this be the associated Hourly Rate for service Labor Categories provided in Column G?	See Comment 2562.
4678	Exhibit 3B – Category B Solutions Spreadsheet – For a Category B Services Provider, what would be the appropriate Contract Line Item Number (CLIN)? Would this be one distinct CLIN per Labor Category? Or would it be the same CLIN for all service labor categories by base/option period?	See Comment 2214.
4679	Section A.3.7.3(b)(1)(v) pg.112 of the RFP states that the offeror must either fill out Exhibit 5: C-SCRM Attestation Form or provide a copy of a valid active Open Trusted Technology Provider Standard (O-TTPS) Certification to attest to meeting the ISO 20243 standard. Please confirm that an "O-TTPS Self-Assessed Certification Tier" certification meets this requirement?	Yes, ISO 20243 self certification meets the requirement.
4680	Please provide the full list of UNSPSC codes applicable to this solicitation, so offerors are able to select the appropriate code in Exhibit 3b.	See Comment 2479.
4687	A.1.30.1, page 57 of the RFP states "Alternatively, an annual report noting certification with the current ISO 20243 standard including a copy of a valid active Open Trusted Technology Provider™ Standard (O-TTPS) Certification can be submitted". What is the timeline for this to be filed?	See Comment 1675.
4696	Pg 103 of the Final RFP indicates that Relevant Experience Projects (REP) must be for projects/contracts that were issued under one of the in-scope NAICS listed in the RFP (pgs 62 & 63). Will the Government consider allowing projects conducted under other NAICS that are relevant to the SEWP scope to be submitted? For example, a contract issued under NAICS 541715 may have significant requirements in software development, IT architecture, cybersecurity, etc that is relevant to SEWP and potentially of much greater scope than a project listed in one of the in-scope NAICS.	See Comment 1671.
4704	In light of the volume, breadth, and complexity of questions submitted by industry in response to the final SEWP VI solicitation, the answers to which may have substantive impact to requirements, including those related to instructions to government clients when completing PPQs, will the government extend the due date to July 31, 2024 to ensure industry has adequate time to adjust their responses in accordance with answers released?	The Comment is out of date.
4709	Does the Government intend to release an updated version of the Past Performance Questionnaire? The current version has choice-cells that are linked, which will prevent the respondents from responding correctly.	See Comment 1804.
4710	A.3.7.1 Offer Volume, the second bullet point states: "The offeror must provide relevant experience as it relates to the NAICS code being used for competition." What information is the Government seeking to satisfy these requirements?	See Comment 2092.

sewp6_rfp_all_comments

4711	Will the government please provide missing Attachments G, H, and L and clarify overall which of attachments need to be submitted with the proposal?	See Comment 1675.
4715	In reference to Section A.3.7.1(b), Please confirm that the Letter of Authorization is only applicable to Category A.	See Comment 1782.
4719	In reference to Exhibit 2-PastPerfQues-SEWP VI, Under Section 2: Description of Contract, where the evaluator is asked to check off whether the company being evaluated was the Prime, Significant Subcontractor, or Other, it is not possible to select only one box. Please release a revised version of the form that allows the evaluator to check a single box.	See Comment 1804.
4729	Should offerors propose a single rate within Exhibit 3b/c that is a contractor site rate at the highest geographic location (OCONUS) with the high level of security clearance (TS SCI) as a single rate, or does the Government require separate rates for CONUS vs. OCONUS, cleared vs. uncleared, contractor vs. government site, etc.?	See Comment 3462.
4743	What does the "*" mean next to a subset of the TBS entries in the table?	The Solicitation has been updated in an Amendment prior to Amendment 7.
4749	The RFP and DRD#3 say that the C-SCRM plan is due 60 day prior to contract award? Does the Government mean that this is due 60 days after contract award?	The solicitation has been updated to remove the reference to 60 days before contract award date.
4753	Please clarify if Offerors are to respond to this requirement as part of their REP submittals.	See Comment 2092.
4756	Exhibit 2 is very involved and also potentially confusing for the evaluator chosen to complete it (given that the technical areas for all three categories are presented, for instance), with the current due date scheduled for just after the July 4th holiday week when many evaluators will be unavailable. Additionally, due to formatting errors (as noted by previous commenters) it looks like an updated template will be necessary. Can the Government provide a two week extension on the proposal due date to July 25th to provide adequate time to for the completion of the new PPQ form once it has been released?	The Comment is out of date.
4765	Are offerors for Categories B & C required to submit Attachment G with the proposal? If so, could the government please provide it?	See Comment 1675.
4773	34 A.3.7.1 Offer Volume, (b) Mandatory Experience / Offerings, Category C p.103 Will the government provide a list of in scope USNSPC codes (available via Contract Holder Only Page (CHOP)) for offerors to utilize in mapping LCATs in Exhibit 3c?	See Comment 2395.

sewp6_rfp_all_comments

4778	Please confirm, for the purposes of responding to A.3.7.2(a)(12), Technical area 11B is not considered a Content Representative area.	Technical Areas 9a, 11b and 11c are not considered a Past Performance Content Representative area and are excluded from the REP Areas.
4782	Can the Government clarify if the \$2 million per order restriction for the 1st year applies to the first year of the NASA SEWP contract or does it apply to the first year of each individual order?	See Comment 3110.
4789	A.1.2.2 - The list of in-scope UNSPC codes and corresponding CLINs is not available in Attachment C – instead we're redirected to the Contract Holder Only Portal. Could the government make this list available within Attachment C or as a separate document?	See Comment 2395.
4791	How is the Government seeking Offerors to comply with bullet 2 as it states, "The offeror must provide relevant experience as it relates to the NAICS code being used for competition." Would Offerors comply with this bullet requirement through the completion of the Exhibit 1 and/or Exhibit 3 deliverables in the Offer Volume?	See Comment 2092.
4793	If we submit a proposal as a Woman-owned Small Business and get the award, are we going to be allowed to bid on Small Business task orders. As a WOSB, we are also a small business.	See Comment 1881.
4798	Category B provides Federal Agencies with customized Enterprise-Wide Strategic Solutions for improvement and enhancement of Agency ITC/AV infrastructure. As telecommunications falls under infrastructure, recommend inclusion of the 517111 NAICS code for Category B crosswalk.	See Comment 2949.
4801	Does the contractor need to include UNSPSC codes for labor rates only in Exhibit 3b/c?	See Comment 2214.
4802	Is the 3-page limit per Letter of Authorization or inclusive of all letters?	See Comment 1957.
4803	3c on page 35 lists Application Services/Software Development but on page 104, it lists Information and Data Analytics Services. Is listing #1 as network services on page 104 an error, which is why the numbering is inconsistent?	The Solicitation has been updated in an Amendment prior to Amendment 7.
4808	Refer to RFP page 100, section "(a) ISO 9001 and CMMI Certification." Will an Unrestricted offeror who is in the process of obtaining ISO 9001:2015 certification at the time of proposal submission be eligible for award consideration?	The Solicitation has been updated in an Amendment prior to Amendment 7.
4817	The evaluation criteria for Past Performance stated in A.4.3 requires showcasing 'content representative' areas to be considered relevant or Pertinent. However, determining similar or relevant complexity requires more details about the scope of work required for this opportunity. Will the Government revise the Scope of Work to include additional details for services required?	The Solicitation will remain as stated. The SEWP scope of services encompasses all ITC/AV services.

sewp6_rfp_all_comments

4818	RFPpage 96A.3.6 (B)"The requirement for LOAs appears in a table on Page 96 that is labeled as Proposal Submission Table. On page 101, Section 3.7.1. Letter of Authorization is labeled as Category A – Letter of Authorization. It does not appear elsewhere in the document. Does the Letter of Authorization only apply to Category A proposals?	See Comment 1782.
4829	ATTACHMENT J- C_SCRM Attestation Formpage 57A.1.30.1.Please confirm if "ATTACHMENT J- C_SCRM Attestation Form" should be completed and submitted with the proposal.	See Comment 1675.
4831	Exhibit 3b- Category B Solutions SpreadsheetColumns B, C, E, and F of Exhibit 3b appear to only apply to Category A proposals. Can Category B bidders leave these columns blank?	See Comment 2214.
4832	Exhibit 3b- Category B Solutions SpreadsheetWhat's the expectation for in terms of providing labor categories and rates in Exhibit 3b?	See Comment 2285.
4841	A.1.32 requires prime contract holders that are other than small businesses to submit a commercial subcontracting plan at the summary level only for agencies. If a Category B Offeror does not have a commercial subcontracting plan, will the government accept an individual subcontracting plan that meets the requirements of FAR 52.219-9?	See comment 1978.
4844	Exhibit 2 - In the instructions section, the Government states "Sections 5 and 6 are completed by the" but does not finish the sentence. Can the Government please clarify?	See Comment 1804.
4846	Under Category B, the Exhibit 3b spreadsheet contains columns that do not apply to labor categories (i.e., Provider (OEM/Service Provider), Provider Part Number, and UNSPSC Code). With Category B Services-based, should offerors provide information for labor categories and indicate these columns as "not applicable"?	See Comment 2214.
4847	Based on the fact that over 2,500 questions have been asked so far, taking into consideration the amount of time it will take to answer such a large volume of questions and the amount of time it will take industry to read through the answers, we respectfully request that an extension be granted in order for offerors to have time to read through all answers, and readjust their bids as necessary depending on the answers. If an answer from the government on an important element that was previously unclear fundamentally changes elements of an offerors response, we will need time to adjust accordingly.	The Comment is out of date.
4851	On the NAICS spreadsheet, 519190 no longer exists. Will the government provide an updated spreadsheet, or should offerors mark this NAICS Code as "not applicable"?	See Comment 1777.

sewp6_rfp_all_comments

4854	REQUEST: Please update the REP requirements to mirror the Past Performance requirements (\$2,500,000 annually or \$12,500,000 total contract value [assuming its 5 yr. contract]), widening the ability for mid-size offerors to provide responses. This also allows offerors to submit experience write-ups that are then supported in the Past Performance, which provides the Government the ability to correlate the experience of the past performance provided."	The Solicitation will remain as stated.
4855	The file Exhibit 2- Past Performance Questionnaire contains several form fields that do not operate correctly, including: 1) "Basis of Selection" only allows for one selection in either Technical or Cost/Price; 2) Section 2 checks all of the boxes simultaneously for Prime, Significant Subcontractor, and Team Member (instead of one selection); 3) Each selection under Section 4 completes "Performed" and "Did Not Perform" simultaneously (instead of one or the other); 4) Section 6 fills the same value for each cost-related field (instead of six independent fields) and the same value for the last five questions. Will the government provide an updated form, and allow offerors to make administrative updates to the form to enable customers to complete the form accurately?	See Comment 1804.
4859	Page 103 states (For Category B and C: A Relevant Experience Project (REP) for mandatory experience is defined as a single contract or task order as either a prime or subcontractor "per REP area".) Should this say "per technical subarea"? If not, what is meant by "per REP area"?	The Solicitation has been updated in an Amendment prior to Amendment 7.
4867	Reference SEWP VI RFP; A.3.2; Will NASA allow for a second Q&A period for questions arising from round one posted answers?	The Comment is out of date.
4869	Reference SEWP VI RFP; page 111; A.3.7.3(a)2 and A.3.7.3(a)3; Reference RFP text: 2. The offeror shall describe their ITC/AV-based solutions and/or services and how the proposed features provide technological leadership in allowing for the next generation of technology in terms of both solutions and services. 3. The offeror shall describe their ITC/AV-based solutions and services and how the proposed architectural features provide technological leadership in allowing for the next generation of technology. Question: In the final RFP, there is very little distinction between A.3.7.3(a)2 and A.3.7.3(a)3. The word "architectural" seems to be the only significant difference. Can the government confirm they would like two separate write-ups in offerors' proposals – one for proposed features and another for proposed architectural features?	See Comment 1808.
4871	Category B- Enterprise-wide ITC/AV Service Solutions in this section contains 11 technical areas, but both the Category B Mandatory Experience Technical Areas and Category B Content Representative Areas each only contain 10. Can the Government clarify if this is by design or if there is information missing from the Mandatory Experience Technical Area and Content Representative Area?	See Comment 4778.
4878	A.3.7.1 OFFER VOLUME Pg 98 The offeror must provide relevant experience as it relates to the NAICS code being used for competition. QUESTION: CAN THE GOVERNMENT PLEASE ADDRESS WHAT TYPE OF INFORMATION THEY REQUIRE HERE? *I*	See Comment 2092.

sewp6_rfp_all_comments

4881	Exhibit 2 - Section 2: Description of Contract: In the "Prime Contractor, Significant Contractor, and Team Member" check boxes, if an offeror selects one box, it selects all 3 boxes.	See Comment 1804.
4882	What is intent between past performance and REPs?	See Comment 3704.
4883	Reference SEWP VI RFP; page 106; A.3.7.2; Page 106 of the RFP states that the minimum average annual value of contracts cited for past performance is \$150,000, while p. 116 states that the minimum value is \$500,000. Which is the correct minimum average annual value?	See Comment 1709.
4884	Under (1) Commitment to Supply Chain Management Category B, please clarify ancillary products. Are ancillary products: 1) products necessary for delivery of services to the customer like hardware purchased through ODCs, 2) corporate resources such as accounting systems and corporate hardware, or 3) both?	See Comment 6409.
4885	Reference SEWP VI RFP; page 101; A.3.7.1; The RFP states that offerors must rank Technical Areas 2-4. What should that ranking be based upon (e.g., perceived relevance, number of CLINs, size, etc.)?	The Solicitation has been updated in an Amendment prior to Amendment 7.
4891	Reference SEWP VI RFP; pages 102; A.3.7.1; Column A on the Technical Area tabs on Exhibit 3a is labeled "Contract Line Item Number (CLIN)"? What data is intended for this field - sequential numbering, our internal CLIN number, product number, or some other information?	See Comment 2214.
4894	The solicitation states "In accordance with DRD #3, a C-SCRM Plan must be submitted to the SEWP Program Management Office annually and no later than 60 calendar days prior to the Contract award date and will be incorporated into the contract as Attachment J." Can the Government clarify if both Attachment J and Exhibit 5 are both due with the proposal submission?	See Comment 3479.
4897	Reference SEWP VI RFP; page 96; A.3.6; The Proposal Submission Table specifies a limit of 3 pages for the Mandatory Experience Letter of Authorization (LOA). With the potential requirement for four letters, will the Government increase this limit to 4 pages?	See Comment 1957.
4902	Will the Government please define what the "*" indicates?	The Solicitation has been updated in an Amendment prior to Amendment 7.
4904	Paragraph states "No information is requested for proposed subcontractors. Subcontractor past performance information will only be evaluated for small business prime offerors." Would the government allow one of the three past performance references to be from a subcontractor teammate regardless of the teammate's business size?	The Solicitation will remain as stated.
4905	The Government requests that Attachments G through L be submitted with the proposal response. However, the proposal package does not include Attachments G, H, I, K, or L. Can the Government please provide the missing attachments?	See Comment 4603.
4917	Exhibit 2 - Section 4 - Technical Area Relevance Ratings, Pages 3-7: In the "Performed, Did Not Perform columns" If an offeror checks one box, both boxes get checked. Can the Government please reconcile?	See Comment 1804.

sewp6_rfp_all_comments

4920	Please confirm that additional subcontractors may be added to meet the needs of ordering bids post-award and define the process associated with post-award on-ramping.	See Comment 4152.
4921	Would the Government consider allowing more than one past performance from Tier 1 subs?	The Solicitation will remain as stated.
4923	Considering the goal of small business subcontracting is to help small businesses to grow, the threshold restrictions listed for Category C seem to fundamentally and diametrically oppose that goal: "Category C has a threshold restriction of \$2 million per order (inclusive of options) for the 1st year of contract performance and \$10 million per order in the 2nd year of contract performance. Category C threshold restrictions are subject to removal beginning in the 3rd year of contract performance." Will the Government consider eliminating the contract threshold restrictions for Category C?	The Solicitation will remain as stated.
4924	Exhibit 3b for Category B asks for OEM and part numbers but is a Services only category. Is this exhibit required for services only as it appears to be addressing a product-based order? If it does apply to service deliveries, please clarify which columns must be filled in, and with what information, to complete the form.	See Comment 2214.
4927	Would the Government consider lowering the Small business past performance threshold to allow small businesses to cite more references to show relevance to required areas?	The Solicitation will remain as stated.
4935	There is a requirement in the table on pg. 96 for a C-SCRM Attestation form. However, there were two forms included, both with the name C-SCRM Attestation. Does the requirement in the table refer to Attachment J or Exhibit 5?	The reference on page 96 in the Proposal Submission Table refers to Exhibit 5.
4940	Please confirm that submission of Exhibit 5 C-SCRM Attestation Form or valid active O-TTPS certification completes the C-SCRM compliance requirement within Subfactor B Management Approach and is separate from SEWP Cybersecurity-Supply Chain Risk Management (C-SCRM) Plan DRD 3.	See Comment 3479.
4946	Category B and C, paragraph 4, page 103: The Government states "If the CLIN is for an hourly labor rate, then the associated labor category shall be provided in Column G (Labor Category if Hourly Rate)". We expect all the CLINs for Category B and C are labor category and hourly rate, should we leave the columns B provider, C provider part number and D Description blank in this case.	See Comment 2214.
4949	Section A.3.7.1 OFFER VOLUME requires Offerors to "provide relevant experience as it relates to the NAICS code being used for competition." Is this the information provided in : Exhibit+1-+Relevant+Experience+Project+Table? Or does the Government expect a separate narrative for each of the REPS we intend to provide for the competition?	See Comment 2092.
4955	Can the submission date for questions be extended?	The Comment is out of date.

sewp6_rfp_all_comments

4956	The RFP refers to Relevant Experience Projects (REP). Our understanding is that REPs are the specific projects used in the Offeror Volume (Exhibit 1) and in the Past Performance Volume to prove relevant experience per Offeror and Past Performance requirements. Please confirm or correct our interpretation.	See Comment 3704.
4960	Page 105 states that "Prime Offerors shall furnish the information requested below a minimum of one (1) but no more than three (3) of your most recent similar contracts" Page 106 states that the "The offeror shall provide the following information on all past/current contract references that meet the above criteria for the prime offeror." Will the Government please confirm the number of past/current contracts that the Offeror is to describe? If the Offeror is to provide information on "all" past/current projects, will the Government please increase the page limitation of Volume II from 10 pages?	The Solicitation will remain as stated.
4961	A.3.7.3 (a) Page 111 Paragraphs 2 and 3 are nearly identical; Paragraph 2 refers to "features," while Paragraph 3 refers to "architectural features." Can the government please clarify the difference in desired content between these two sections?	See Comment 1808.
4965	For Category C on Page 104, the Government lists 10 mandatory experience sub-areas, however, in Section A.1.2 Scope of Work on Page 38, the Government lists 11 for Category C, including Program Management/Ancillary Services. Can the Government clarify whether Offerors should demonstrate support capabilities for 10 or 11 scope areas?	See Comment 4778.
4967	Category B and C Content Representative Areas, paragraph 2, pages 109 & 116: The Government states " Offerors identified as HUBZone, SDVOSB, EDWOSB, 8a in Category B and C shall provide past performance references showcasing relevant work in at least two (2) content representative areas for content to be rated relevant (pertinent)." Will the Government consider adding WOSB socio-economic status to this category?	See Comment 1697.
4971	Will the government please grant a 60-day extension to accommodate answering the enormous number of questions, and allow offerors sufficient time to respond to the revised solicitation once published?	The Comment is out of date.
4972	We have received Letters of Authorization in the name of divisions/subsidiaries of providers listed on Enclosure 1- SEWP VI Providers. Must the LOAs be in the name of the parent organization listed in Enclosure 1- SEWP VI Providers or may a LOA on the letterhead of the division/subsidiary suffice.	See Comment 2305.
4973	Exhibit 3b and 3c for Categories B & C; The requirement to use UNSPSC codes: The Excel Code Download cost is \$275.00, Will the Government provide this file?	See Comment 2395.
4975	For Categories B and C, how should offerors determine the labor categories / UNSPSC codes? Is there a list we can refer to?	See Comment 2949.
4976	Exhibit 3b for Categories B & C: Please provide instructions for each column with the information the Government requires	See Comment 2214.

sewp6_rfp_all_comments

4978	(a) Technical Approach (Subfactor A), Bullets 2 & 3, pages 110-111: Bullets 2 & 3. Can the Government provide clarity on the request of proposed features and proposed architectural features? The request looks similar and it would be great if the Government can explain the expectations of the request.	See Comment 1808.
4983	Concerning ISO, does "proof that the certification approval is in process" indicate that a small business is actively working towards obtaining ISO certification at any stage, or must the company have progressed beyond the assessment phase by the accreditor?	See Comment 2200.
4991	If we are submitting the response for Category C, is it necessary for the REPs and PPs to fall under the NAICS codes 518210, 519190, 519290, 541330, 541430, 541490, 541511, 541512, 541513, 541519, 541614, 541618, 541690, 541990, 561621, 611420	See Comment 1886.
4992	Are there any limits to SEWP VI Task Order opportunities based on selected NAICS Codes? Will Awardees have the opportunity to bid all task orders for the Category awarded? For example, a Category B Small Business awardee will also have visibility to SDVOSB task orders.	See Comment 1881.
4993	In A.3.7.1 OFFER VOLUME (b) on page 103 the RFP states, "Only projects with NAICS codes listed as in-scope for SEWP VI are to be submitted." Many contracts use overarching NAICS designations to describe the preponderance of the work. For example, 541715, Research and Development in the Physical, Engineering, and Life Sciences has been assigned to many large contracts that have significant IT services embedded in the contract. For this reason, will the Government allow offerors to state in the Project Descriptions (Part III) of their Representative Experience Project Table (Exhibit 1) that the portion performed aligns with specific NAICS codes listed as in-scope for SEWP VI, even if the umbrella NAICS code provided in Part I differs.	See Comment 1671.
4997	Category B areas listed on page 32 include 11 items, the list on page 104 is 10 items, the list on Page 108 is 10 items (in a different order). Would the Government review these lists and clarify the items/order across Category B, as bidders are unsure if or where we are to respond to (for example), Technical Area 11b - Program Management/Ancillary Services and Supplies when it's not listed across all sections cited above.	See Comment 4778.
5008	Category B areas listed on page 32 include 11 items, the list on page 104 is 10 items, the list on Page 108 is 10 items (in a different order). Would the Government review these lists and clarify the items/order across Category B, as bidders are unsure if or where we are to respond to (for example), Technical Area 11b - Program Management/Ancillary Services and Supplies when it's not listed across all sections cited above.	See Comment 4778.
5012	Category C areas listed on page 36 include 11 items, the list on page 104 is 10 items, the list on Page 108 is 10 items (in a different order). Would the Government review these lists and clarify the items/order across Category C, as bidders are unsure if or where we are to respond to (for example), Technical Area 11c - Program Management/Ancillary Services when it's not listed across all sections cited above.	See Comment 4778.

sewp6_rfp_all_comments

5014	There is some ambiguity between “features” (A.3.7.3(a) 2) and “architectural features” (A.3.7.3(a) 3) since architectural features can fall under the umbrella of features in general. Is it accurate that A.3.7.3 (a) 2 is intended to be a focus on services and A.3.7.3 (a) 3 a focus on software and hardware solutions? If this distinction between services and hardware/software solutions is not accurate, please clarify the differentiation between “features” and “architectural features”.	See Comment 1808.
5016	A.3.7.1 OFFER VOLUME, page 98. The RFP states “Identify any consultants, generative artificial intelligence, and/or sub-contractors used in writing this proposal (if any) and the extent to which their services will be available in the subsequent performance of this effort.” Will the Government define generative artificial intelligence? Are PerfectIt and Grammarly considered generative artificial intelligence?	See Comment 2276.
5019	A.3.7.1 OFFER VOLUME, (b) Mandatory Experience/ Offerings, For Category B and C, page 103. RFP states “Offerors proposing to category B and/ or C shall complete Exhibit 3b- Category B Solutions Spreadsheet and Exhibit 3c- Category C Solutions Spreadsheet.” Will the Government explain what information is needed to fill out Exhibit 3c-Category C Solutions Spreadsheet and provide an example?	See Comment 2214.
5024	The "Enclosure+1-+SEWP+VI+Providers.pdf" lists the Designated SEWP VI Providers which require a LOA if used as one of the Technical Area main OEM. This list seems to be bias towards certain OEMs. Can NASA add Eaton, Belkin, Viewsonic, Ruckus, and Microfocus to the Designated Providers?	See Comment 5655.
5032	"An Offeror may submit a single award IDIQ/BPA at the contract/agreement level for a single past performance reference. However, Offerors are not permitted to submit a multiple awards or GWAC as an individual past performance reference." Please provide clarification on the use of the word "single past performance" to mean for example, only one of three references provided can be a Single Award IDIQ/BPA. If the answer is yes, is the Government considering this as a "collection of task orders"? If the Gov't will accept a collection of task orders that meet all other requirements, can the Offeror combine the Average annual Cost/fee incurred of all Task Orders?	See Comment 2623.
5035	A.1.30.1 Cybersecurity-Supply Chain Risk Management (C-SCRM) Plan, page 57. RFP states “In accordance with DRD #3, a C-SCRM Plan must be submitted to the SEWP Program Management Office annually and no later than 60 calendar days prior to the Contract award date and will be incorporated into the contract as Attachment J.” Without knowing when the award will be and who will be awarding a contract, we assume the government intended this requirement to be 60 days after award notification. Will the Government clarify the requirement to provide the C-SCRM Plan?	See Comment 1675.
5043	In the Exhibit 2 PP Questionnaire, under Category C- ITC/AV Mission-based Service Solutions, there are only 10 service areas. 11 c Program Management is missing. Is this an intentional skip?	See Comment 4778.
5044	While completing Exhibit 1 REP, should we consider 11c Program Management as a service area? 11c is missing in Exhibit 2.	See Comment 4778.

5045	<p>An Offeror shall not be rated favorably or unfavorably if the offeror does not have a record of “recent” and “relevant” past performance or if a record of past performance is unavailable. In such cases the offeror will receive a “Neutral” rating. However, an offeror with favorable, recent, and relevant past performance that meets the average value as specified in A.3.7.2 may be considered more favorably than an offeror with no relevant past performance information.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">This statement is in conflict with A.4.1 (2) Phase 2. Request clarification of evaluation process for past performance.</p>	The Solicitation has been updated in an Amendment prior to Amendment 7.
5055	<p>The summary shall provide detail as to how the offeror will support the four Acquisition Objectives including information in the following areas: Acquisition Objective 4 - "To embrace and facilitate innovative procurement transactions and processes that will place a minimal administrative burden on the customer, contractor, and the Gov't while minimizing incompatibilities and maximizing strategic decision-making across the ITC/AV infrastructure." "The fourth objective relates to the Procurement expertise that NASA SEWP brings to any size acquisition in combination with the ITC/AV technical expertise needed to develop, test, and utilize new processes for automating the entire procurement process." Can the Gov't provide clarification that this narrative is more aligned with SubFactor B, Management Approach? Or, is the Gov't referring to a capability to provide ITC/AV infrastructure technology support services?</p>	The Solicitation has been updated in an Amendment prior to Amendment 7.
5059	<p>1. Page 88 of the solicitation indicates an asterisk (*) before the TBS (To Be Submitted) for the following documents – can the government please explain the significance of the asterisk in this table for these documents?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a.DEIA Plan (applicable for Categories B and C) b.Ability One Formal Agreement c.SEWP C-SCRM Annual Plan d.Climate Change Risk Management Plan 	See Comment 1869.
5061	<p>Is an Offeror required to propose only the minimum number of CLINS in four technical areas under Category A? Will Awardees be able to add additional products in all of the Category A technical areas post award? Are we limited to only submitting for a maximum of 4 technical areas?</p>	<p>No, the offeror can propose more than the minimum number of CLINs. However, CLINs will not be reviewed or evaluated and will only be utilized to establish the initial Contract Database of Record upon Contract award. Yes, Contract Holders can utilize the Technology Refreshment process to add any in-scope product, solution or service for their Category post award. No, Offerors are not limited to submitting CLINs only the 4 designated Technical Areas.</p>

sewp6_rfp_all_comments

5062	In Technical Area 8: Software and Cloud Technology, the solicitation states the only NAICS code applicable is NAICS 513210 (Software Publishers). Will a user be allowed at the task order level to select NAICS Code 541519 Footnote 18 (the Established NAICS code for Category A) for acquisitions with Category A contractors as an alternative to 513210?	See Comment 2009.
5063	There are several text areas on the PPQ that are linked in a way that an answer typed to one question is automatically duplicated in all other question areas, if you delete the text, all text is deleted. This will pose a problem for our customers when it comes to completing the document. We respectfully request that a new PPQ PDF that does not contain these issues be released and an extension be granted so that our customers have time to complete the forms.	The Comment is out of date.
5066	"An Offeror may submit a single award IDIQ/ BPA at the contract/ agreement level for as a single past performance reference. However, Offerors are not permitted to submit a multiple award or GWAC as an individual past performance reference." Does this mean that an Offeror can not use an IDIQ contract as a past performance reference if there were multiple IDIQ contracts awarded for the same customer program?	See Comment 2623.
5069	Will a SB SocioEconomic or 8(a) Offeror be able to compete for all Small Business Task Order opportunities? Or, will the SocioEconomic or 8(a) status limit the Offeror to only the Task Orders with the specific Set-Aside?	See Comment 1881.
5071	"1.The RFP mentions a size standard for PP of minimum \$150,000 for small biz in Category A in one spot, and \$500K in another spot. Which is correct? "For Small Businesses proposing in Categories A- the past performance provided shall be for similar scope efforts with a minimum average annual cost incurred of \$150,000 (One Hundred- Fifty Thousand) for size to be rated relevant (pertinent)." Page 106 "In Category A and C, shall furnish the past performance for similar scope efforts with an average annual cost/fee incurred of \$500,000." Page 116"	See Comment 1709.
5080	The Exhibit 4 NAICS Size Standard Crosswalk file Category B and Category C tabs include NAICS Code 519190 which is no longer a valid NAICS Code. This code was retired in 2022. Will the Government please provide a revised document?	See Comment 1777.
5081	2. Page 96 – Proposal Content and Page Limitations – the table lists Mandatory Experience Letter of Authorization (LOA) as a proposal component. Can the government please confirm that this requirement is applicable to those offerors proposing under Category A and is not required for Categories B or C?	See Comment 1782.
5087	The first listed NAICS code is incomplete, please confirm this is intended as 334111, rather than stated 33411. Is the NMR class waiver for utilizing commercial off-the-shelf laptops and tablets; mainframe computers and peripherals when the peripheral equipment is purchased with a mainframe computer, Automated Data Processing (ADP) Input/Output and Storage Devices, and ASP storage supplies and ASP storage equipment 334111?	The Solicitation has been updated in an Amendment prior to Amendment 7.

sewp6_rfp_all_comments

5089	Given the requirement that bidders include (4) of the mandatory technology categories and these may potentially come from (4) different OEMs, will the Government consider extending this page limit or will the Government count the LOAs outside of the page limit?	See Comment 1957.
5094	In section A.3.7.2 the dollar threshold for category A small business past performance is listed as \$150,000, however in section A.4.3, the size will be evaluated at \$500,000. Can the Government confirm the minimum Past Performance requirement?	See Comment 1709.
5095	The font size auto reduces when adding content in the cells of the Exhibit 1 - Relevant Experience Project Table and Exhibit 2 - PastPerfQues-SEWP VI PDFs. Can the Government provide editable Word versions of both Exhibit 1 and 2 so that Offerors can ensure that font size and style comply with instructions?	See Comment 1804.
5100	The Contact Information section as well as the Vendor Response and Summary Explanation columns do not work in Attachment J. Text is duplicated in all cells, only one Yes/No checkmark can be selected at a time, and text auto reduces. Can the Government provide an editable Word version of the attachment so that Offerors can complete the form properly and ensure that font size and style comply with instructions?	See Comment 1675.
5101	SEWP V currently has over 9,700 OEMs and distributors successfully providing hardware and software solutions, yet the Government is only accepting LOAs from "approved resellers" described in Enclosure 1. Many of the OEMs listed in Enclosure 1 have refused to issue LOAs to new vendors for the purpose of the SEWP VI proposal. Will the Government include the current SEWP V OEMs/Distributors on Enclosure 1 and allow Category A offerors to submit their actual capabilities in their Solutions Spreadsheet?	See Comment 5655.
5102	In Attachment J, there are multiple functions that do not work correctly, such as the radial buttons and the content boxes (i.e., only select one radial dial can be selected and the content copies to all boxes). Is it the Government's intention to correct these issues, or can the Offeror correct the errors in functionality themselves	See Comment 1675.
5103	Are Letters of Authorization and Points of Contact to be provided for the "additional provider(s)" as well? Should they be provided for all proposed providers under each technical area or just for one "designated provider" under each technical area?	See Comment 1874.
5104	The instructions for Attachment J require you to include information if you select no, but some questions ask for information to be submitted, such as a date of a last review for question 3.2.	See Comment 1675.
5109	Attachment J's Question 6.2 is not a yes or no question. Would the Government considering rewording this to read "Are provisions for auditing included within supplier contracts?" to better fit the requirement.	See Comment 1675.
5110	Attachment J's Question 7.2 Would the Government considering rewording this requirement to read "Does the prime contractor have remote work capabilities?"	See Comment 1675.

sewp6_rfp_all_comments

5112	Page 25 Paragraph 1 indicates that "Each technology area includes specific mandatory technology that must be supplied; however, offerings shall not be limited to those specific mandatory areas," what proportion of the minimum proposed CLIN solutions must be devoted to accomplishing the specific mandatory technology?	See Comment 5061.
5113	The Government-provided fillable PPQ PDF (Exhibit 2) has errors in the fillable fields. Can the Government please provide an updated fillable PDF form as soon as possible?	See Comment 1804.
5114	Is NASA currently using a centralized or several separate asset management systems? i.e. one for computers, another for phones, different asset management at separate geographic locations, nodes, sub-nodes, etc.	See Comment 3752.
5119	On page 109, under A.3.7.2, it states "Offerors identified as HUBZone, SDVOSB, EDWOSB, 8a in Category B and C shall provide past performance references showcasing relevant work in at least two (2) content representative areas for content to be rated relevant (pertinent)." Can the Government please confirm if WOSB can also be included in this list? The REP requirements under section A.3.7.1 on page 104 does include WOSB stating, "For HUBZone, VOSB, SDVOSB, WOSB, EDWOSB, 8a offerors (inclusive of first-tier subcontractors, if applicable): A total of 2 different REPs for each of the mandatory experience technical areas shall be submitted. Each Project must have had a minimum of \$4M in total value size of a single order or contract and must be described using the Exhibit 1 REP template."	See Comment 1697.
5120	Does the government intend to establish labor categories for each category area, or is it seeking contractors to provide labor categories for each proposed task area?	See Comment 2285.
5122	Exhibit 2 states that "The Offeror shall provide a questionnaire for each past performance reference submission and be submitted directly by the evaluator to Government Contracting Officer via email PastPerformance@sewp.nasa.gov. Sections 1-4 are to be completed by the Offeror and verified by the evaluator. Sections 5 and 6 are completed by the..." It appears some of the instructions are missing after "the." Will the Government please provide the missing information?	See Comment 1804.
5130	Each Project must have had a minimum of \$2M in total value size of a single order or contract and must be described using the Exhibit 1 REP template. Question: Would the Government consider lowering the minimum TCV for small business contracts to accommodate micro small businesses competing for this GWAC?	The Solicitation will remain as stated.
5134	Often work performed on a NASA SBIR or STTR is primarily 541511 (Custom Computer Programming Services), but NASA classifies SBIR and STTR contracts as 541715 because of the type of money being spent, not the actual work being performed. Is there a way we can claim the work performed on Phase I, II, or III NASA contracts as being related to a Category C scope NAICS code (541511) when it is being categorized as 541715 because of the funding?	See Comment 1671.
5141	If the work performed on a contract was a combination of two NAICS codes (541715 and 541511) but was primarily IT software development, is there a way to claim this as 541511 work even though the NAICS code showing in FPDS-NG (i.e., 541715) is not within the scope of Category C?	See Comment 1671.

sewp6_rfp_all_comments

5142	Page 57 under A.1.30.1 Cybersecurity-Supply Chain Risk Management Plan, states the C-SCRM is due within 60 days of the contract award. Does that mean it is due on Aug 1st or would Sept 1st be acceptable for a late October award date? Will awards be delayed until the document is received or will an offeror be disqualified for award if not received timely? If so, what is considered timely?	See Comment 1675.
5147	"A full list of all currently identified in-scope UNSPSC codes for in-scope offerings is found in Attachment C, SEWP Contract Holder User Manual." Please provide the attachment which includes the UNSPSC codes as it was not provided in the final RFP. Since these are the "currently identified in-scope" codes, may other UNSPSC codes be offered that are not included on the list?	See Comment 2395.
5151	Page 103 In understanding the interplay between relevant experience and past performance for Categories B and C, is it correct that you must have more relevant experience than the required past performance?	See Comment 3704.
5152	A.3.7.3 (a) directs offerors to provide detail as to how the offeror will support the four Acquisition Objectives including information in three subsequently listed areas. The second and third areas listed seem to be mostly duplicative. QUESTION: Could the Government please clarify the difference in intent between the second and third areas listed?	See Comment 1808.
5154	Will the government increase the page count for Volume III: Mission Suitability Volume to 25 pages?	The Solicitation will remain as stated.
5155	A.1.32 Requirement is to submit a Commercial Subcontracting Plan. QUESTION: As a Commercial Subcontracting Plan is for companies that manufacture products, can Offerors that do not manufacture products submit an Individual Subcontracting Plan instead?	See comment 1978.
5165	Page 102 Paragraph 2 Point of Contact (POC) Tab indicates, "For each of the four (4) proposed Technical Areas, a minimum of one (1) additional provider must be proposed" while Page 101 Category A - Letter of Authorization indicates " LOA for each different designated provider for a maximum of four (4) LOAs"; how many Providers can Offerors use to accomplish the mandatory quantity of distinct and relevant CLINs?	The Solicitation has been updated in an Amendment prior to Amendment 7.
5168	For Category A, #9 Product based Services is not listed. Is this intentional or an omission?	See Comment 4778.
5175	For Category A, please confirm that Product Based Services is not considered to be one of the content representative areas.	See Comment 4778.

sewp6_rfp_all_comments

5176	We understand that NASA will not answer any new questions beyond the 6/7/24 questions deadline. If clarification is required for any responses published after that question deadline, we assume that any such clarification request must reference a previous question and response by number. Is our assumption correct?	The Comment is out of date.
5181	Will the government provide a 30-day extension for the submission deadline once questions have been answered via formal amendment?	The Comment is out of date.
5187	A.1.30.1. Cybersecurity-Supply Chain Risk Management states that in accordance with DRD#3, C-SCRM attestation for is to be submitted annually and no later than 60 days prior to the Contract award date. Should this be 60 days after contract award date?	The Solicitation has been updated in an Amendment prior to Amendment 7.
5190	A.3.7.2 PAST PERFORMANCE VOLUME Pg 109(a) INFORMATION FROM THE OFFEROR Offerors identified as HUBZone, SDVOSB, EDWOSB, 8a in Category B and C shall provide past performance references showcasing relevant work in at least two (2) content representative areas for content to be rated relevant (pertinent). Question: In the RFP requirement, it states that offerors identified as WOSB are only required to provide 2 REPs. However, for past performance in Category C, it states: "Offerors identified as HUBZone, SDVOSB, EDWOSB, 8(a) in Category B and C shall provide past performance references showcasing relevant work in at least two (2) content representative areas for content to be rated relevant (pertinent)." Could the Government please clarify if WOSB falls into this category as well? *I*	See Comment 1697.
5191	Reference bullet 3 in Section A.3.7.1 Offer Volume, is the AbilityOne letter required or only recommended with proposal submission?	See Comment 2322.
5192	Can a sample line item be provided for Exhibit 3b?	See Comment 2214.
5193	The government had promised 60 days to propose SEWP, but we were given 45. Will there be an extension?	The Comment is out of date.
5201	If an offeror is submitting a proposal focused on services, is an Individual Subcontracting Plan adequate to meet the requirement?	See comment 1978.
5204	Can other OEM's be added to the approved manufacture list such as Lenovo and Promethean?	See Comment 5655.
5207	Regarding A.3.7.1, Exhibit 3b and 3c for Categories B & C UNSPSC codes, the download cost is \$275. Is the government planning to provide the Excel file or do Offerors need to acquire on their own?	See Comment 2395.

sewp6_rfp_all_comments

5209	We have encountered technical issues with ATTACHMENT J - C_SCRM Attestation Form. When selecting Yes/No for one question, the response disappears upon answering the subsequent question. Additionally, when providing a summary explanation, the explanation is duplicated in all of the boxes for other questions. Can you please provide guidance on how to resolve these issues, or could you supply a corrected version of the form that allows for independent responses and individual summary explanations for each question?	See Comment 1675.
5213	Can offerors provide a blank or "n/a" response to columns that do not apply to certain CLINs within the Exhibit 3b spreadsheet?	See Comment 2214.
5214	In Section A.3.6 the RFP does not ask for Attachment J - C_SCRM Attestation form. Will the Government please clarify which Volume the Attachment should reside in?	See Comment 1675.
5216	If the offeror is submitting under Small Business, does the offeror have to submit a subcontracting plan? *1*	See Comment 2207.
5224	A.3.7.1 Offer Volume (pg 98) asks Offerors to provide a Subcontracting Plan. Can the Government provide instructions/requirements for the Subcontracting Plan?	See Comment 2207.
5225	The Proposal Submission Table on page 95 does not match the order of how items are listed in A.3.7.1 Offer Volume. Should we follow the order items are listed in A.3.7.1?	The Solicitation has been updated in an Amendment prior to Amendment 7.
5226	1)Can a company prime a category and also be a member of a joint venture(whether managing member or minority member) priming within the same category? If so, are there any restrictions or limitations on the projects that company can use for both submissions? For example, can the company that is the prime use the same projects for their prime bid and also use the same projects for their Joint venture prime bid? 2) Can a company use the same projects in a category B as they use for category C?	The Solicitation has been updated in an Amendment prior to Amendment 7.
5233	Would the U.S. please provide a completed example of Exhibit 3a, 3b, or 3c?	See Comment 2214.
5235	Could the Government confirm column F SEWP Catalog Price and column G Labor Category (if Hourly Rate) will be based on Year 1 and offerors will be given an opportunity to provide Year 2-10 pricing during the task orders to take into account the current market?	See Comment 2035.
5237	Exhibit 2, Past Performance Questionnaire Section 4. Technical Area Relevance Ratings under the Category A-ITC/AV Solutions IT Solutions does not provide an area to access Technical Area 9a: Product-Based Services. Was Technical Area 9a: Product-Based Services intentionally left of or was this an oversight	See Comment 4778.

sewp6_rfp_all_comments

5238	During the Draft RFP Industry Day, it was stated that "Proof that the ISO 9001:2015 or CMMI certification is in process at the time of proposal submission is acceptable" without giving any further specifics as to what that meant or how to provide the evidence, therefore leaving many small business offerors to assume that being in ANY stage of the certification process was acceptable. However, the final RFP states that "It is acceptable to provide proof that the certification "approval" is in process." Please confirm that it is acceptable for Small Business offerors to provide evidence that they have started the ISO Certification process by contacting a Certification Body and scheduling an audit. Please confirm that we do not have show that we have already been audited and are awaiting approval from the Certification Body.	See Comment 2646.
5239	The RFP document provides instructions for column E UNSPSC code, and Column G Labor Category (if Hourly Rate) of the Exhibit 3b spreadsheet. Can instructions also be provided for the remaining columns in Exhibit 3b (CLIN, Provider, Provider Part Number, Description, and SEWP Catalog Price)?	See Comment 2214.
5244	Please provide an updated Exhibit 2 form as there is a significant typo omission with respect to the instructions for completing Sections 5 and 6.	See Comment 1804.
5245	Will the Government confirm that Letters of Authorization are only required for Category A bidders? Letters of Authorization appear as a row in the general Proposal Submission Table on Page 95 and do not appear to be isolated to Category A. On page 101 it does appear to be exclusive to Category A.	See Comment 1782.
5247	A.3.7.3 MISSION SUITABILITY VOLUME pg 111 (b) MANAGEMENT APPROACH (SUBFACTOR B)ii. FOR CATEGORY B and C - The Offeror shall describe ancillary products required for performance of specific tasks and corporate risks associated with SCRM (e.g., availability and security of corporate resources). Question: Can the Government clarify and confirm what they are looking for in this section? *I*	See Comment 6409.
5248	The RFP states "10. Small Business Subcontracting Plan history, if applicable: provide latest Individual Subcontract Report (ISR) and Summary Subcontract Report (SSR) (formerly known as the SF 294 and 295 reports) and supporting rationale (Excluded from the page limitation)." Is this a requirement of submission for Large and Small businesses?	See comment 1978.
5252	"Only projects with NAICS codes listed as in-scope for SEWP VI are to be submitted. No additional information is requested in support of the Exhibit 1 REP template. Offerors shall only submit the total number of REPs as required for the proposed category and business size standard." Do all projects need to be in the SAME NAICS or can they be different NAICS as long as they are in the list for the Category (A, B, or C)	See Comment 1886.
5264	Reference the Mandatory Experience/REPs for Category B, only 10 are listed; however, there is an 11b: Program Management/Ancillary Services and Supplies and in Category C, an 11c: Program Management/Ancillary Services. Does NASA require Offerors to provide REPs for these, as well as anywhere else asked for in the instructions to address the 10 technical areas when it is 11 for each category? Or, is no response required for 11b and 11c in the respective Categories B and C?	See Comment 4778.

sewp6_rfp_all_comments

5266	Could the Government confirm if CLINs in Exhibit 3 should be based on named CLIN type like sample 1 of Attachment C? Or should CLINs in Exhibit 3 be numerical like sample 2 of Attachment C?	See Comment 2214.
5272	This section states "For Small Businesses proposing in Categories A- the past performance provided shall be for similar scope efforts with a minimum average annual cost incurred of \$150,000 (One Hundred- Fifty Thousand) for size to be rated relevant (pertinent). For Small Businesses proposing in Categories C- the past performance provided shall be for similar scope efforts with a minimum average annual cost/fee incurred of \$500,000 (Five Hundred Thousand) for size to be rated relevant (pertinent)" However, Section A.4.3, P. 116 has a direct contradiction in the evaluation section. Small Businesses- In Category A and C, shall furnish the past performance for similar scope efforts with an average annual cost/fee incurred of \$500,000. Which value is accurate?	See Comment 1709.
5278	The form question "During the performance being evaluated, this company was the:", with the following options. Prime Contractor, Significant Subcontractor, Team Member. The form has an error where only all 3 options can be selected, and we are unable to identify the proper choice.	See Comment 1804.
5281	Please confirm for Category A that the "Designated Provider" shall come from Enclosure 1 – SEWP VI Providers and the "50 distinct and relevant CLIN's from these secondary providers" can be from any provider, i.e., they do not need to be on the Enclosure 1 – SEWP VI Providers list. Is this correct?	See Comment 5655.
5297	Exhibit 1 Part III instructions state: "Use Arial font, no smaller than 10 points." Question: Exhibit 1 has a data entry field where the words get progressively smaller when inputted. Does the Government's intend for offerors use a separate file exhibit 1 for this narrative or to insert into a MS Word Volume II Proposal Response document?	The Solicitation has been updated in an Amendment prior to Amendment 7.
5300	On Exhibit 2 - PPQ, this instruction is incomplete. " The Offeror shall provide a questionnaire for each past performance reference submission and be submitted directly by the evaluator to Government Contracting Officer via email PastPerformance@sewp.nasa.gov. Sections 1-4 are to be completed by the Offeror and verified by the evaluator. Sections 5 and 6 are completed by the " -> Will the Government confirm who needs to complete Section 5 and 6 in Exhibit 2?	See Comment 1804.
5303	The RFP says, "All offerors that are not small businesses must submit a commercial subcontracting plan." For categories B and C, given the mandatory technical areas emphasize services, would the government confirm that an offeror without an approved commercial plan and intends to provide enterprise IT services can submit an individual subcontracting plan to comply with FAR 52.219-9 requirements?	See comment 1978.
5320	The A.2.1. GSFC 52.211-101 List of Attachments includes a DEIA Plan (Applicable for Categories B & C) due at proposal submission. There are no instructions or requirements provided for a DEIA Plan anywhere in the RFP. We recommend removing this requirement from the pg 88 List of Attachments.	See Comment 1675.

sewp6_rfp_all_comments

5323	The A.2.1. GSFC 52.211-101 List of Attachments includes a Climate Change Risk Management Plan due at proposal submission. The only requirement for this plan, on pg 76-77, state that it is due 12 months after Contract Award. Please update the pg 88 List of Attachments to reflect this is due after Contract Award.	See Comment 1675.
5329	As the Government was developing Enclosure 1, what rationale did the Government use to determine the 30 or so companies listed within Enclosure 1 were the only authorized OEMs who can provide hardware/software solutions to meet minimum requirements of the Category A Exhibit 3a? What was the rationale to exclude OEMs Logitech and Xerox from Enclosure 1 who are actively providing hardware/software solutions on SEWP V?	See Comment 6216.
5330	Reference Volume III Mission Suitability, Subfactor B Management Approach, last requirement, Supporting the Responsibilities in Attachment A: SEWP Statement of Work; Section A.5 Contractor Responsibilities. There is no matching evaluation criteria for this requirement. Please provide the evaluation criteria.	See Comment 2494.
5332	Please consider allowing 10-point font for headers and footers.	See Comment 1962.
5335	What is the rationale for requiring that LOAs for Category A be obtained from such a small list of specific providers? How is the government able to mandate that these providers be used? If SEWP V currently has over 9700 OEM providers, are those not on the LOA list no longer going to be available to use as providers?	See Comment 5655.
5347	For CATEGORY A Content Representative Areas, Technical Area 9a is omitted from the technical areas that will be evaluated for relevancy. Many of our contracts with strategic customer support center around our excellence in assisting customers with identifying opportunities and providing complex proposals to minimize administrative overhead and annual year-over-year maintenance pricing uplifts by consolidating and co-terminating software and hardware maintenance contracts with the inclusion of option years that align to future technology refreshes to provide funding stability and predictability, and effective contract administration. Will SEWP consider adding Technical Area 9a to the list evaluated content representative areas so that these types of past performance references may be considered as one of the three (3) content representative areas for content to be rated relevant (pertinent)?	See Comment 4778.

sewp6_rfp_all_comments

5352	Will SEWP please add Ivanti to the list of SEWP Designated Providers in Enclosure 1. Ivanti is an IT software company headquartered in South Jordan, Utah, and United States with annual revenue of \$500M. It produces software, hardware, and cloud services for IT Security, IT Service Management, IT Asset Management, Unified Endpoint Management, Identity Management and supply chain management, all of which are within the scope of the SEWP VI contract. Our company has done extensive Ivanti business over the last ten (10) years across dozens of civilian, DoD, intelligence community, and private sector customers, including 89 contracts totaling more than \$4M through the NASA SEWP V contract. To exclude Ivanti from this list would put our organization's ability to bid on SEWP VI at an arbitrary disadvantage because Ivanti is not listed in Enclosure 1 even though they are currently providing hardware and software solutions on SEWP V.	See Comment 5655.
5355	Exhibit 2 past performance questionnaire is 10 pages. To reduce administrative burden, will the Government please consider scaling back the questionnaire for evaluators rating our performance?	The Solicitation will remain as stated.
5357	For category B & C the reduced requirement of providing 2 REPs applies to HUBZone, VOSB, SDVOSB, WOSB, EDWOSB, and 8a, while the reduced requirement to meet 2 Content Representative Areas for past performance only applies to HUBZone, SDVOSB, EDWOSB, and 8a. Please confirm that VOSB and WOSB must provide past performance references for 3 content representative areas.	See Comment 1697.
5363	May the legends required by NFS 1852.237-73 be included on the cover page and page footer in a font smaller than 12pt?	See Comment 1962.
5365	If an offeror is small under some NAICS but large under others, will the offeror be permitted to compete on task orders that are not set aside for small business in the NAICS where the offeror is not small?	See Comment 1881.
5367	The U. S. Small Business Administration Table of Small Business Size Standards Matched to North American Industry Classification System Codes Effective March 17, 2023, no longer lists 519190 as an available NAICS code with a size standard measure to meet, is there another NAICS code to use for Exhibit 4, Category B and C in its place, or will it be rolled into 519290?	See Comment 1777.
5374	If a bidder is awarded a contract with a HUBZone set-aside proposal and is also a qualified 8(a), WOSB, and SB at the time of award, are they allowed to bid on SEWP RFQs under all set-asides for which they qualify?	See Comment 1881.
5377	Will the Government please consider increasing the 15 pages limitation for Volume III-B Management Approach Volume given the significant amount of required elements, per the Instructions to Offerors (ITO) (RFP Section A.3.7.3(b) Management Approach (Subfactor B)), and evaluation criteria outlined in RFP Section A.4.4(b)(4).	The Solicitation will remain as stated.

sewp6_rfp_all_comments

5378	Will small businesses receive all RFPs solicited to the Category they are awarded? For example, will all full and open Category B solicitations go to B(1) and B(2) or will small business set-aside opportunities go only to B(2) and unrestricted will go only to B(1)? Some governmentwide programs have seen an advantage to keeping the size pools as independent fair opportunity pools in order to expedite awards. In this scenario small businesses that wish to bid the unrestricted groups must meet the evaluation criteria established for the other than small business offerors and may receive an award as an unrestricted and small business contractor.	See Comment 1881.
5387	Given the broad scope of services requested under SEWP VI, will the Government include NAICS 541611 as in scope for Categories B&C? Work under the NAICS directly aligns to these areas.	See Comment 2669.
5389	A.3.7.2 PAST PERFORMANCE VOLUME (a), Page 105. This sections states that "offerors identified as HUBZone, SDVOSB, EDWOSB, 8a in Category B and C shall provide past performance references showcasing relevant work in at least two (2) content representative areas for content to be rated relevant (pertinent)." However, WOSB is not included in list of socio-economic small business categories to which this applies. This is inconsistent with other solicitation sections. Please clarify whether the statement related to showcasing relevant work in at least two (2) content areas also applies to WOSBs.	See Comment 1697.
5390	A.1.35 AbilityOne SUBCONTRACTING, Page 63. Does the AbilityOne subcontracting requirement apply only to other than small business contractors who are awarded a SEWP contract under the applicable NAICS codes?	See Comment 2322.
5391	A.3.7.1 OFFER VOLUME, Page 98.This section states that the Offeror must provide a subcontracting plan and AbilityOne Commitment Letter, if applicable, in the Offer Volume. Please confirm whether this requirement applies only to Offerors who are other that small businesses.	See Comment 2322.
5396	Exhibit 2: When one box is selected in the "Description of the Contract," Prime Contractor row, all three boxes automatically get checked. There are several other instances of this duplication error in Exhibit 2. Please resolve all instances of this error and make the updated form available as soon as possible.	The Solicitation has been updated in an Amendment prior to Amendment 7.
5397	A.3.7.1 OFFER VOLUME, Page 103.The scope of services defined in the solicitation for Category B and Category C do not specifically align with the scope of UNSPSC code 43000000 Information Technology Broadcasting and Telecommunications and its various subcategories. For Offerors proposing labor services only for Category B and Category C, please provide additional guidance regarding CLIN and UNSPSC code(s) to use in completing Exhibit 3b – Category B Solutions and Exhibit 3b – Category C Solutions spreadsheets. Also, please provide guidance regarding CLIN bundling for labor services.	See Comment 2118.
5401	A.3.7.2Page 103, 109, 115. Category B and Category C cites "HUBZone, VOSB, SDVOSB, WOSB, EDWOSB, 8a offerors" as qualifying socioeconomic categories. However, Page 109 and page 115 only references the HUBZone, SDVOSB, EDWOSB, and 8a qualifying socioeconomic categories. Please update.	See Comment 1697.

sewp6_rfp_all_comments

5403	A.3.7.2, Page 103. The RFP States that "Offerors shall furnish relevant experience projects that are completed or ongoing within three (3) years of the solicitation release date to be considered recent and be from a different requirement." Will the Government please update this requirement to align to the Government/Industry standard of furnishing "relevant experience projects that are completed or ongoing within five (5) years of the solicitation release date?"	The Solicitation will remain as stated.
5405	If a contractor completes Exhibit 4 and is a LB for some of the NAICS in the exhibit and a WOSB in other areas of the exhibit, will the contractor be considered a LB or a WOSB? Will the contractor be able to compete for delivery orders as a WOSB in delivery orders with the NAICS where they qualify as a WOSB?	See Comment 1881.
5406	In Category A, if a contractor is a small business in some Technical Areas based on the primary NAICS and a LB based on the primary NAICS in some Technical Areas, will the contractor qualify for Group A2? Will the contractor qualify as a small business in the Technical Areas where they qualify based on those NAICS and a large business in the Technical Areas where they qualify based on those NAICS?	See Comment 1881.
5407	In Category A, Exhibit 4, if a contractor is a small business for some of the NAICS and a large business for some of the NAICS, will the contractor be able to compete for small business set aside Delivery Orders based on the NAICS where they qualify as a SB?	See Comment 1881.
5412	Please consider increasing the 3 pages limitation for the Mandatory Experience Letter of Authorization (LOAs) considering that (per RFP Section A.3.7.1(b) Mandatory Experience/ Offerings Category A- Letter of Authorization) Offerors are required to provide a LOA from a designated provider (OEM) for each of it's four (4) Technical Areas proposed under Category A Mandatory Experience/ Offerings.	See Comment 1957.
5422	Exhb 2 PPQ SEWP VI.pdf Instructions The sentence "Sections 5 and 6 are completed by the" is incomplete. Will the Government complete the sentence to indicate what entity should complete sections 5 and 6?	The Solicitation has been updated in an Amendment prior to Amendment 7.
5425	Exhb 2 PPQ SEWP VI.pdf Section 4 Would it be permissible for offerors who are bidding for Category B to remove the Section 4 tables for Categories A and C prior to sending the Questionnaire to the evaluator?	The Solicitation has been updated in an Amendment prior to Amendment 7.
5436	We are requesting to add Google to Enclosure 1 Sewp VI provider document. Thank you.	See Comment 5655.

5438	<p>The OEMs listed in Enclosure 1 seem arbitrary and exclude almost all of the OEMs/Distributors who are currently authorized to sell on the SEWP V contract. Limiting the minimum requirements in Exhibit 3a to the OEMs listed in Enclosure 1 artificially limits competition and places those OEMs at an advantage over all of the other OEMs who will be authorized to sell on SEWP VI through the technology refresh process. The OEMs listed in Enclosure 1 can now select the winners of the SEWP VI Category A by denying LOAs to offerors they do not deem as favorable. The offerors who have preexisting relationships with this limited number of OEMs will favor the OEMs listed in Enclosure 1 on SEWP VI, which will limit options for SEWP VI customers. Our organization has already reached out to and been denied by F5, who told us that they will not authorize or onboard new partners for the purpose of bidding on SEWP VI because they already have plenty of SEWP V partners. Our calls and emails to other OEMs listed in Enclosure 1 have been unanswered. Even though we have excellent relationships and have won competitive small business set aside contracts on SEWP V with our current OEMs, we are not able to bid on a SEWP VI contract because we have not developed relationships with the OEMs listed in Enclosure 1. This requirement will significantly impact competitiveness for SEWP VI customers. The Government could change the requirement to be LOAs only from OEMs who have provided hardware/software solutions on SEWP V as a way to ensure compliance with SEWP requirements. This approach would ensure fair competition across the current OEM supply chain and ensure SEWP VI customers have the variety of providers they have come to expect from the SEWP contract. Will the Government remove the LOA requirement to come from only OEMs in Enclosure 1?</p>	See Comment 5655.
5451	<p>Could Government remove the US Citizen requirement for the OEM POC? Given that these POCs are employees of other companies, offerors would not have the requisite access to verify citizenship status.</p>	The Solicitation will remain as stated.
5452	<p>Do we need to provide LOAs from OEMs whose products are proposed in the 4 selected technical areas. Further, is there any need to provide LOAs for secondary OEMs?</p>	See Comment 1874.
5459	<p>I was looking at the Allowed OEM's and for the category "IT Power and Cabling Equipment" they only have 1 Power company "Schneider" and no Cabling Company. How can we have 2 OEM's fulfilling that category? Or would the government prefer us to add another company to the SEWP VI Provider list?</p>	See Comment 5655.
5461	<p>Exhibit 2 - Page 2 - Reference "Prime Contractor/Significant Contractor/ Team Member"; The boxes for these options all populate if any are checked. Would the government provide a corrected document?</p>	See Comment 1804.
5463	<p>Section A.2.1; page 88; The government lists attachments to be part of the contract. Within the Date column, some documents have an asterisk next to TBS ("*TBS"). What does the asterisk indicate?</p>	See Comment 1869.
5468	<p>Exhibit 2 - Page 3 - Reference "Evaluator Information"; Information put into any field duplicates itself across all Evaluator fields. Would the government provide a corrected document?</p>	See Comment 1804.

sewp6_rfp_all_comments

5472	Exhibit 2 - Section 4; Category A - Reference "Performed/Did Not perform boxes"; Completing either field will automatically duplicate itself across the other field. Would the government provide a corrected document?	See Comment 1804.
5473	Page 103 of the solicitation states " Offerors proposing to category B and/ or C shall complete Exhibit 3b- Category B Solutions Spreadsheet and Exhibit 3c- Category C Solutions Spreadsheet. The UNSPSC codes must accurately match the proposed services/technology in each row and must be the full 8-digit UNSPSC code. If the CLIN is for an hourly labor rate, then the associated labor category shall be provided in Column G (Labor Category if Hourly Rate)." Will the government provide clarification on how offerors should provide labor categories and hourly rates to UNSPSC codes? To which level are offerors to proposed services to (Segment, Family, Class, Commodity)?	See Comment 2118.
5479	Exhibit 2 - Section 4; Category B - Reference "Performed/Did Not perform boxes"; Completing either field will automatically duplicate itself across the other field. Would the government provide a corrected document?	See Comment 1804.
5481	Exhibit 2 - Section 4; Category C - Reference "Performed/Did Not perform boxes"; Completing either field will automatically duplicate itself across the other field. Would the government provide a corrected document?	See Comment 1804.
5482	Can the government please confirm if an offeror submits for SDVOSB that they will be able to compete on Task Orders designated as Small Business with no socioeconomic category attached?	See Comment 1881.
5485	Exhibit 2 - Section 6 - Reference "Contract Value / Fee / Total Value"; Entering data into any of these fields auto populates the other fields. Would the government provide a corrected document?	See Comment 1804.
5487	For emerging large businesses, the \$30M threshold is very high especially when restricted to the SEWP NAICS. And, many larger contracts have a broad scope that may include SEWP-relevant tasks even if the contract NAICS reflects a different one. Suggest allowing REPs from other NAICS codes provided the Offeror can provide justification of relevance to SEWP VI.	The Solicitation will remain as stated.
5490	Can you please explain the use of * in the Date column of this table?	The Solicitation has been updated in an Amendment prior to Amendment 7.
5491	Exhibit 2 - Section 6 - Reference "Was there a cost overrun?"; The free text field auto populated other fields. Would the government provide a corrected document?	See Comment 1804.
5496	In Exhibit 2, would Government consider moving "Basis of Award" to the Section completed by the Evaluator, as they are better equipped to provide the answer? The contractor may not know the specific reason that they were awarded as compared to another specific company.	See Comment 1804.
5499	Exhibit 2 - Section 6 - Reference "If less than Very High Performance Rating, please explain."; The free text field auto populated other fields. Would the government provide a corrected document?	See Comment 1804.

5500	Re: Attachment G, is a DEIA Plan required for submission with the proposal?	See Comment 1675.
5502	Could the Government please correct the incomplete sentence, "Sections 5 and 6 are completed by the" in Exhibit 2?	See Comment 1804.
5504	Per the RFP, "The Ordering CO has the responsibility to determine which predominant NAICS code applies to a task order solicitation, whether the task order is unrestricted or set-aside, including the type of socio-economic set-aside (e.g., Women-Owned, HUBZone, 8(a) if applicable, and whether the solicitation is sole-source or competitive. Small businesses are expected to comply with 52.219-14 Limitations on Subcontracting for set-aside contracts and orders expected to exceed the simplified acquisition threshold." If an Offeror receives and award in the HUBZone category, will they be permitted to bid on SB task orders?	See Comment 1881.
5507	Mandatory Experience Letters of Authorization (LOA); The RFP states the Page Limitation for these letters is 3 pages. However, the RFP requires 4 LOAs to be provided. Would the government change the Page Limitation for this requirement to 4 pages?	See Comment 1957.
5508	Under A.1.2 GSFC 52.211-91 SCOPE OF WORK (FEB 2016), page 36, the descriptions of the services for Category are listed in a different order than for the services listed under Category C on page 104. Can the Government please confirm the correct order of the services and if 11c is to be included as a service? Technical Area 11c - PROGRAM MANAGEMENT/ANCILLARY SERVICES, is not in the Category C list on page 104.	The Solicitation has been updated in an Amendment prior to Amendment 7. Technical Area 11c and 11b are excluded from the available Past Performance content areas.
5513	Mandatory Experience Letters of Authorization (LOA); Would the government confirm that the Mandatory Experience Letters of Authorization (LOA) are not required to be provided for a Category C submission?	See Comment 1782.
5515	<p>Could you please provide further clarification on the ISO 9001:2015 certification requirement as outlined in the Final RFP? We noticed a change from the Draft RFP regarding the addition of a certificate of conformity/conformance.</p> <p>Does the requirement for third-party compliance verification with the ISO 9001 standard now include a current 9001:2015 Certification, as stated in the Final RFP?</p> <p>If an offeror is a small business not yet certified to the standard at the time of proposal submission, is proof that certification approval is in process still acceptable, as indicated in the Draft RFP?</p> <p>Regarding the verification requirements, is a copy of the Offeror's official ISO 9001:2015 Certification of Conformity/Conformance now mandatory for proposal submission?</p>	See Comment 2646.

sewp6_rfp_all_comments

5516	<p>"Requesting clarification on the following instructions: ""The Contractor shall provide the following information for any IT system, or component thereof, or covered telecommunications equipment or services to be provided in performance of the contract</p> <p>(1) A brief description of the item(s).</p> <p>(2) The vendor/manufacturer's company name and address.</p> <p>(3) If known, the vendor/manufacturer's web site, and the Commercial and Government Entity (CAGE) code."" Can the Government confirm if the contractor needs to provide 1) A brief description of the item(s), (2) The vendor/manufacturer's company name and address, and (3) If known, the vendor/manufacturer's web site, and the Commercial and Government Entity (CAGE) code for ALL proposed IT systems, or just if the contractor is providing covered telecommunications equipment or services?"</p>	The Solicitation has been updated in an Amendment prior to Amendment 7.
5523	Given the fact that most product bids with ancillary services are of smaller dollar values, would the Government consider lowering the \$2.5 million/150,000/500,000 annual spend threshold or clarifying whether it is cumulative across all references?	The Solicitation will remain as stated.
5527	Small Businesses - In Category A and C, shall furnish the past performance for similar scope efforts with an average annual cost/fee incurred of \$500,000.; The instructions in section A.3.7.2(a) on page 106 state the Category A past performance references require a minimum average annual cost incurred of \$150,000. This directly conflicts with evaluation requirements in Section A.4.3. Would the government change Section A.4.3 to reflect past performance minimum limits to \$150,000?	See Comment 1709.
5528	In the Proposal Submission Table, please clarify that the Mandatory Experience Letter of Authorization (LOAs) are only required for Category A.	See Comment 1782.
5529	Given the fact that most product bids with ancillary services are of smaller dollar values, would the Government consider lowering the \$2.5 million/150,000/500,000 annual spend threshold or clarifying whether it is cumulative across all references?	The Solicitation will remain as stated.
5531	Section A.1.32 of the RFP states that other than small business will be required to submit commercial subcontracting plans at the summary level. Will the government please allow offerors the option to submit an individual subcontracting plan rather than a commercial plan?	See comment 1978.
5534	Throughout this RFP, it is clear that Government is looking for vendors with exceptional GWAC program management skills. As such, would Government consider allowing Offerors to use GWACS as past performance?	The Solicitation will remain as stated.
5535	Would the government please consider increasing the page limitation for the Technical Approach Volume (III-A) for each Category and the Management Approach Volume (III-B) from 15 pages to 30 pages each?	The Solicitation will remain as stated.
5538	Section A.3.6 (B). Page 96 – Proposal Content and Page Limitations – the table lists Mandatory Experience Letter of Authorization (LOA) as a proposal component. Can the government please confirm that this requirement is applicable to those offerors proposing under Category A and is not required for Categories B or C?	See Comment 1782.

sewp6_rfp_all_comments

5539	Will the Government consider expanding the Designed Providers list? For example, Intel is listed, but AMD is not. Seagate Technology is listed, but Western Digital / HGST is not.	See Comment 5655.
5542	RFP Section A.1.32 currently requires all OTSB offerors to submit a Commercial subcontracting plan. This is problematic for two reasons: first, (1) commercial subcontracting plans are geared towards purchases of commercial products (and offerors on SEWP IV are not required to propose on any of the product Categories, so a commercial plan would not be appropriate for an offeror proposing only on category B), and (2) commercial subcontracting plans apply to all of the offeror/contractor's Government contracts during the fiscal year – even those with already-existing Individual subcontracting plans (which may have significantly different goal requirements specifically tailored by that Government agency/customer for that particular contract). FAR 52.219-9 gives offerors the choice to implement whichever type of plan (Individual, Master, or Commercial) is most appropriate for their business for a reason – to protect the contractor's ability to meet the goal requirements of individual Government contracts/customers in the most appropriate manner. If an offeror is only submitting a proposal for Category B, will the Government allow the offeror to submit an Individual subcontracting plan instead of a Commercial plan since the Individual Plan will still provide the Government with the same summary level SSR data that the RFP currently wants to see from a Commercial plan?	See comment 1978.
5557	Exhibit 2 PPQ on Page 1; Instructions are cut off at the top of the page. Please provide the remaining text for the instructions.	See Comment 1804.
5559	A.3.7.1(a), A.3.7.2(a), and A.4.3 on page 104, 109, 116; WOSB is listed as one of the small business designations on page 104 but not referenced on pages 109 or 116. Please confirm WOSB is included in the list of applicable small business designations.	See Comment 1697.
5561	For Small Businesses proposing in Categories A, if awarded, will they be able to participate in full and open competition? If small businesses proposing in Categories A only qualify for small business opportunities, can they submit past performance meeting the other than small threshold so that they can also participate in full and open?	See Comment 1881.
5572	AbilityOne SubK Requirements - Mandating contractual requirements for subcontracting to large non-profit entities impacts the ability of small businesses to competitively bid on smaller orders thru SEWP. Is the AbilityOne subcontracting requirement only for large businesses or does it apply to Category C small businesses under NAICS 541512?	See Comment 2322.
5574	RFQ Page 101: Category A- Letter of Authorization Offerors shall provide a Letter of Authorization (LOA) from a designated provider (OEM) for each of the four (4) Technical Areas RFQ Page 95: Mandatory Experience LOAs Page Limitations: 3 Pages How can four LOAs fit in 3 pages? Or is the 3 page limit for each LOA?	See Comment 1957.

sewp6_rfp_all_comments

5575	Could you clarify if we need the same designated provider for all four technical areas, or is it only required for the primary technical area with 1000 CLINs? (page 101)	The Solicitation has been updated in an Amendment prior to Amendment 7.
5579	Can you confirm whether the minimum amount for Past Performance (PP) is \$150K as stated on page 106, or \$500K as stated on page 116?	The Solicitation has been updated in an Amendment prior to Amendment 7.
5584	Please confirm that CLINs are the Technical Areas (B) and Sub-areas (C) on page 104?	See Comment 2214.
5586	Per A.3.7.1(a) - Is a Small Business required to show any in process documentation for the CMMI requirement or is that only applicable to ISO 9001?	See Comment 2690.
5588	Exhibit 2: Page 1, Instructions, is missing words in the last sentence. Please advise.	See Comment 1804.
5589	Since Phase I is pass/fail, our understanding is that there is no benefit to the offeror to exceed the minimum number of required mandatory technical areas in REPs. Is that correct?	See Comment 2845.
5594	Do we need to fill out Attachment J if we have Exhibit 5? Can we provide an ISO document or relevant narrative in place of the Attestation Form? (page 57)	See Comment 3479.
5599	What should the 3 pages for Mandatory Experience include? If four LOAs are required, how do we submit these while adhering to the 3-page requirement? (pages 96 & 101)	See Comment 1957.
5607	Regarding Exhibits 3b and 3c, the RFP states in Section A.4.1. "The Source Evaluation Board will conduct evaluations in accordance with FAR 15.304 (c)(1)(ii)(A), and not evaluate price." Would the government remove requirement for Exhibits 3b and 3c at the time of submission and clarify that this is a post award process that will have more detailed instructions.	See Comment 1804
5608	Regarding NAICS codes, 519190 does not show up in SAM. Should we make a note in the response that we intend to add this code, but cannot?	See Comment 1777.
5616	Where do the labor categories for Category C come from? (page 103)	See Comment 2285.
5619	Exhibit 2 has a number of errors in response fields such as duplicating text. Will the Government please correct all errors and redistribute Exhibit 2 as soon as possible to avoid undue burden to customer references completing the Past Performance Questionnaire by the proposal due date? In light of Independence Day, office closures, and customer points of contact potentially on vacation for the holiday, we want to respectfully give ample time to our customer references on this requirement.	The Comment is out of date.

sewp6_rfp_all_comments

5622	WOSB is listed as one of the small business designations on page 104 but not referenced on pages 109 or 116. Please confirm WOSB is included in the list of applicable small business designations.	See Comment 1697.
5625	Does TBS mean to be submitted as part of the original proposal or to follow afterwards?	The Solicitation has been updated in an Amendment prior to Amendment 7.
5628	RFP Page 102, multiple locations, Page 102, 103, A.1.22 UNSPSC and Exhibit+3b+Category+B+Solutions_Spreadsheet and Exhibit+3c_Category+C+Solutions+Spreadsheet – Can the Government provide the UNSPSC for what offerors can/must use?	See Comment 2949.
5629	Request the Government extend the due date of the proposal. Per the Draft RFP, the Government stated 60 days per Page 13 of DRFP, FAR 52.212-4.	The Comment is out of date.
5633	For the CLIN column of Exhibit 3b and 3c, what is the source of CLIN numbers for labor?	See Comment 2214.
5635	RFP , A.1.35 AbilityOne SUBCONTRACTING – Is an AbilityOne commitment letter required for Small Business proposal submissions?	See Comment 2322.
5639	Is a Letter of Authorization required for a non-designated Provider?	See Comment 1874.
5648	For the UNSPSC Code for Exhibit 3b or 3c, please confirm how we use this for labor services that are not Labor Hour or T&M?	See Comment 2118.
5649	Will HUBZone awardees that also qualify as other socio-economic set-asides be allowed to bid on orders other than the designation of their contract?	See Comment 1881.
5652	For the SEWP Catalog Price for Exhibit 3b or 3c, is this this labor hour rate ceiling that can be further discounted when bidding a TO?	See Comment 2562.
5655	Pure Storage is one of the largest storage OEM vendors in the market. Can the government add them to the Enclosure 1 list?	The Solicitation only requires the 4 designated providers be from the list in Enclosure 1. Other providers may be proposed at the time of proposal or post-award. The solicitation will be updated to revise and significantly increase the list of providers.

sewp6_rfp_all_comments

5661	UNSPSC code Exhibit 3c - Can the Government provide directions for filling out this Exhibit? The crosswalk is unclear between services and technology.	See Comment 2118.
5662	Do all REPs need to be projects with the same NAICS code?	See Comment 1886.
5664	Given that A.1.7 reference multiple authorized contract types including "any hybrid" should the offeror offer in Exhibits 3b and 3c multiple offering types including for example bundled Fixed Unit Price or other priced offerings, e.g. one Month Medium Sprint Team?	The Offeror can add CLINs to cover multiple contract types.
5665	Exhibit 3c - When using an hourly Rate should the offer use its GSA schedule for the LCATS?	See Comment 2285.
5691	Do offerers need to complete ATTACHMENT J (C-SCRM) and submit it with the proposal? Or just 60 days before award?	See Comment 1675.
5697	Exhibit 3b and 3c - Would the Government please provide detailed instructions for each column of Exhibit 3 for both Categories B and C?	See Comment 2214.
5704	We've seen a few comments calling out only a single instance, this is to help consolidate all duplicate sub-areas - although several of these instances make sense. The following Sub-areas are found in multiple Technical Areas: Anti-fatigue mats (1a and 4a) Bags and cases for ITC/AV products (1a and 4a) ITC/AV Shipping Products and Supplies (1a and 4a) Media storage technology (1a and 2a) Optical storage technology (1a and 2a) Storage management systems / file servers (1a and 2a) Storage virtualization system (1a and 2a) X ray baggage inspection system (3a and 7a)	See Comment 4028.
5717	We want to inform you of an issue that has been raised by several of our partners. Specifically, Enclosure 1 of the SEWP VI RFP identifies HPI Federal LLC as a "provider." As you know, the SEWP contract has historically identified HPI Federal LLC and HP, Inc. as "provider aliases." However, in order to eliminate any potential future confusion, we wanted to make NASA aware that all corresponding LOA's will be provided by HP Inc., not HPI Federal LLC.	See Comment 2305.
5718	On Exhibit 2, PPQ Form: The "Prime Contractor", "Significant Subcontractor", "Team Member" blocks all get "checked" when you select any one of them. Will this get corrected and will we be given additional time to submit these for customer evaluation?	See Comment 1804.

sewp6_rfp_all_comments

5722	Will the contract structure of SEWP VI enable government buyers to compete socio-economic set-aside competitions (for example WOSB or SDVOSB) for individual orders under the Small Business contracts for Category B and Category C?	See Comment 1881.
5732	Industry Day Update, June 4, 2024. When does the Government anticipate releasing the update to the Past Performance evaluation guidelines?	The Comment is out of date.
5737	Exhibit 3b and 3c. These two Exhibits appear to be basically duplicates of Exhibit 3a all having a product orientation to them. We provide customized IT services that are tailored and bid based on a Level of Effort assessments corresponding to a government provided a PWS or SOW. This is true whether it is FFP or T&M or other contract type. Sometimes we are asked to expose the underlying labor used; other times we are not. Based on this, we do not understand how to fill in Exhibit 3b and 3c. Column A (CLIN), Column B (Provider), Column C (Part Number), and Column F (SEWP Catalog Price) seem to infer only "productized" services. This is not our understanding of the intent of Category B & C (since these types of services were already allowed in Category A). How are we to fill this out? We would recommend that the government either remove pricing all together for Category B & C or request the offeror provide a minimum number of Labor Categories and associated onsite labor ceiling rates for those corresponding categories similar to how other large IT service-based IDIQs do it.	See Comment 2214.
5740	Regarding Exhibit 3b and 3c, available UNSPSC codes seem to apply to Products which is applicable to Category A, while Category B and C are service based. For Categories B and C, please confirm that the Contractor responds with N/A in the applicable UNSPSC codes column.	See Comment 2118.
5741	Can the Government provide detailed instructions for how proposers on Category B and Category C are expected to fill in Exhibit 3b and 3c?	See Comment 2214.
5743	Can the Government provide an updated Exhibit 1 - Relevant Experience Project, Exhibit 2 - Past Performance Questionnaire, and Exhibit 5 - C-SCRM Attestation Form? The current versions have duplicating fields, check fields that move, and text boxes that do not expand to include required content. If possible, can Word versions of these forms be provided?	The Solicitation has been updated in an Amendment prior to Amendment 7.
5745	In reference to Section A.3.7.1(b), page 103, for Categories B and C, the RFP states that, "Offerors proposing to category B and/ or C shall complete Exhibit 3b- Category B Solutions Spreadsheet and Exhibit 3c- Category C Solutions Spreadsheet. The UNSPSC codes must accurately match the proposed services/technology in each row and must be the full 8-digit UNSPSC code. " For uniformity in the selection of the category to be competed for, can the Government provide Offerors with additional instructions, guidance and a list of standard 8 digit UNSPSC codes to utilize in Exhibit 3b/Exhibit 3c?	See Comment 2395.

sewp6_rfp_all_comments

5749	<p>Section A.3.7.3 MISSION SUITABILITY VOLUME (A) Technical Approach (SUBFACTOR A) states that Offerors "shall provide detail as to how the offeror will support the four Acquisition Objectives." Acquisition objective two (2) states that, "The offeror shall describe their ITC/AV-based solutions and/or services and how the proposed features provide technological leadership in allowing for the next generation of technology in terms of both solutions and services." Acquisition objective three (3) states that, " The offeror shall describe their ITC/AV-based solutions and services and how the proposed architectural features provide technological leadership in allowing for the next generation of technology." The "architectural features" described in objective three are MOST relevant to Offerors submitting proposals in Category A - and can only be described for a small sample of the thousands of CLINs that Offerors are expected to propose. Will the government remove acquisition objective three from Categories B and C and provide further clarification as to what is required in response to acquisition objectives two and three?</p>	See Comment 1808.
5753	<p>Due to the number of questions that have been submitted, in addition to the uncertainty of how to respond to the Technical Approach in Volume III - will the Govt. extend the proposal due date 5 weeks to August 15, 2024?</p>	The Comment is out of date.
5756	<p>During the industry day in October 2023 and in the Draft RFP, the Government relaxed the requirement for small businesses to have either an ISO 9001:2015 or CMMI 2 certification at time of submission to proving proof that the certification process has started and then receiving the appropriate certification within 1 year of award, which is a welcome change and is increasing the number of qualified small businesses on SEWP VI. The requirement says, ": It is acceptable to provide proof that the certification approval is in process..." Providing proof that the certification approval is in process is different than proving that the certification process has started. Will the Government confirm that this requirement is met when a small business provides proof that they have engaged an organization to start the process of becoming ISO 9001:2015 or CMMI 2 certified with an entity that helps organizations prepare to pass the certification?</p>	See Comment 2646.
5759	<p>Section A.1.8 states, "Supplies or services to be furnished under this contract shall be specified by the issuance of delivery orders from any Government agency priced in accordance with the Discounts for Technology Equipment." If an Offeror wins an award under Category A Small Business, will the offeror see and be able to bid on OTSB task orders?"</p>	See Comment 1881.
5762	<p>A.3.7.1(c) NAICS Code Crosswalk. Cat B a C - Will a SB Primer be limited to only bidding on SEWP VI task orders in the NAICS codes in which they are Small?</p>	See Comment 1881.

5769	<p>"For Other than Small Businesses: A total of four (4) different REPs from different mandatory experience technical areas shall be submitted. Each Project must have had a minimum of \$30M in total value size of a single order or contract and must be described using the Exhibit 1 REP template."</p> <p>Requiring a Prime OTB to cite 4 single order REPs, each with a minimum total value of \$30M (\$120M total requirement), seems limiting to competition. Considering the limited number of Enterprise contracts that align to the Category A, B, and C NAICS mapping, will the Government please consider reducing the total individual value for acceptable REPs to \$10M (\$40M total requirement) to improve competition among OTBs?</p>	The Solicitation will remain as stated.
5772	<p>We understand the Mission Suitability Volume, specifically the Management Approach (Subfactor B), encompasses the request of many different Plans, Policies, and Approaches. We typically see these requirements, such as Sustainability Management, Program Management, Product/Services Policies, etc. written as standalone documents with separate page count limitations. It is strongly recommended that the Government please consider revising the Mission Suitability Volume, Management Approach (Subfactor B) page count to be 25 pages total. We feel that by granting Offerors the additional page count, it will allow the Government to receive and evaluate more complete and inclusive management plans that truly showcase what the Government is seeking.</p>	The Solicitation will remain as stated.
5790	<p>A.3.7.3 MISSION SUITABILITY VOLUME instructions state that "The Mission Suitability Proposal must specifically state for which group the offeror is proposing." Section A.3.6 (B) indicates that Volume III-A and Volume III-B are to be submitted separately with separate cover pages. Please confirm where this statement should be included within the Mission Suitability Proposal to meet this requirement.</p>	See Comment 1706.
5793	<p>A.3.7.1(b): For Categories B and C, what "services" or "solutions" are to be included in the Exhibit 3, Category Solutions Spreadsheet? Do "solutions" equate to product, services, or services bundled with product? What UNSPSC codes should we use for services? If we are listing services with LCATs, should we provide every LCAT we support or only those related to the PWS Technical Areas? What hourly labor rates do we use, ceiling? Labor rates typically take into consideration location (CONUS, OCONUS, and low or high Locality Pay rates), security clearance requirements, etc. Clarification is requested.</p>	See Comment 2285.
5794	<p>"The RFP states: ""The Offeror shall also provide an ...AbilityOne Commitment Letter, if applicable....""</p> <p>To which type of Offeror and/or SEWP VI Category is this proposal requirement applicable?"</p>	See Comment 2322.
5796	<p>Are small businesses exempt from the AbilityOne requirement due to their disadvantaged status and exemption from small business subcontracting goals?</p>	See Comment 2322.

sewp6_rfp_all_comments

5800	Will the government consider changing the NAICS Code for Technical Area 8: Software and Cloud Technology from NAICS 513210 to 541519 Foot Note 18. The majority of the software OEM's (Providers) are Channel Centric and sell most of their products to the Government through Value-Added Resellers, which have the 541519 Footnote 18 NAICS Code. Since over 80% of software sales under SEWP V were small business set-aside under 514519, changing to 513210 with a small business threshold of \$47M will result in a significant reduction in "Small Business" sales.	See Comment 2009.
5806	"The RFP states: ""Sections 5 and 6 are completed by the"" but the sentence appears to be cut off. What is the remainder of this instruction?"	See Comment 1804.
5807	Page 98 of the RFP indicates instructions pertaining to the Offer Volume. This is the second bullet in the list of Offer Volume requirements, "The offeror must provide relevant experience as it relates to the NAICS code being used for competition." Will the Government please clarify what specific information is needed by this statement?	See Comment 2092.
5809	Will the Government please elaborate on the specific requirements needed for the Subcontracting plan?	See Comment 2207.
5812	On the NAICS crosswalk, 519190 no longer exists. Will the Government provide an updated spreadsheet, or should offerors mark this NAICS Code as "not applicable"?	See Comment 1777.
5815	"For HUBZone, VOSB, SDVOSB, WOSB, EDWOSB, 8a, offerors (inclusive of first- tier subcontractors, if applicable): A total of 2 different REPs from different mandatory experience technical areas shall be submitted." Are we allowed to submit more than 2 different REPs?	See Comment 2845.
5825	Section # A.3.7.1 (b) Pge # 101 Que: Are there specific format guidelines or required verbiage that we need to follow for the Letter of Authorization?	See Comment 1799.
5827	Within the Mission Suitability Volume Section (a) Technical Approach (Subfactor A), can the Government please explain the difference between Questions 2 and 3? Is the duplicative question a typograph? If the question is intended to address a distinct requirement, what differentiates "features" from "architectural features"?	See Comment 1808.
5828	Could Government provide the list of "currently in-scope UNSPSC Codes"? The RFP section A.1.22 on page 50 states that "full list of all currently identified in-scope UNSPSC codes for in-scope offerings is found in Attachment C, SEWP Contract Holder User Manual"; however, Attachment C does not appear to contain this list.	See Comment 2395.

5831	Will the Government please allow Category A – Letter of Authorizations to be excluded from the page count within Volume I? The current RFP instruction is very confusing and the math of each letter would make an Offeror non-compliant because the RFP states that a maximum of four LOAs is required, but if each LOA is one-page, this section would be 4-pages, which according to the Proposal Submission Table, would be non-compliant since its limited to 3-pages. To eliminate confusion, we believe it would be best to remove the page restriction entirely.	See comment 1957.
5845	A.3.7.3 (a) Technical Approach (Subfactor A) Numbered Paragraphs (2) and (3) (Pg 111) - Items 2. and 3. beneath A.3.7.3 (a) are nearly identical. Both require the offeror to describe how their proposed features provide technological leadership in allowing for the next generation of technology in terms of solutions and services. Is it the Government's intent for offerors to address Non-Architectural Features Providing Technological Leadership in item 2. and architectural Features Providing Technological Leadership in item 3?	See Comment 1808.
5854	The 2nd bullet of Volume I instructions states, "The offeror must provide relevant experience as it relates to the NAICS code being used for competition." These instructions are clear for Categories B and C, but unclear for Category A. Will the Government please clarify how Category A Offerors shall interpret Exhibit 1 for purposes of demonstrating relevant experience?	See Comment 2092.
5858	Section # Section A.3.7.2 (a) Pge # 106 Que: Section III Instructions to offerors mentions the dollar value for past performances for category A to a minimum average annual cost of \$150,000 while in Section IV it still shows the dollar value for category A to a minimum average annual cost of \$500,000. Please clarify the ambiguity.	See Comment 1709.
5862	Can Government confirm that Offerors can self-certify as O-TTPS compliant?	See Comment 2469.
5866	RFP A.3.7.1 Page 103 - The RFP states, "For Category B & C - Only projects (REPs) with NAICS codes listed as in scope for SEWP VI are to be submitted." Can the government please clarify the process by which commercial projects will be verified to ensure compliance with the NAICS code requirement?	The Solicitation has been updated to remove this reference.
5871	On the Category B and Category C Solution Spreadsheets, if Offerors are only providing hourly labor rates, can product-specific columns such as "Part Number" or "UNSPSC code" be left blank as not applicable?	See Comment 2214.
5873	In Section A.2.1 GSFC. The RFP provides a list of attachments to include Attachments A through L. However, the sam.gov posting only includes Attachments A, B, C, D and J. Can the Government confirm that the additional Attachments referenced will be provided to Offerors on the solicitation posting?	See Comment 4603.
5875	Currently, the RFP requires 12-point font in headers and footers. Since header/footer content is not evaluated, will the Government please amend the instructions to allow a reduced 10-point font in headers/footers?	See Comment 1962.
5878	Does an award for a HUBZone or 8(a) proposal automatically grant access to all small business task orders, not just those designated for the offeror's specific category?	See Comment 1881.

5881	Reference Section A.3.7.2 pg 108 – Past Performance Category A Content Representative Areas. Technical Area 9a (Product-Based Services) is not indicated as a valid technical area to provide Past Performance history. As described in section A.1.2 on page 32 “Technical Area 9a: Product Based Services,” these services are an integral part of delivering and supporting the technology needs of the Government, and can be procured as a standalone service. Can you please include Technical Area 9a as a content representative area for Past Performance?	See Comment 4778.
5884	Reference Section A.4.3 Page 116 “Small Businesses – In Category A and C, shall furnish past performance for similar scope efforts with an average annual cost/fee incurred of \$500,000.” This conflicts with Section A.3.7.2 page 106 “For Small Businesses proposing in Categories A – the past performance provided shall be for similar scope efforts with a minimum average annual cost incurred of \$150,000.” Can you please indicate which minimum amount is correct?	See Comment 1709.
5887	Section # A.4.4 (b) (1) (v) Pge # 119 Que: The Government will evaluate whether the Offeror has a valid Exhibit 5: C-SCRM Attestation Form or valid active Open Trusted Technology Provider™ Standard (O-TTPS) Certification specified in Section A.3.7.3(b)(1)(v). A response of “no” to any disqualifying items in Exhibit 5 renders a proposal ineligible for award. Does this mean that the offeror needs to answer all the questions in Exhibit 5 affirmatively?	See Comment 3529.
5888	Reference Section A.3.6 (B) Proposal Content and Page Limitations. Mandatory Experience Letters of Authorizations (LOAs) page limit is indicated as 3 pages. Per section A.3.7.1 (b) on page 101 Category A – Letter of Authorization, “There shall be an LOA for each different designated provider for a maximum of four (4) LOAs.” Each LOA is one page, and there could be 4 different designated providers. Can you please increase the page limit to allow for 4 LOAs?	See comment 1957.
5889	Reference Section A.3.7.1 (b) on page 101 – Category A: All offerors shall complete Exhibit 3a – Category A Solutions Spreadsheet and propose technology solutions for any four (4) of the eight (8) Mandatory Technical Areas below and technical Area 9. Is responding to four (4) Mandatory Technical Areas the maximum allowed for an offeror? Or could an offeror propose technology solutions for all eight (8) Mandatory Technical Areas? If an offeror can propose technology solutions for all eight (8) Mandatory Technical Areas, can you please increase the LOA page limit to 8 to allow for 8 unique designated providers?	See comment 1957.
5890	If an Offeror submits a proposal under Category B as a small business and is awarded a contract, will the small business be able to bid on full and open/large business opportunities as well as small business set-aside?	See Comment 1881.
5891	Reference Section A.1.34 NAICS Codes within Scope pages 61-63 and Exhibit 4 NAICS Size Standard Crosswalk. The lists are not an exact match. For example, NAICS 333316 is listed in the RFP, but not the NAICS crosswalk. Can you please revise the crosswalk to match the RFP?	The Solicitation has been updated to match Section A.1.34 with Exhibit 4.
5893	Section # A.3.6 (B) Page # 96 Que: The proposal submission table specifies a 3-page limit for Letters of Authorization (LOAs). Is this limit per LOA or for all LOAs combined?	See comment 1957.

sewp6_rfp_all_comments

5899	Reference Section A.3.6 (B) Proposal Content and Page Limitations. Mandatory Experience Letters of Authorizations (LOAs) page limit is indicated as 3 pages. Per section A.3.7.1 (b) on page 101 Category A – Letter of Authorization, “There shall be an LOA for each different designated provider for a maximum of four (4) LOAs.” Are LOAs not required for any provider that is not specified as a “designated provider”?	See Comment 1874.
5904	Can the government please provide Attachments G, H, and I?	See Comment 4603.
5909	Can the government please provide Attachments K and L?	See Comment 4603.
5914	Can the government please provide instructions on how offerors are supposed to submit Attachment G, the DEIA plan?	See Comment 1675.
5915	Instructions on page 1. There is an incomplete sentence at the end of the paragraph. This leaves Offeror's and Responders to the PPQ request without instruction on how to properly complete the form. A revised form is needed.	See Comment 1804.
5917	Does an award based on HUBZone or 8(a) status automatically grant access to all small business task orders, beyond those specifically set aside for the offeror's designated category?	See Comment 1881.
5918	RFP A.3.7.3(b) for FOR CATEGORY B and C states: “The Offeror shall describe ancillary products required [italics added] for performance of specific tasks and corporate risks associated with SCRM (e.g., availability and security of corporate resources).” How is the Government’s example of SCRM availability and security of corporate resources a “product?” Can the Government give other examples of other “ancillary products required” that would apply to this section?	See Comment 6409.
5921	Can the government please clarify what the requirements are for the Small Business Subcontracting Plan (Attachment I)?	See Comment 2207.
5924	The second bullet in the instructions on page 98 of the RFP states that offerors “...must provide relevant experience as it relates to the NAICS code being used for competition.” Is the Government expecting offerors to provide this information as a separate response within Volume I? Is this bullet referring to the Mandatory Experience information offerors are providing in Volume I via the Mandatory Experience requirement?	See Comment 2092.
5925	PPQ form - Section 2. The check boxes to define the Offeror's role are not functioning properly. If you select the "Prime" checkbox, then all boxes are also checked. A revised form is necessary for Responders to a PPQ form cannot properly complete the firm.	See Comment 1804.
5926	Can the government please clarify the requirements for Climate Change Risk Management Plan (Attachment L)?	See Comment 1675.

sewp6_rfp_all_comments

5930	The RFP provides a list of attachments to include Attachments A through L. However, the sam.gov posting only includes Attachments A, B, C, D and J. Can the Government confirm that the additional Attachments referenced will be provided to Offerors on the solicitation posting?	See Comment 4603.
5935	Will the Government please clarify the requirements for UNSPSC codes? As a services provider, we have not been required to utilize these in the past.	See Comment 2118.
5941	On the Category B and Category C Solution Spreadsheets, if Offerors are only providing hourly labor rates, can product-specific columns such as "Part Number" or "UNSPSC code" be left blank as not applicable?	See Comment 2214.
5942	<p>FILE: 80TECH24R0001 SEWP VI Final RFP.pdf</p> <p>REFERENCE TEXT: "In accordance with DRD #5, within 12 months of Contract Award, the Contractor shall submit a Climate Change Risk Management Plan that identifies climate-related risks that could negatively impact performance of any resultant task order(s). The Climate Change Risk Management Plan will be attached to the contract as Attachment L."</p> <p style="text-align: center;">&</p> <p>FILE: 80TECH24R0001 SEWP VI Final RFP.pdf</p> <p>REFERENCE TEXT: General - Attachment L, Climate Change Risk Management Plan, *TBS (To be Submitted)</p> <p>QUESTION: RFP Section A.1.51 and Attachment D, DRD#5, both state that the Climate Change Risk Management Plan is to be initially submitted within twelve (12) months of contract award while RFP Section A.2.1 states that the Climate Change Risk Management Plan is TBS/To be Submitted (with the proposal). Please confirm that the reference to "*TBS" is intended to be "TBP" as the Climate Change Risk Management Plan is TBP/To be Proposed post-award, specifically within twelve (12) months of contract award.</p>	The Solicitation has been updated in an Amendment prior to Amendment 7.
5947	Enclosure 1-SEWP VI Providers is limited. Kindly please consider expanding the Providers list on Enclosure 1 that can be used for LOA's. We have significant experience with Hexagon AB / Leica. They were mentioned on the draft and are not included now. They are an extremely large company with significant offerings on several Technical areas. Them not being included on Enclosure one is hindering our ability to provide the required LOA's as their competitors are not providing us LOA's	See Comment 5655.
5948	For the subcontracting plan referenced in this section, does the Government have a suggested template to provide to Offerors?	See Comment 2207.
5951	The NAICS codes provided in Section A.1.34 are not applicable to some of the Technical areas under each of the three categories. Would the government consider adding additional NAICS codes, such as 517121 Telecommunications Resellers or 541519 Information Technology Value Added Resellers? These NAICS are more appropriate for services such as Network Services, Cybersecurity Services, and Cloud Services.	The Solicitation has been updated in an Amendment prior to Amendment 7.

sewp6_rfp_all_comments

5952	Currently, the RFP requires 12-point font in headers and footers. Since header/footer content is not evaluated, will the Government please amend the instructions to allow a reduced 10-point font in headers/footers?	See Comment 1962.
5958	Could the government please consider extending the due date for proposal submission for all three categories?	The Comment is out of date.
5964	Please clarify if Letters of Authorization required for Categories B and C, or just for Category A?	See Comment 1782.
5968	REFERENCE TEXT: "The offeror must provide relevant experience as it relates to the NAICS code being used for competition." & "Only projects with NAICS codes listed as in-scope for SEWP VI are to be submitted." QUESTION: Must offerors provide relevant experience as it relates to the two (2) NAICS Codes that are being used for competition purposes or must offerors provide relevant experience as it relates to any of the in-scope NAICS Codes cited at RFP Section A.1.34?	See Comment 2092.
5969	Due to the large number of vendor comments and data entry issues with the PPQs that must be completed and returned by the customer prior to the proposal due date, will the government please extend the proposal due date by 4 weeks to allow time for offerors to review the answers to the questions and to distribute a working PPQ Exhibit?	The Comment is out of date.
5970	Please note in Exhibit 2, Exhibit 2-PastPerfQues-SEWP VI, within the first paragraph the last sentence, "Sections 5 and 6 are completed by the" ends incompletely. We presume Sections 5 and 6 are completed by the government. Please confirm.	See Comment 1804.
5972	Please confirm under A.1.2 GSFC 52.211-91 Scope of Work, the Technical Area alpha-numeric designators and titles, e.g., "1b: Enterprise-Wide Network Services" (page 33 on) are the desired references versus the differing alpha-numeric designators and titles indicated under A.3.7.2 (a) Information from the Offeror (page 108), "Category B Content Representative Areas" e.g., 1. IT Managed Services." There is a similar discrepancy for Category C.	The Solicitation has been updated in an Amendment prior to Amendment 7.
5975	Will the government consider adding NAICS code 541511 to Category A? 541511 is currently listed under Categories B & C. This NAICS code is widely utilized to deliver technology products today that align to the technical areas of SEWP VI. Including this NAICS code in Schedule A will allow offerors to demonstrate the broadest scope of capabilities regarding products associated with the proposed technical areas and ensure the government continues to have flexibility and procurement options to continue buying technology products as they do today.	The Solicitation has been updated in an Amendment prior to Amendment 7.
5977	Attachment-J_C_SCRM Plan Template - The radio buttons are one physical group, preventing the ability to respond to each question. The PDF form needs to be re-coded to put each pair of Y/N buttons in an exclusive group, per question. Offeror's cannot use the form until the form is corrected.	See Comment 1675.

sewp6_rfp_all_comments

5982	<p>Would you consider adjusting the requirements of category C? Some of these requirements which are provided in the 4 Acquisition Objectives in attachment A are more Appropriate for categories A and B, but not C as C is focused on services not hardware, software, or enterprise solutions.</p> <p>We find merging of these objectives with the technical categories would hinder small business responses to category C.</p>	The Solicitation will remain as stated.
5986	Please confirm our understanding that the evaluation of an Offeror's Exhibit 3a for Category A is pass/fail in Phase One of the government's evaluation, and the number of products proposed will not be used in the Phase Three evaluation to determine "minimal" or "high" confidence for Mission Suitability.	See Comment 5061.
5988	Would you consider an extension for proposal submissions?	The Comment is out of date.
5990	In its instructions for the Technical Approach, instruction #2 and #3 are nearly identical, with #3 including the specifying "proposed architectural features" rather than "proposed features" and #2 including the final phrase "...in terms of both solutions and services," which is excluded from #3. Can the Government please provide additional clarity and explanation as to the differing aspects of what the Government would like to see from these two requirements?	See Comment 1808.
6000	Could you please clarify if the Relevant Experience Project (REP) NAICS code must be the same as the NAICS code we're bidding on, or if a similar scope would suffice?	See Comment 1886.
6007	DRD No. 5 Climate Change Risk Management (Attachment L), Section 11 indicates the plan is due 12 months after contract award however the RFP, Section A.2.1 GSFC 52.211-101 LIST OF ATTACHMENTS. (NOV 2022) indicates it is due with submission on Page 88 of the RFP	See Comment 1675.
6011	DRD No. 1 Diversity, Equity, Inclusion, and Accessibility (DEIA) Plan (Attachment G), Section 11 Indicates the plan is due 30 days after contract award however the RFP, Section A.2.1 GSFC 52.211-101 LIST OF ATTACHMENTS. (NOV 2022) indicates it is due with submission on Page 88 of the RFP. ["Initial Submission: The plan shall be submitted within 30 days after contract award"]	See Comment 1675.
6012	Would Government confirm that the C-SCRM Plan is required to be submitted "no later than 60 calendar days AFTER the Contract award date"? The RFP states it is due "no later than 60 calendar days prior to the Contract award date".	The Solicitation has been updated in an Amendment prior to Amendment 7.
6016	DRD No. 3 SEWP Cybersecurity-Supply Chain Risk Management Plan (C-SCRM) Plan DRD (Attachment J), Section 11 indicates the plan is due 60 days prior to contract award however the RFP, Section A.2.1 GSFC 52.211-101 LIST OF ATTACHMENTS. (NOV 2022) indicates it is due with submission on Page 88 of the RFP. ["Initial Submission: The plan shall be submitted no later than 60 calendar days prior to the contract award date."]	The Solicitation has been updated in an Amendment prior to Amendment 7.

sewp6_rfp_all_comments

6022	Is Climate Change Risk Management (Attachment L) required at submission?	See Comment 1675.
6024	The requirement states that "In accordance with DRD #3, a C-SCRM Plan must be submitted to the SEWP Program Management Office annually and no later than 60 calendar days prior to the Contract award date and will be incorporated into the contract as Attachment J." Can the Government please confirm that Attachment J has been provided for information purposes only, and is not required in offerors' proposal submissions?	See Comment 1675.
6026	There was no Attachment L provided in the RFP documents, was it the governments intention to include an Attachment L to the RFP documents?	See Comment 1675.
6029	Reference page 109 - paragraph "Offerors identified as HUBZone, SDVOSB, EDWOSB, 8a in Category B and C shall provide past performance references showcasing relevant work in at least two (2) content representative areas for content to be rated relevant (pertinent)" - please note that it is inconsistent with the rest of the Solicitation as it misses WOSB	See Comment 1697.
6030	Reference Enclosure 1- SEWP VI Providers: Will AWS be included as a Designated provider under Amazon.com Inc.	See Comment 2305.
6031	There was no Attachment G provided in the RFP documents, was it the governments intention to include an Attachment G to the RFP documents?	See Comment 1675.
6032	Could Government please provide a copy of Attachment I (Commercial Small Business Subcontracting Plan (Other than Small Businesses)) which is listed as TBS - To be submitted?	See Comment 2207.
6033	Is the Diversity, Equity, Inclusion, and Accessibility (DEIA) Plan (Attachment G) required at submission.	See Comment 1675.
6035	Would Government confirm that Attachment G (Diversity, Equity, Inclusion, and Accessibility (DEIA) Plan-Applicable for Categories B & C), Attachment H (AbilityOne Formal Agreement), and Attachment L (Climate Change Risk Management Plan) should be "TBP - To be-proposed post award?"	See Comment 1675.
6037	To ensure Offerors conduct a proper analysis pre-submission, would Government please provide a copy of Attachment L-Climate Change Risk Management Plan?	See Comment 1675.
6039	Is the SEWP Cybersecurity-Supply Chain Risk Management Plan (C-SCRM) Plan (Attachment J) due at submission?	See Comment 1675.

sewp6_rfp_all_comments

6042	Would Government please provide a new version of Attachment J-ATTACHMENT+J-+C_SCRM+Attestation+Form? In the current form, the content in the text field duplicates as the current duplication increases the chances for errors. Additionally, the radio button responses do not appear to persist/save.	See Comment 1675.
6048	"However, an offeror with favorable, recent, and relevant past performance that meets the average value as specified in A.3.7.2 may be considered more favorably than an offeror with no relevant past performance information." Section A.3.7.2 does not define an "average value". Please clarify.	The Solicitation has been updated in an Amendment prior to Amendment 7.
6050	The past performance questionnaire does not permit electronic completion of the individual performance ratings in Section 5. Would the Government please provide a version of this form that permits electronic completion of these ratings?	See Comment 1804.
6051	To allow offerors to account for all the answers and the potentially new forms, would Government consider extending the submission due date to one month after all answers are posted?	The Comment is out of date.
6056	For Commitment to Supply Chain Management, if an offeror does not require ancillary products for performance, is the offeror required to describe SCRM risks?	See Comment 6409.
6058	Please extend the deadline for proposal submissions to a minimum of 30 days after the release of any amendment issued to provide clarifications.	The Comment is out of date.
6060	Please permit submission of questions related to clarifications for a minimum of one week after the release of any amendment issued to provide clarifications.	The Comment is out of date.
6063	Would the Government please permit captions to be included in the items permissible to use 10-point font?	See Comment 1962.
6070	The instructions state that: "Offeror's subcontracting plan and AbilityOne Commitment Letter, if applicable: The AbilityOne Commitment Letter shall identify the POC from SourceAmerica/NIB and identify plans to subcontract with qualified nonprofit agencies for SEWP opportunities within identified NAICS Codes" - Is this requirement applicable to small business offerors also or to only Other Than Small Business like Subcontracting Plan and Small Business Subcontracting Plan history?	See Comment 2322.
6077	Will the Government delete Section A.3.7.3 (a)(3) as duplicative of Section A.3.7.3 (a)(2) (see p. 111)?	See Comment 1808.

<p>6079</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">SECTION TITLE: Exhibit 2: Past Performance Questionnaire</p> <p>QUESTION: The fillable PDF found at Exhibit 2 has multiple formatting errors that prevent the Offeror from accurately completing Sections 1-4 and make it difficult for our customers to complete their sections as well.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. In Section 1, under Basis of Selection, a user may only mark one radio box. If a contract was evaluated by cost and technical factors, it is impossible to mark both options as "yes." Conversely, items that should logically be checkboxes with only one allowable selection - such as Section 1 H or Section 2 Relationships - require a "Yes" or "No" to be typed in. 2. In Section 3 Evaluator Information, any entry made in blocks 1-5 are automatically duplicated across the others without the ability to overwrite the autofilled duplicates. 3. Section 4, which should also logically be formatted as checkboxes or radio buttons, has the same autofill duplication error - if you type in "Yes" under "Performed," the "Yes" is automatically duplicated under "Did Not Perform." 4. In Section 5, the Customer is asked to circle or highlight a performance rating. Both of these inputs add a burden to an evaluator who is assumedly being bombarded with the PPQ requests. We would recommend changing the entry method for this section to checkboxes or radio buttons as well. 5. Section 6 has the same autofill errors on the Contract Value fill-ins. When entering a value for the "Total Contract Value," the input is duplicated into Fee / Initial Value, Fee / Current Value, Total Value / Initial Value, and Total Value / Current Value without the ability to overwrite. The input for Estimated Cost / Initial Value is autofilled to Estimated Cost / Current Value as well. 6. Under the radio button in Section 6, the five explanation sections to be filled in by the evaluator all have the same autofill issue. 7. We would further recommend that the Overall Performance Rating in Section 6 be changed to a checkbox or radio button for the same reasons identified in Section 5. <p>Will the SEWP office revise and republish this form to accommodate for these critical errors or is the Contractor authorized to make those modifications to the existing exhibit, thus classifying the exhibit as "in the Contractor's format"?</p>	<p>See Comment 1804.</p>
<p>6081</p>	<p>The RFP states that: For Mandatory Experience Letter of Authorization (LOAs) the page limit is 3 pages. According to the information provided in the Offer Volume (page 101), the RFP requests LOAs for 4 Technical Areas. Can you confirm if the page limit is indeed 4 pages?</p>	<p>See Comment 1957.</p>

6085	<p>Does Attachment J - C_SCRM Attestation Form and Exhibit 5 C-SCRM Attestation Form both need to be submitted with the proposal response on July 11th? Or does Attachment J need to be submitted after award?</p> <p>A.1.30.1. Cybersecurity-Supply Chain Risk Management (C-SCRM) Plan (Attestation Form) In accordance with DRD #3, a C-SCRM Plan must be submitted to the SEWP Program Management Office annually and no later than 60 calendar days prior to the Contract award date and will be incorporated into the contract as Attachment J. Refer to NIST SP 800-161(most current version) for additional guidance.</p>	See Comment 3479.
6089	Can the Category Solutions Spreadsheet include products such as related licensing in addition to the service labor categories?	Yes, the Category Solutions Spreadsheet can include products such as related licensing in addition to the service labor categories.
6090	Do we have to submit REP projects with NAICS codes listed as in-scope for SEWP VI only?	See Comment 1886.
6091	If we qualify as both a Small Business and a HUBZone contract holder, how should we submit the proposal to ensure access to task orders for both Hubzone and Small Businesses? For instance, if we submit our offer as a Hubzone Small Business, would we still be eligible to pursue task orders designated for Small Businesses? Just to confirm, if we qualifies for a Small Business contract, will we automatically be eligible for set-aside contracts they also qualify for, such as Hubzone? And is it accurate to say that this eligibility does not work the other way around?	See Comment 1881.
6098	<p>Are there 10 or 11 Mandatory Experience Technical Areas for Category B? It is unclear if Program Management and Ancillary Services is a Category B Technical Area. Would the Government please list all the Mandatory Experience Technical Areas under Category B and provide their associated definitions?</p> <p>Re: RFP A.1.2 GSFC 52.211-91 SCOPE OF WORK; Page 35 A.3.7.1; Page 104Category B Technical Areas. "On Page 35, Program Management/Ancillary services is labeled as Technical Area 11b. On Page 104, only 10 mandatory experience technical areas are listed for Category B.</p>	See Comment 4778.
6099	<p>Are LOAs only applicable to Category A bidders? "OEM designated provider" does not appear to apply to Service providers that are pursuing categories B or C. Can the Government please clarify if "OEM" is applicable to only Products (Category A bidders) and not Services (Category B and/or C bidders)?</p> <p>Re: RFP A.3.7.1 "Offerors shall provide a Letter of Authorization (LOA) from a designated provider (OEM) for each of the four (4) Technical Areas, excluding Technical Area 9, which does not require a designated provider, identifying that the provider is aware and approves of the offeror proposing their solutions for the SEWP VI proposal."</p>	See Comment 1782.

sewp6_rfp_all_comments

6103	<p>With regard to "Category A- Letter of Authorization" - Large providers have standard letter of authorization which do not reference a specific opportunity. Is a letter of authorization dated after solicitation date from providers on their letterhead without SEWP reference acceptable?</p> <p>Can NASA SEWP provide a template or list of keywords that have to be present on the letter of authorization?</p>	See Comment 1799.
6104	<p>Can you clarify when the C-SCRM Plan is due, and if it is required as part of the response (prior to award) or at a later time and will we be asked for it?</p>	See Comment 1675.
6105	<p>Although they are listed as attachments in Section A.2.1, the Government did not issue the following attachments with the RFP:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">Attachment G Attachment H Attachment I Attachment K Attachment L</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Re: RFP, A.2.1 GSFC 52.211-101 LIST OF ATTACHMENTS., Page 88</p>	See Comment 4603.
6107	<p>Can the Government clarify how it measures or defines "reasonableness"?</p> <p>Re: RFP, Section M Reference: The Mission Suitability Volume "The Government will evaluate the Offeror's technical approach, specified in Section A.3.7.3 (a)(1), Section A.3.7.3 (a)(2), Section A.3.7.3 (a)(3), for effectiveness, reasonableness, and efficiency."</p>	See Comment 1808.
6109	<p>Exhibits 3.b and 3.c contain a number of concepts that do not necessarily apply to the Service providers.</p> <p>1. Please advise how Service providers responding to Categories B and C should complete Columns A, B, C, E, and F of Exhibits 3.b and 3.c?</p> <p>2. What does the Government mean by "SEWP Catalog Price" for Services?</p> <p>3. What is a "UNSPSC Code" for Services?</p> <p>4. Please clarify what pricing components are included in CLINs.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Re: Exhibit 3.b</p>	See Comment 2214.
6113	<p>Is the AbilityOne subcontracting applicable to small businesses?</p>	See Comment 2322.
6114	<p>NASA often uses NAICS 541715 for its technology efforts (evidenced by the contracts Langley RSES, Goddard SESDA and Goddard SES), please consider adding 541715 to the in-scope NAICS to improve the viability of the SEWP vehicle for NASA IT contractors.</p>	See Comment 1671.

sewp6_rfp_all_comments

6121	We do not typically subcontract at all, we plan to only sell products and services related to those products under Category A. Does AbilityOne apply to us?	See Comment 2322.
6125	Please confirm if the contractor, when proposing labor categories and associated rates, only needs to populate Column F and Column G in the 'Exhibit 3b - Category B Solutions Spreadsheet' and the 'Exhibit 3c - Category C Solutions Spreadsheet'? Also, please clarify if the contractor needs to provide the UNSPSC code for the labor category?	See Comment 2214.
6129	Will the government provide detailed instructions for proposing labor categories and associated rates for category B and C??	See Comment 2285.
6138	Under A.7.3.7, (a) TECHNICAL APPROACH (SUBFACTOR A), can the government provide additional clarity on the difference between area 2 and area 3? The requirements differ by only a few words, and we want to be sure we are adequately addressing the government's needs without being unnecessarily redundant.	See Comment 1808.
6141	Requesting that the government consider past performances within 5yrs of the solicitation release date.	The Solicitation will remain as stated.
6142	We are a small business with active ISO 27001 and CMMI Level 3 certifications. We are in the process of achieving our ISO 9001 certification and have a letter of engagement from a firm that will perform the two-stage certification process. We anticipate the certification will be issued in Q1 2025. Will the letter of engagement qualify for proof that the ISO 9001 certification is in process?	See Comment 2200.
6152	Does each CLIN that is used in our catalog proposal submission need to have an LOA with it?	See Comment 1874.
6155	Phase 3 - Technical Approach (Subfactor A) - could you please provide specific guidance for each column of exhibit 3 for Category B and Category C?	See Comment 2214.
6156	Due to the Past Performance Questionnaires not accepting or processing data properly, can NASA please: (1) provision new templates that function properly, and (2) extend the due date for proposal submittals commensurate to the time since RFP release that offerors have not been able to send to Government customers to complete? The concern is that the window for customers to complete will be too short.	The Comment is out of date.
6157	The A.3.7.3 instructions for Volume III-A items #2 and #3 references "proposed features" and "proposed architectural features", respectively. Please define and clarify "features" versus "architectural features" relative to an offeror proposing in Category C. Alternatively, remove requirement #3 to remove duplication and/or confusion.	See Comment 1808.
6159	A Small Business is currently in the works of getting their ISO Cert, is this acceptable at the time of submission as long as we provide the POC? Or does the Business need a complete ISO Cert as the time of submission?	See Comment 2200.

sewp6_rfp_all_comments

6161	Kindly request the SEWP VI RFQ be revised to extend the due date from date of proposal submissions 11 July to 11 Aug for Past Performance Questionnaires from the Government Contracting Officers. Most of industry is awaiting answers to Q&A and to determine if exhibits/attachments will be updated before PPQs are sent out. With the upcoming 4th of July holiday, many government officials are out of the office and unavailable to complete the PPQ before 11 July 2024.	The Comment is out of date.
6162	The A.3.7.3 instructions for Volume III-A state that for all categories "The offeror must provide a summary description of their offerings and capabilities as it relates to the scope of the proposed Category as provided in A.1.2 GSFC 52.211-91 SCOPE OF WORK (FEB 2016). The summary shall provide detail as to how the offeror will support the four Acquisition Objectives including information in the following areas". The first Acquisition Objective listed within Attachment A, Section A.1 states "1. To have hardware and software solutions and services available to address an increasingly difficult, complex, and changing set of NASA-specific scientific and engineering problems while also providing Information Technology, Communication (and AV (ITC/AV) product-based solutions to assist all Federal Agencies in meeting their ITC/AV needs." This Acquisition Objective (#1) references hardware and product-based solutions, whereas Category C pertains only to services, and not products. Please revise or clarify the instructions for Category C Offerors in how to respond to this objective.	See Comment 2929.
6170	The draft RFP timeline stated that Government would allow Offerors 60 days to respond to the final RFP, but the current response window is 43 days, including three Federal holidays. Can the Government extend the response window to a minimum of 60 days in view of updated requirements in the final RFP and holidays?	The Comment is out of date.
6175	In attachment J- C SCRM Attestation Form, if the vendor response is "no", can not applicable be used as the summary explanation and risk mitigation plan if the control does not pertain to the organization?	See Comment 1675.
6202	Please allow for the possibility that a vendor authorization letter may be more than 1 page.	See Comment 1957.
6210	Can bidders add additional labor categories at the task order level?	See Comment 4152.

6216	<p>"Pg 102, A.3.7.1 OFFER Volume, (b) Mandatory Experience Offerings, Point of Contact Tab, the government notes that ""The designated provider for each of the proposed areas must be from the list of approved SEWP Providers listed in Enclosure 1.</p> <p>a. How did the government determine the OEM list from the potential pool of over 9,700 OEM vendors from SEWP V?</p> <p>b. Are all OEM providers on the list providing LOAs – our current experience is that some are saying they are not issuing LOAs to new clients, or not issuing LOA's specific to SEWP at all.</p> <p>c. How did the government determine that this list of OEM providers can fulfill all the needs"</p>	<p>The list of designated providers is the mandatory list to select 1-4 designated providers based on past and current customer requirements. Offerors may include any other providers as secondary or other providers both as part of their proposal and post-award.</p>
6240	<p>Attachment D includes the "Diversity, Equity, Inclusion, and Accessibility (DEIA) Plan," can the Government please provide clarity on whether this plan is about what the Offeror will do to meet the questions listed in the document, or is the Offeror to answer those questions on what the organization does currently?</p>	<p>See Comment 1675.</p>
6241	<p>If Mandatory Experience Letters of Authorization are subject to a 3 page limitation, can NASA confirm that the 3 page limitation applies to each individual Letter of Authorization that will be furnished by one of the identified Designated Providers?</p>	<p>See Comment 1957.</p>
6252	<p>In order for us to provide complete and compliant past performances, can you extend the page limit for this section from 10 to 20?</p>	<p>The Solicitation will remain as stated.</p>
6262	<p>Section A.3.7.3 (b) (1) v; Page 112; The RFP package includes two C-SCRM Attestation Forms (Attachment J and Exhibit 5). Is it correct to assume in the case the offeror plans to submit a C-SCRM Attestation Form that they are only required to submit Exhibit 5 as part of the submission, and that Attachment J is only required after contract award? Within Attachment J it states" This document is intended to evaluate a potential contractor's SCRM maturity".</p>	<p>See Comment 3479.</p>
6275	<p>Referring to attachment "Exhibit 3b- Category B Solutions Spreadsheet", Can Government Explain what need to put under Labor Category? What Labor Categories are Government Expecting to be provided?</p>	<p>See Comment 2285.</p>

6276	<p>RFP Section A.3.7.1 OFFER VOLUME, Subsection a: ISO 9001 and CMMI Certification: To increase the competitive environment and to expand the government's access to innovative capabilities and commercial best practices, we suggest that the government amend the timing of CMMI certification for Large Businesses to mirror the requirement for Small Businesses: within 12 months of contract award (or, at a minimum, upon contract award). This offeror, and we are willing to bet several others, are in the CMMI preparation and audit process, but our audit (scheduled in advance of the RFP release and proposal due date) will occur after proposals are submitted.</p> <p>The duration to achieve CMMI Level 2 or Level 3 can vary greatly depending on several factors, including the size of the organization, the complexity of the processes, the starting maturity of the processes, the overall customer scope of the business (public sector only vs public sector and commercial) and the resources dedicated to the improvement efforts. It's a significant commitment and can take anywhere from several months to a couple of years.</p> <p>While we started this process several months ago, the factors cited above have extended the preparation process and thus resulted in an audit date that is post proposal submission. Given this situation, we ask that the requirement be relaxed to be similar to the SB requirement for CMMI, where bidders must "provide proof that the certification approval is in process by providing the Point of Contact information including the name of appraisal body and name, phone number, and email of a representative from whom the Offeror is obtaining the certification. The certification process must be completed within 12 months of contract award."</p> <p>Making this change only enhances the competitive landscape of Category B and provides companies that are in the process of achieving CMMI certification an opportunity to bid.</p>	The Solicitation has been updated in an Amendment prior to Amendment 7 to clarify the instructions related to ISO 9001 and CMMI certification.
6281	Referring to attachment "Exhibit 3c- Category C Solutions Spreadsheet", Can Government Explain what need to put under SEWP Catalog Price?	See Comment 2214.
6283	Page 104, for Category B, 2 or 3 REPs over 4 millions in the last 3 years is a pretty high number. Based on the previous feedback from Industry Days our understanding was that the intent is to help Small Businesses get this contract not to be restrictive. Please consider reducing the requirement to make it consistent with Category C, 2 millions. Thank you	The Solicitation will remain as stated.
6286	Referring to attachment "Exhibit 3c- Category C Solutions Spreadsheet", Can Government Explain what need to put under Labor Category? What Labor Categories are Government Expecting to be provided?	See Comment 2285.
6287	Please provide a copy of the in Scope SEWP VI UNSPSC Codes.	See Comment 2949.

sewp6_rfp_all_comments

6297	Referring to section: "The Offeror shall provide a questionnaire for each past performance reference submission and be submitted directly by the evaluator to Government Contracting Officer via email PastPerformance@sewp.nasa.gov. Sections 1-4 are to be completed by the Offeror and verified by the evaluator. Sections 5 and 6 are completed by the". It looks like the incomplete information is being provided. Can Government clarify this?	See Comment 1804.
6302	the Exhibit 2 fillable PDF has areas that are not working. For instance, where the respondent needs to check one box for prime, significant subcontractor, or team member, when you click one box, they all fill in.	See Comment 1804.
6311	The RFP states: "Offerors proposing to category B and/ or C shall complete Exhibit 3b- Category B Solutions Spreadsheet and Exhibit 3c- Category C Solutions Spreadsheet. The UNSPSC codes must accurately match the proposed services/technology in each row and must be the full 8-digit UNSPSC code. If the CLIN is for an hourly labor rate, then the associated labor category shall be provided in Column G (Labor Category if Hourly Rate). The information including pricing in these spreadsheets will not be reviewed or evaluated and will only be utilized to establish the initial Contract Database of Record upon Contract award." Can the government clarify what it expect to see in Solutions Spreadsheet (Exhibit 3b & 3c) considering that there are no labor categories provided in the RFP?	See Comment 2285.
6326	Referring to the section "Identify any consultants, generative artificial intelligence, and/or sub-contractors used in writing this proposal (if any) and the extent to which their services will be available in the subsequent performance of this effort", Can Government Clarify what generative artificial intelligence means?	See Comment 2276.
6341	Per A.1.51 DRD #5 is due within 12 months of award and that Attachment L will be attached to the awarded contract. Section A.2.1 states Attachment L is To Be Submitted. Should this state To be Proposed post-award?	See Comment 1675.
6350	Per A.1.51 DRD #5 is due within 12 months of award and that Attachment L will be attached to the awarded contract. Section A.2.1 states Attachment L is To Be Submitted. Should this state To be Proposed post-award?	See Comment 1675.
6351	The mandatory LOA's have a limitation of 3 pages. However, A.3.7.1 (b) under Category A – Letter of Authorization, "There shall be an LOA for each different designated provider for a maximum of four (4) LOA's." An LOA on provider letterhead is typically one page each. Will the Government increase the page limitations to meet the later maximum requirements?	See comment 1957.
6352	The Exhibit 3c – Category C Solutions Spreadsheet is required for proposal submission. Since Category C is services only, how should Offerors fill in the product-specific information in Exhibit 3c?	See Comment 2214.
6354	A.3.7.1 (c)- Exhibit4NAICSSizeStandardCrosswalk.xlsx - NAICS 519190 and 561621 are not listed in SAM and therefore cannot be added to an Offeror's Entity Registration. Should these codes be removed from the NAICS tables for Category B and Category C in the above xlsx file?	See Comment 1777.
6356	Is it required that the NAICS code used for the submitted Relevant Experience Project reference(s) match the NAICS code for the proposed category?	See Comment 1886.

sewp6_rfp_all_comments

6357	Please provide an example/illustration for completing Exhibit 3c for instances where the offeror is providing services.	See Comment 2214.
6358	For Category C Mandatory Experience/Offerings, WOSB and VOSB are included in the list of companies required to submit two different REPs from different mandatory experience technical areas. However, for Category C Past Performance, WOSB and VOSB are not included in the list of companies required to provide past performance references showcasing relevant work in at least two content representative areas. Were WOSB and VOSB left out by mistake? Please clarify	See Comment 1697.
6359	Categories B and C includes technologies, solutions, and services that are prominently procured under NAICS code 513210 (formerly NAICS code 513210). Will the Government consider updating the scopes of categories B and C to include NAICS Code 513210? Updating the list of in-scope NAICS Codes will ensure that the Federal Government has access to a diverse group of providers pool of awardees with experience delivering best-of-breed solutions at the enterprise and mission levels.	The Solicitation has been updated in an Amendment prior to Amendment 7.
6369	A.3.6.B RFP Proposal Submission Table, pp. 95-96 specifies a three-page limit for Volume I Mandatory Experience Letter of Authorization (LOA). Category A- Letter of Authorization, p. 101 NASA indicates a Category A Offeror may submit as many as four LOAs. Assuming each LOA is at least one page, Category A Offeror submitting four LOAs will exceed the stated three-page limit. Please confirm if the LOA page limit is three pages or will NASA increase the page limit to four pages?	See comment 1957.
6379	A.3.7 Proposal Volume. The offeror must provide relevant experience as it relates to the NAICS code being used for competition. What will SEWP accept as proof of relevant experience?	See Comment 2092.
6380	Are CLINs for the RFQ to be provided by SEWP (per Technical Area/Category), or do we submit our own?	See Comment 2214.
6383	Proposal Upload is currently not on the https://www.sewp.nasa.gov/sewp6rfp navigation bar. When will this be available; is there an ability to do a test zip file upload submission?	See Comment 3100.
6384	For Small Businesses in Category B, would the Government consider decreasing the past performance for similar scope efforts to an average annual cost/fee incurred of \$500,000 instead of \$1,000,000?	The Solicitation will remain as stated.
6386	A.1.3 Report of Work. We believe Reports of Work should be specific to service orders only, as it mirrors the language in Attachment B - Category 5: Delivery / Completion Status (service orders). mirrors it. Updates to product orders are managed via the CHOP Order Status Report.	See Comment 1862.
6390	Would you please consider allowing 4 pages for the Mandatory Experience LOAs since you are requesting up to 4?	See comment 1957.

sewp6_rfp_all_comments

6394	Can the government add Semtech (Sierra Wireless) to the Enclosure 1? Sierra Wireless is the leading IoT Wireless provider.	See Comment 5655.
6395	Section A.3.7.1, pg 98, indicates "The offeror must provide relevant experience as it relates to the NAICS code being used for competition.", additionally, Section A.3.7.2, pg 105, indicates "The offeror must provide past performance submissions as it relates to the NAICS code being used for competition." If an Offeror selects NAICS 541511 to use for competition, does that mean all Mandatory Experience/Offerings and Past Performance References can only be from contracts with a 541511 NAICS?	See Comment 2092.
6401	Reference Section A.4.3 Page 116 "Small Businesses – In Category A and C, shall furnish past performance for similar scope efforts with an average annual cost/fee incurred of \$500,000." This conflicts with Section A.3.7.2 page 106 "For Small Businesses proposing in Categories A – the past performance provided shall be for similar scope efforts with a minimum average annual cost incurred of \$150,000." Can you please indicate which minimum amount is correct?	See Comment 1709.
6403	Will the Government expand in scope NAICS to include 541715 Engineering research and development laboratories or services (except nanotechnology research and development)? This work directly aligns to SEWP VI Categories B&C. -	See Comment 1671.
6408	NASA- SEWP VI EXHIBIT 2- PAST PERFORMANCE QUESTIONNAIRE has errors. Can the government please provide a new template?	See Comment 1804.
6409	FOR CATEGORY B and C - The Offeror shall describe ancillary products required for performance of specific tasks and corporate risks associated with SCRM (e.g., availability and security of corporate resources). What type of ancillary Products is government expecting from contractor	It is up to the offeror to address service requirements which require products (i.e. ancillary products) such as software or hardware to complete a task and what risks exist and how they are mitigated.
6416	Section A.3.7.1; Page 103; Exhibits 3b/3c; Can the Government provide better instructions on how to fill out Exhibits 3b/3c and possibly populate a few examples within the spreadsheets? It is not real clear on what to include in several of the columns.	See Comment 2214.
6418	Bullet 2 of requested information calls for relevant experience. Is this an instruction for other sections or are you requesting we also put experience narrative here as well as in the Mandatory Experience section and in Volume II?	See Comment 2092.
6422	Regarding Exhibit 3b, for IT service providers, does the government expect us to establish a UNSPSC Code?	See Comment 2118.
6423	Can the government clarify how we are supposed to fill out Exhibit 3b (i.e. Category B only)	See Comment 2214.

sewp6_rfp_all_comments

6427	Exhibit 2 does not have functional cells. Will the government please update the document?	See Comment 1804.
6428	The Attachment A: scope section does not align with the RFP Section A.1.2 scope section. Can the government explain the difference and purpose of these two documents?	The Solicitation has been updated in an Amendment prior to Amendment 7.
6443	Request for Clarification - Typo in RFP Number The zip file shall be labeled: "OfferorName_80TECH23R0001_Category GetItDone_80TECH23R0001_CategoryA GetItDone_80TECH23R0001_CategoryB These filenames reference the DRAFT RFP Number rather than the FINAL RFP Number.	The Solicitation has been updated in an Amendment prior to Amendment 7.
6444	In an effort to ensure the widest flexibility for the products and services able to be offered, will the Government permit offerors to provide a LOA from an OEM or a large-scale aggregator, both of which would be capable of meeting the Government's requirement(s) for a designated Technical Area? Further, if an offeror has a pre-existing LOA with an OEM or large-scale aggregator, may it rely on that LOA even if that LOA does not reference the SEWP VI procurement?	See Comment 1799.
6450	Exhibit 3b for Categories B & C. Please provide instructions for each column with the information the Government requires Offerors to provide.	See Comment 2214.
6452	Section A.1.31 NAICS CODES WITHIN SCOPE. p. 63 CATEGORY C. NAICS codes 51618, 541690 and 541990 are all similar to and references NAICS 541611. Will the Government add NAICS 541611 to the CAT C in-scope NAICS?"	See Comment 2669.
6453	Exhibit 4 NAICS Size Standard Crosswalk - Are there any limits to SEWP VI Task Order opportunities based on selected NAICS Codes, will Awardees have the opportunity to bid all task orders for the Category awarded?	See Comment 1881.
6454	Does UNSPSC codes need to be submitted for Mandatory Technical Area 9, Services in the Exhibit 3a Solutions Spreadsheet?	See Comment 2118.
6455	On page 109 of the RFP, is WOSB included with the socio economic categories indicated? "Offerors identified as HUBZone, SDVOSB, EDWOSB, 8a in Category B and C shall provide past performance references showcasing relevant work in at least two (2) content representative areas for content to be rated relevant (pertinent)."	See Comment 1697.
6456	A.3.7.1 - Offer Volume: Can you please provide a definition of generative artificial intelligence?	See Comment 2276.
6459	Please confirm that it is acceptable for text in headers and footers to be minimum 10 pt. Times New Roman.	See Comment 1962.

6463	A.2.1 List of Attachments What is the significance behind the asterisk shown on some of the TBS lines within the table?	See Comment 1869.
6467	For REPs related to Category B (Other than Small Businesses), we have the following question: Can the government please lower the requirement from \$30M to \$10M-\$15M?	The Solicitation will remain as stated.
6474	On page 116 of the RFP, is WOSB included with the socio economic categories indicated? "In Category C, shall provide past performance references showcasing at least 3 content representative areas. HUBZone, SDVOSB, EDWOSB, 8a shall provide past performance references showcasing at least 2 content representative areas."	See Comment 1697.
6479	A.1.2 GSFC 52.211-91 SCOPE OF WORK (FEB 2016) - Can the Government please confirm that "Technical Areas" 1-11 of the SOW are equivalent to "Mandatory Experience Sub-areas" (page 104) and/or "Content Representative Areas" (pages 108-109). If that is not correct, can the Government confirm that offerors shall only use areas 1-10 found in "Mandatory Experience" and "Past Performance" and omit "Technical Area 11: Program Management/Ancillary Services"?	The wording has been updated in the solicitation. Technical Areas 9a, 11b and 11c are not considered a Past Performance Content Representative area and are excluded from the REP Areas.
6481	Enclosure 1-SEWP VI Providers is very restrictive. Kindly please expand the Providers list on Enclosure 1 to allow couple more large OEM's to be used. Hexagon AB / Leica has 23 Subsidiary companies on the Draft Enclosure 1. Them not being included on released Enclosure 1 blindsided us. We are a Small Business with significant experience with Hexagon AB / Leica. They are an extremely large company with significant offerings on several Technical areas. Hexagon AB not being on Enclosure 1 one is limiting our ability to provide the required number of LOA's as their competitors are not providing us LOA's. A revision of Enclosure 1 to add couple more large OEM's including Hexagon AB will help us get the required number of LOA's	See Comment 5655.
6489	We respectfully request an extension of at least 30 days from when answers to questions are released in order to provide the best proposal possible to the Government.	The Comment is out of date.
6492	Section A.3.7.1 Page 103; Exhibits 3b/3c; If REP is just for services, do we list n/a for columns B & C?	See Comment 2214.
6494	Page 103 of RFP, Category B requirements: Would the government consider decreasing the total value size of a single order or contract to allow mid-size companies to pursue category B as Prime bidders? Currently, the \$30M threshold for Relevant Experience Projects, without the use of BPAs or IDIQs, limits mid-size companies in their ability to pursue category B as prime bidders.	The Solicitation will remain as stated.
6495	Section A.3.7.1 Page 103; Exhibits 3b/3c; If the REP contract is for Labor with multiple applicable labor categories, how are labor categories to be quoted in Category B/C?	See Comment 3462.

sewp6_rfp_all_comments

6501	Will the Government consider a 3-4 week extension given the significant changes from the draft to the final RFP so that industry can pivot and re-arrange teaming?	The Comment is out of date.
6503	NASA often uses NAICS 541715 for its technology efforts (evidenced by the contracts Langley RSES, Goddard SESDA and Goddard SES), please consider adding 541715 to the in-scope NAICS to improve the viability of the SEWP vehicle for NASA IT contractors.	See Comment 1671.
6505	Section A.3.7.1 Page 103; Exhibits 3b/3c; In column A of Exhibits 3b/3c, is this CLIN in reference to the SEWP or the specific CLINS associated with the proposed REP by the offeror?	See Comment 2214.
6508	Given the excessive number of comments posted, can the Government provide an estimated approach to and schedule for providing answers? e.g. will answers be provided in groups, or all at once? Will requests for corrected RFP attachments be provided in the first group?	The Comment is out of date.
6519	Exhibit 2: Could the govt. please complete this unfinished sentence? "Sections 5 and 6 are completed by the...."	See Comment 1804.
6531	"There shall be an LOA for each different designated provider, with a maximum of 4 LOAs in total". Must the LOAs be from providers on the Enclosure 1 list? Additionally, does the maximum of 4 LOAs refer to a total of 4 LOAs across all Technical Areas, or can there be 4 LOAs within each Technical Area?"	The 1-4 LOAs must be from the 1-4 designated providers. Each of the designated providers must be from the list in Enclosure 1. There is no more than 1 designated provider in a Technical Area. Therefore there is only one LOA each associated with each of the 4 Technical Areas. See Comment 1874.
6532	Exhibit 3b & 3c: Could the Government please explain the intent behind Exhibits 3b and 3c? For example, what is the intent of the "Provider (OEM/Service Provider); OEM is not a term normally used for service provider. What is the URL for the SEWP Catalog that should be used for the price column? The "part number" field seems inappropriate for quoting the price for human resources. The sheets seem more suited to products than services.	See Comment 2214.
6534	Can the government provide more clarity about the CLINs in Exhibit 3b? Are the offerors to propose our own CLINS?	See Comment 2214.
6535	Since all offerors who meet phase requirements will be awarded a contract, what is the value of being "considered more favorably?"	The Solicitation has been updated in an Amendment prior to Amendment 7.
6536	Can the government provide more clarity about the CLINs in Exhibit 3b? Are the offerors to propose our own descriptions for these CLINS?	See Comment 2214.

sewp6_rfp_all_comments

6548	Will a SB SocioEconomic or 8(a) Offeror be able to compete for all Small Business Task Order opportunities? Or, will the SocioEconomic or 8(a) status limit the Offeror to only the Task Orders with the specific Set-Aside?	See Comment 1881.
6553	For Exhibit 3C, if the CLIN is for an hourly rate, then can you please confirm if Column A and Column G are the only two columns that need to be filled in.	See Comment 2214.
6557	On page 106 - the RFP states" For Small Businesses proposing in Categories A- the past performance provided shall be for similar scope efforts with a minimum average annual cost incurred of \$150,000 (One HundredFifty Thousand) for size to be rated relevant (pertinent)." However on page 116 the RFP states "Small Businesses- In Category A and C, shall furnish the past performance for similar scope efforts with an average annual cost/fee incurred of \$500,000." Will the government update the RFP to reflect the correct contract value required for past performance for Small Businesses in Category A?	See Comment 1709.
6571	The RFP states: "An Offeror shall not be rated favorably or unfavorably if the offeror does not have a record of "recent" and "relevant" past performance or if a record of past performance is unavailable. In such cases the offeror will receive a "Neutral" rating. However, an offeror with favorable, recent, and relevant past performance that meets the average value as specified in A.3.7.2 may be considered more favorably than an offeror with no relevant past performance information." If the Past Performance Volume evaluation is pass/fail - how will the government evaluate one offeror more favorably than another?	The Solicitation has been updated in an Amendment prior to Amendment 7.
6572	RFP Page 111, Regarding "how the proposed architecture features provide technical leadership...": What is the "architecture" being referred to? The RFP does not present a technical problem or sample task order requiring offers to propose an architecture.	The Solicitation has been updated in an Amendment prior to Amendment 7.
6573	The designated provider for each of the proposed areas must be from the list of approved SEWP Providers listed in Enclosure 1. Question - Upon observation of Enclosure 1, there are no approved SEWP providers that an AV contractor would primarily design and integrate with. For true diversity amongst IT and AV contractors, we recommend the inclusion of the largest AV Video Signal Distribution and Control OEMs; Crestron, Extron, and AMX. These OEMs have been historically purchased frequently through NASA SEWP and integrated into ALL Government collaboration spaces such as operations centers, conference rooms, and secure environments. Please advise if these can be added as designated providers under Category A.	See Comment 5655.
6575	RFP Page 111, Regarding "The Offeror shall describe ancillary products," in Categories B and C many task orders may be delivered using human services delivered through the prime or its subcontractors, without ancillary products. In that case, should "ancillary products" be interpreted as services provided by subcontractors, or does "ancillary products" strictly mean software tool, hardware, etc.?	Ancillary products strictly means software tool, hardware, etc. and do not refer to services.
6578	Please clarify that ALL offerors (both SB and OTSB) who are bidding any of the three categories required to submit an AbilityOne Letter of Commitment?	See Comment 2322.

sewp6_rfp_all_comments

6586	Please confirm that an offeror may use experience from a company or companies serving as subcontractor(s) in the Offeror's CTA for the REPs and Mandatory Experience requirements for both SB and OTSB tracks.	The Solicitation has been updated to indicate when a subcontractor's experience may be used.
6587	Regarding the Designated Provider list in Enclosure 1. If the legal name of designated provider is different than the name listed in Enclosure 1, is it acceptable to draft Letters of Authorization with the correct legal name?	See Comment 2305.
6609	Do the REPs submitted for "mandatory experience" need to be the same projects that we submit for Past Performance or can they be different?	See Comment 3704.
6614	Section A.3.7.1 of the RFP states that offerors must provide a 'subcontracting plan and AbilityOne Commitment Letter, if applicable.' Could you clarify whether the requirement to submit a subcontracting plan and AbilityOne Commitment Letter applies to small business and socioeconomic status prime offerors?	See Comment 2322.
6616	Please confirm that Past Performance Questionnaires (Exhibit 2) are only required for REPs and not for Mandatory Experience.	See Comment 3704.
6620	A.2.1 GSFC 52.211-101 List of Attachments - The following attachments are listed in the List of Attachment, however, were not provided. Can the Government please provide: Attachment G: Diversity, Equity, Inclusion, and Accessibility (DEIA) Plan- Applicable for Categories B & C Attachment H: AbilityOne Formal Agreement Attachment I: Commercial Small Business Subcontracting Plan (Other than Small Businesses) Attachment K: Meaningful Relationship Commitment Letter, if applicable Attachment L: Climate Change Risk Management Plan	See Comment 4603.
6626	Does this requirement apply to service providers who do not typically provide physical hardware or products? If so, could you please elaborate on the type of ancillary products you expect us to describe in the context of our service offerings?	See Comment 6409.
6630	Will RFQ notices only go out to the offerors who fall under the CO's selected NAICS code (according to your crosswalk file) or will each CH do a self-attestation that they meet the NAICS code listed on the RFQ at the time we submit our quotes?	See Comment 1881.
6632	We note that in A.1.2, Category B, there is a Technical Area 11b included, but it does not appear on the list of Category B - Mandatory Experience Technical Areas. Was the omission of Technical Area 11b from the list of Category B - Mandatory Experience Technical Areas intentional or does it need to be added to the list?	See Comment 4778.
6636	We note that in A.1.2, Category B, there is a Technical Area 11b included, but it does not appear on the list of Category B - Content Representative Areas. Was the omission of Technical Area 11b from the list of Category B - Content Representative Areas intentional or does it need to be added to the list?	See Comment 4778.

6638	Can you please allow for flexibility on the NAICS between what we list on the REP and what we submit our bid under? Some NAICS have been altered or discontinued by the SBA, a broad NAICS may cover various types of effort, and some contracts have inadvertently listed an inapplicable code.	See Comment 1886.
6641	We note that in A.1.2, Category C, there is a Technical Area 11c included, but it does not appear on the list of Category C - Mandatory Experience Sub-areas. Was the omission of Technical Area 11b from the list of Category C - Mandatory Experience Sub-areas intentional or does it need to be added to the list?	See Comment 4778.
6644	We note that in A.1.2, Category C, there is a Technical Area 11c included, but it does not appear on the list of Category C - Content Representative Areas. Was the omission of Technical Area 11b from the list of Category C - Content Representative Areas intentional or does it need to be added to the list?	See Comment 4778.
6660	Subsection a. states: "The agreed to Subcontracting Plan required by the clause is included as an attachment to the contract". Can the Government clarify if it intends to provide a Subcontracting Plan template as an attachment, or if it is referencing an approved Subcontracting Plan being incorporated into a Contract award?	See Comment 2207.
6665	Only socio-economic set asides, Hubzone, SDVOSB, EDWOSB, and 8a are required to showcase relevant work in at least two content representative areas for category b and c. Can VOSB also be included in this past performance requirement?	See Comment 1697.
6670	<p>page. 33 - Technical Area 1b: Enterprise-Wide Network Services</p> <p>"Manage a single end-to-end service provisioning organization that combines and streamlines LAN and WAN communications services for both corporate and mission networks. The enterprise model is to improve the planning and delivery of enterprise-wide IT services and to obtain cost efficiencies resulting from the consolidated delivery structure."</p> <p>Could Government specify the components and coverage of your LAN and WAN infrastructure?</p>	No, the SEWP contracts are utilized by the entire Federal Government which in turn utilizes a wide range of Infrastructures, technology, services, processes, etc. Specifics will be provided at the task order level.
6675	For LOA's, if receiving CLINs from OEM's that include other OEM's part numbers as second tier providers, does the prime require LOA's from the second tier OEM providers or only from first tier OEM provider?	Only provide the LOA from the designated providers. The maximum number of LOAs is 4. See Comment 1874.
6676	"In Category A and C, shall furnish the past performance for similar scope efforts with an average annual cost/fee incurred of \$500,000. " - This requirement contradicts the requirement stated in Section A.3.7.2, Past Performance Volume for Category A (\$150K). What is the minimum average annual cost/fee of the past performance reference for a small business submission for Category A?	See Comment 1709.

6677	<p>page 33 - Technical Area 2b: IT MANAGED SERVICES</p> <p>"Provide, manage, secure, and maintain IT services across the Agency/Enterprise including but not limited to: End-User Compute Device Management, End-User Software Management, Mobile Device Management, Print Device Management, Messaging /Collaboration, Infrastructure Services, Enterprise Service Desk (ESD), Local Service Desks, End-User Standards, and IT Security."</p> <p>Could Government provide an overview of the current IT infrastructure?</p>	See Comment 6670.
6680	<p>Will the Government consider removing the Year 1 and 2 contract value threshold restrictions for Category C Small Businesses? The RFP is structured in a way that allows Category C Small Businesses to demonstrate having the breadth and depth in experience, capabilities and infrastructure to propose, execute, and manage contracts of varying size, scope, and complexity. The threshold restrictions of \$2M in year one, and \$10M in year two penalize mature small businesses who have demonstrated in the response the ability to effectively propose and execute Task Orders greater than \$10M in awarded value. These restrictions limit the ability of small businesses to compete for work having potential value sufficient to provide an opportunity to achieve a return on investment for the investments made to propose as a prime at the BPA level. Will the Government consider removing the awarded contract value threshold restrictions for Category C Small Businesses?</p>	The Solicitation will remain as stated.
6685	<p>Page 112, A.3.7.3, (b)(1) v</p> <p>Please update the references to ISO 20243:2018. ISO replaced 20243 with new versions in 2023.</p>	The Solicitation has been updated to remove the reference to 2018.
6687	<p>"Category B, Small business project value minimum is \$5 Million and for HUBZone, VOSB, SDVOSB, WOSB, EDWOSB, 8a offerors, it is \$4 Million." - Will the government make all past performance value minimums \$4 Million?</p>	The Solicitation will remain as stated.
6688	<p>Page 112, A.3.7.3, (b)(1) v</p> <p>Are we supposed to submit Exhibit 5, Attachment J, or both as the C-SCRM Attestation Form?</p>	See Comment 3479.
6689	<p>page 33- Technical Area 4b: IT SERVICE MANAGEMENT "Enterprise-wide Standardization of IT Service Management (ITSM) refers to process, tools, and the way services are delivered to improve IT efficiency, effectiveness, customer experience, and reduce cost."</p> <p>What IT service management tools and platforms are currently in use within the agency?</p>	See Comment 6670.
6693	<p>Based on the RFP instructions, "Each Project must have had a minimum of \$30M in total value size of a single order or contract and must be described using the Exhibit 1 REP template." Will the government consider changing the value to \$25M?</p>	The Solicitation will remain as stated.

sewp6_rfp_all_comments

6696	EXHIBIT 2- PAST PERFORMANCE QUESTIONNAIRE, First paragraph - "The Offeror shall provide a questionnaire for each past performance reference submission and be submitted directly by the evaluator to Government Contracting Officer via email PastPerformance@sewp.nasa.gov. Sections 1-4 are to be completed by the Offeror and verified by the evaluator. Sections 5 and 6 are completed by the" - Can you please complete the last sentence?	See Comment 1804.
6699	The Exhibit 2 PPQ form does not function correctly. Will the government provide an updated form?	See Comment 1804.
6701	"Mandatory Experience Letter of Authorization (LOAs) is limited to 3 pages in the proposal response." - Can the page count for the LOAs be increased to 4 pages to accommodate the allowable 4 LOAs per A.3.7.1, page 101?	See comment 1957.
6703	Exhibit 1 REP instruction says may not exceed a total of three (3) pages. However, the form reduces font size rather than expands to second and third pages. Will the Government provide an updated version?	The Solicitation has been updated in an Amendment prior to Amendment 7.
6708	If we bid on the Small Business track of Category B and C, will we still be able to bid on WOSB opportunities if we meet that socioeconomic status?	See Comment 1881.
6711	"The UNSPSC codes must accurately match the proposed services/technology in each row and must be the full 8-digit UNSPSC code." Question: Would the Government clarify and provide instructions for completing the UNSPSC code in the, "Exhibit 3c- Category C Solutions Spreadsheet" tab Proposed Offering?	See Comment 2118.
6714	Question: Would the Government specifically clarify how offeror would identify the CLIN in column A of "Exhibit 3c- Category C Solutions Spreadsheet" tab, Proposed Offering? Question: Would the Government specifically clarify how the offeror would identify the Provider Part Number in column C of "Exhibit 3c- Category C Solutions Spreadsheet" tab, Proposed Offering? Question: Would the Government specifically clarify how the offer would identify the Description in column D of "Exhibit 3c- Category C Solutions Spreadsheet" tab, Proposed Offering, to identify Labor Category multiple levels such as Senior, Mid and Junior? Question: Would the Government specifically clarify how the offer would identify the SEWP Catalog Price in column F of "Exhibit 3c- Category C Solutions Spreadsheet" tab, Proposed Offering?	See Comment 2214.

6719	<p>"The offeror must provide relevant experience as it relates to the NAICS code being used for competition."</p> <p>Question: Would the Government clarify what needs to be provided for, "relevant experience as it relates to the NAICS code being used for competition". Do we need to provide contract documentation?</p>	See Comment 2092.
6720	<p>Under the Category B heading (pg 103-4), for Small Business states that two different REPs from mandatory experience technical areas shall be submitted. For 8a offerors, it states that two different REPs for EACH of the mandatory technical areas be submitted. Please clarify for both Small Business and 8a offerors if the requirement is to respond to different mandatory experience areas or to each of the mandatory technical areas.</p>	The Solicitation has been updated to clarify the instructions.
6721	<p>page 34 - Technical Area 6b: ENTERPRISE-WIDE INFORMATION AND DATA ANALYTICS SERVICES (IDAS) "The Information and Data Analytics team is a virtually distributed, hybrid team of analysts, data scientists, developers, and technologists working together across an agency to rapidly prototype, develop and deploy solutions to address the most pressing analytic challenges."</p> <p>What is the analytic tool currently used enterprise-wide?</p>	See Comment 6670.
6722	<p>On pages 101, the solicitation states there shall be an LOA for each different designated provider for a maximum of four (4) LOAs. On page 102, the solicitation explains a minimum of one (1) additional provider must be proposed with relevant offerings in each of the proposed four Technical Area. The additional providers do not need to be from the list provided in Enclosure 1 and the contact information is not needed. Is there a limit to how many additional providers an offeror can propose in the four Technical Areas? Also confirming LOAs are NOT required for the additional providers?</p>	See Comment 5061. LOAs are not required for secondary providers.
6729	<p>"Post award, the RFP process within each of the categories and ability to respond based on business classification (small, HUBZone, SDVOSB, etc...)." - Assuming we are a small business that has multiple designations (HUBZone, SDVOSB, WOSB, etc...), will we be able to bid on every RFP, to include large?</p>	See Comment 1881.
6731	<p>Question: For the CMMI requirement for Small Business offerors, what is meant by "certification approval"? How far along in the CMMI certification process do we need to be by the time of proposal submission?</p>	See Comment 2646.
6732	<p>Reference SF 1449 Block 8 (Proposals due). Given the shrinking amount of time to analyze and react to answers to questions, adapt to future Amendments, and the intervention of the Independence Day holiday right before the current submission deadline, we hereby respectfully request an extension of the date proposals are due to August 2, 2024.</p>	The Comment is out of date.

sewp6_rfp_all_comments

6736	Just to verify, if we can use providers that are not in the list of designated providers for the "other" 50 CLINs required? Kindly advise.	See Comment 6216.
6738	<p>page 34 - Technical Area 7b: ENTERPRISE-WIDE APPLICATION SERVICES/SOFTWARE DEVELOPMENT "Perform assessment, planning, design, development, testing, integration, administration, maintenance, operational support, decommission, and documentation for new and existing applications defined at the order level for Agency/Enterprise-wide Applications."</p> <p>What technologies, platforms, and tools are currently in use for desktop, server, web, cloud, and mobile application development and support?</p>	See Comment 6670.
6740	Reference A.3.7.1 (Page 101). Please confirm or clarify that offerors are required to submit a single LOA for a provider (OEM) for each of the four Technical Areas in Category A or is the Government looking for multiple LOAs for each Technical Area if the offeror has them?	See Comment 1874.
6746	Page 42, section A.1.10 states an order minimum of \$25. With inflation and increased shipping costs in mind, has NASA considered an increased order minimum? We suggest a minimum order requirement of \$100, which will allow offerors to provide more competitive pricing without risk of taking a loss on small orders.	The Solicitation will remain as stated.
6749	<p>page 34 - Technical Area 8b: ENTERPRISE-WIDE CYBERSECURITY SERVICES "Cybersecurity standards, architecture and engineering include assisting in designing and developing cybersecurity architecture and engineering in order to improve an Agency's cybersecurity posture, take advantage of modern technologies such as cloud, meet Federal requirements, and enhance the user experience."</p> <p>Could Government provide details of the current cybersecurity infrastructure and practices?</p>	See Comment 6670.
6750	For category A, RFP page 101 should the RFP state "any of the four", instead of what it currently states which is "each of the four"?	The Solicitation has been updated in an Amendment prior to Amendment 7.
6752	<p>page 35 - Technical Area 10b: ENTERPRISE-WIDE DIGITAL MULTIMEDIA AND TECHNICAL COMMUNICATIONS SERVICES</p> <p>"This category includes but is not limited to: Agency-wide Television and Broadcasting services; Agency web site and social media operations; digital communications; institutional audiovisual support; publishing support; and foundational work in graphic, visual, electronic and broadcast arts."</p> <p>What are the main challenges or gaps that Government is currently facing in terms of multimedia and communication services?</p>	See Comment 6670.
6754	Can the government clarify the fields that are to be completed on Exhibit 3c – Category C Solutions Spreadsheet if we are only proposing labor categories for services?	See Comment 2214.

6755	<p>page 35 - Technical Area 11b: PROGRAM MANAGEMENT/ANCILLARY SERVICES AND SUPPLIES "The Contractor may provide ancillary support as necessary to offer an IT services-based solution."</p> <p>Are there any preference for tools and technologies that are typically required as part of ancillary support?</p>	See Comment 6670.
6756	<p>Per the instructions for Exhibit 3c - Category C Solutions Spreadsheet, UNSPSC codes must accurately match the proposed services/technology in each row and must be the full 8-digit UNSPSC code. The RFP states, "A full list of all currently identified in-scope UNSPSC codes for in-scope offerings is found in Attachment C, SEWP Contract Holder User Manual." Upon review of Attachment C a list of in-scope UNSPSC codes is not listed, can the government please provide?</p>	See Comment 2395.
6757	<p>If a Offeror is a Small Business under one of the NAICs in the crosswalk, but NOT under 541512 or 541519, can they submit as a Small Business if their Mandatory Experience and Past Performance match the larger NAICS code, for example 517111?</p>	See Comment 2949.
6759	<p>page 36 - Technical Area 3c: APPLICATION SERVICES/SOFTWARE DEVELOPMENT "Perform assessment, planning, design, development, testing, integration, administration, maintenance, operational support, decommission, and documentation for new and existing applications defined at the order level for Mission specific Applications."</p> <p>Could Government provide the approximate number of mission specific applications that need to be considered here?</p>	See Comment 6670.
6761	<p>pages 36 & 37 - Technical Area 4c: CYBERSECURITY SERVICES "Cybersecurity standards, architecture, and engineering include assisting in designing and developing cybersecurity architecture and engineering taking advantage of modern technologies such as the cloud, meeting Federal requirements, and enhancing the user experience."</p> <p>What are the main challenges that Government currently face with the existing cybersecurity setup?</p>	See Comment 6670.
6763	<p>page 37 - Technical Area 7c: IT OPERATIONS AND MAINTENANCE / HELP DESK/CALL CENTER SUPPORT "Support the operation and maintenance of IT systems. Operations and maintenance on IT systems include all software and hardware associated with mainframes, client/server, web-based applications, XYZ-as-a-Service, virtual desktop infrastructure, and networking."</p> <p>Does Government prefer onsite or remote support for IT operations and maintenance tasks?</p>	See Comment 6670.
6765	<p>page 38 - Technical Area 9c: DATABASE SERVICES "Manage database applications and services including database administration, Database Management System (DBMS) software, and associated database tools both on-premises and in the cloud."</p> <p>Could Government provide details of the current database environment?</p>	See Comment 6670.

sewp6_rfp_all_comments

6767	In Section 4.3, "VOSB" is not included the list of socio economic groups required to provide 2 past performance references, however in section 3.7.1 "VOSB's" are included in this group. Please clarify if "VOSBs" are only required to provide past performance references showcasing at least 2 content representative areas for categories B and C.	See Comment 1697.
6775	Please add more manufacturers to your list like LG, Veeam, Blackberry, Getac, BeyondTrust, Symantec etc.	See Comment 5655.
6786	Regarding A.1.29 DELIVERY AND OTHER CHARGES: Is this all CONUS or will it go OCONUS?	See Comment 2319.