

Q#	RFP DOC	SEC	RFP LANGUAGE REFERENCE	QUESTION(S)	GOV RESPONSE(S)
1	Attachment 1 - PWS	6.2	The Government will evaluate the Contractor's performance under this contract in accordance with (IAW) the Quality Assurance Surveillance Plan.	When will QASP be provided?	QASP are GOV only (internal) document that use contract/order Performance Requirement Summary (PRS) standards for evaluation. PRS are provided to Contractor as part of a award/contract/order.
2	Attachment 1 - PWS	6.6	Type of Contract: The Government will award a Firm Fixed Price/Cost Plus Fixed Fee/Cost Reimbursable contract.	Is there an expected % of solicited FFP vs. Cost Plus vs. Cost Reimbursable under the MDoDs Pool Contract?	No set %; contract/CLIN type is based on the individual requirement (i.e. future IDIQ task orders).
3	Attachment 1 - PWS	7.28	All Contractor employees shall complete Level I OPSEC training within 30 calendar days of their reporting for duty.	Will the Government provide the required OPSEC training?	Yes; when required by (future) task orders, GOV required training will be provided.
4	Attachment 1 - PWS	11.1.1.3	XML Data Transfer Standards	Are there specific document standards or formats required for technical deliverables beyond what is specified in the solicitation, especially for XML data transfers?	RFP Section 11.1.1.3 applies to FAR required Service Contract Reporting requirements (only). All/any (future) task order deliverables and details related to, will be provided at the time of that required (via solicitation / order award).
5	Attachment 1 - PWS	11.1.1.6	Monthly Status Report Frequency	Would the Government please clarify if the Monthly Status Report should be submitted on the first of the month following the reporting period or at the end of the reporting month?	Deliverables will be provided at the task order level.
6	Attachment 1 - PWS	11.1.2.2	TO Project Kick-Off Meeting Agenda	Are there any specified formats or templates for the TO Project Kick-Off Meeting Agenda, or can the contractor propose its own format?	Details related to will be provided at the task order level.
7	Attachment 1 - PWS	11.1.2.3	OCONUS Travel Frequency and Support	Would the Government elaborate on the expected travel frequency and Government-provided logistical support for OCONUS tasks?	Details related to OCONUS work will be provided at the task order level, as applicable.
8	Attachment 1 - PWS	11.1.8.5	The Contractor shall draft and provide a Project Kick-Off Meeting Minutes Report documenting the Project Kick-Off Meeting discussion and capturing any action items. Following the Project Kick-Off Meeting, the Contractor shall provide the Final TDP to the COR for review and approval in accordance with Section E.	The section references a Section E, can the Government point Offerors to this Section or whether it will be provided on a Task Order level?	Refer to Section E of the RFP (Section E - Inspection & Acceptance)
9	Attachment 1 - PWS	11.1.8.6	Deliverable: Draft Technical Direction Letter	Is it the Government's intention for the deliverable to be the Technical Direction Plan as referenced in 11.1.8.1?	Details related to will be provided at the task order level.
10	Attachment 1 - PWS	7.15.2.	Costs for travel, subsistence, and lodging shall be reimbursed to the Contractor only to the extent that it is necessary and authorized for performance of the work under this SOW.	Please clarify if the SOW as referenced refers to the PWS or if there is a separate document.	PWS Section refer to overall MATOC SOW. Individual requirement SOW (via PWS) will be provided at the task order level.
11	Attachment 1 - PWS	8.1.7	Contractor personnel that are evaluated in a source selection process and that may be required to be used in the performance of a contract by the Key Personnel listed in the PWS.	Section 7.12. lists Key Personnel as N/A. Can the Government clarify if the key personnel referenced are as listed within the solicitation document or if there are no key personnel at the contract vehicle level?	Section 8 are definitions only. KP requirements for (future) task orders at clarified at that time/task order request (TOR).
12	Attachment 3 - Price/Rates	-	Labor Rate Table	For roles that are not full-time equivalents (FTEs) or may fall under ODC-funded positions (e.g., Surge support, SMEs), should Offerors still propose annual rates for these labor categories?	Offerors are requested to submit FTE labor rates IAW the solicitation and attachments.
13	Attachment 3 - Price/Rates	-	Formulas, Column H and onwards	The formulas in the Government's template for out-year ceiling rates are not rounding to the nearest cent, as required in Section L.11.3. if the Government would like the out-year rates rounded to the nearest cent, should bidders change the template or will the Government issue an updated one?	Government has verified that RFP Attachment 3 is rounding to two places for rates and labor (columns C through P on both tabs) and is consistent with RFP Section L.11.3.
14	Attachment 3 - Price/Rates	-	Labor Categories	The Labor Categories in Attachment 3 Price Labor Rates Template do not match those in Exhibit 2 Labor Categories and Definitions. Please explain the discrepancy and the purpose of both lists of labor categories in the context of the positions described in the solicitation on pp. 21-23. Furthermore, please provide the mapping of the MATOC positions to the relevant Labor Categories.	The Government will not provide a mapping/crosswalk.
15	Attachment 3 - Price/Rates	-	Loaded Labor Rates	What is the purpose for requesting ceiling loaded labor rates, in the context of Cost Reimbursement task orders, where the Government will reimburse Contractors for their actual incurred costs plus potentially a fixed fee - which is by CLIN or for the entire award, but not by individual position? Loaded labor rates would be relevant to T&M task orders.	PRISM requires fully burdened ceiling rates.
16	Attachment 3 - Price/Rates	-	Loaded Labor Rates	Will the loaded rates have any bearing on Fixed Price task orders?	PRISM requires fully burdened ceiling rates.
17	Attachment 7 - MATOC Labor	-	SOC Identifier & LCAT	Will the Government provide guidance or a crosswalk on how proposed labor categories should map to the standardized LCATs in Attachment 7? Specifically, can Offerors rename titles if they clearly map to the functional description?	The Government will not provide a mapping/crosswalk.
18	Other - General	-	-	Given the new Administration's direction to reduce services contracts and centralize contracting operations under GSA, is it reasonable to assume that a significant level of work will be moved to this vehicle?	Applicable E.O. or OPM directives/guidance regarding centralization contracting functions is not related to GSA's Assisted Acquisition Services (AAS). PRISM is a AAS support vehicle for applicable Defense Departments and Directors.
19	RFP	H.8.1.	Acceptable Accounting System	Would the Government provide more detail on what constitutes "current status" for the Acceptable Accounting System updates to ensure compliance?	As stated in RFP Section H.8.1, "If a contractor does not have an acceptable accounting system at the time of proposal submission, the contractor must pass a pre-award survey audit before an award can be made. Additionally, once the pre-award survey is passed, the contractor must go through a full DCAA system audit that results in a DCMA approved accounting system. In the event that a pre-award survey is not passed, the next HTRO-RP contractor will be selected."
20	RFP	B	B.3.4 Subcontracting	Would the Government consider removing the B.3.4 Subcontracting section requiring a Subcontracting Plan given that awards will only be made to Small Business prime contractors and that is covered sufficiently in section G.3.1?	While this PRISM MDoDS on-boarding is for small businesses only, the MDoDS Pool contains both OTSBs and SBs. As resulting awards will contain RFP language, section shall remain and only apply as applicable.
21	RFP	B	NAICS: 541715 for Business Size, but all three NAICS (541715, 541611, 541330) will apply to this Pool at the task order level.	Can the Government explain the selection of 541715 for its primary SB NAICS, as opposed to 541611 for the LB competition?	This is the structure established under PRISM.
22	RFP	B.1	This will be a Small Business on-ramp to the MDoDS Pool of the Multiple Award Task Order Contract (MATOC) to supply enterprise solutions to enhance P&R capabilities that will enable soldiers and strategic partners to increase readiness and meet mission requirements through more efficient collaboration and integration.	Can the Government please clarify whether small business base contracts will be awarded within the P&R Pool from this solicitation? If so, how many base contracts does the Government anticipate awarding to small businesses within the P&R Pool?	Selected SBs will be awarded a Multiple Award Task Order Contract (MATOC), which is a type of Indefinite-Quantity Contract awarded to more than one Offeror. Refer to Federal Acquisition Regulations Subpart 16.5 for further explanation.
23	RFP	B.1.5	Task Order and Contract Ceiling	What safeguards will be in place to prevent task order awards that exceed the \$400M individual ceiling or cause over-obligation of the \$1.8B MATOC cap?	The Government monitors this information internally.
24	RFP	B.2	ODC Proposal Requirements	Will ODCs such as travel and materials be proposed and reimbursed per a standardized structure or task-order specific instructions?	ODCs are clarified at the (future) task order level.
25	RFP	G.2.3.2	PCPM Hours	Is the 480 hours per year allocated for the PCPM a firm funded amount or a reimbursable ceiling across task orders?	A reimbursable ceiling across active task orders.
26	RFP	G.2.3.3.	"Substitute Key Personnel qualifications shall be equal to, or greater than, those of the Key Personnel substituted. If the AAS CO and the AAS COR determine that a proposed substitute Key Personnel is unacceptable, or that the reduction of effort would be so substantial as to impair the successful performance of the work under the TO, the contractor may be subject to default action as prescribed by FAR 52.249-6 (for Cost Reimbursement) or FAR 52.249-8 (for Fixed-Price Supply and Service)."	Would the Government modify the requirement to allow for the replacement of Key Personnel in accordance with an established set of minimum qualifications, which can be quantified, rather than the subjective opinion of the CO and COR.	The Government will not modify the requirement.

Q#	RFP DOC	SEC	RFP LANGUAGE REFERENCE	QUESTION(S)	GOV RESPONSE(S)
27	RFP	G.2.3.3.	"Substitute Key Personnel qualifications shall be equal to, or greater than, those of the Key Personnel substituted."	Please modify the referenced requirement to allow for the replacement of Key Personnel in accordance with an established set of minimum qualifications, rather than comparison to the previous employee, since the current language can discourage bidders from offering stellar Key Personnel, as they would have to replace them with someone progressively better as they retire or leave employment due to reasons outside of the Contractor's control. The language as written penalizes Contractors which provide the top Key Personnel candidates up front (e.g., someone with a PhD and 30 years of experience - if vacant, this position would then have to be filled with someone with a PhD and 31+ years of experience, and then 32+ years, and so on - versus a contractor who starts with a Key Personnel with a Bachelor's and 8 years of experience, for example - and can much more easily find replacements as the positions are vacated). The replacement should be judged against a baseline for that position rather than the last employee who filled that position.	This is the structure established under PRISM.
28	RFP	G.2.3.4.	"a. Information Assurance (Jr., or Journeyman)... "	Can the Government please map the MATOC positions provided in section G.2.3.4. Minimum Requirements for Non-Key Personnel to the Labor Categories provided in Exhibit 2_Labor Categories and Definitions, as well as to those provided in Attachment 3 Price Labor Rates Template?	The Government will not provide a mapping/crosswalk.
29	RFP	G.3.1	Teaming Commitment Letters	Can the Government confirm whether Teaming Commitment Letters (TCLs) are mandatory when using subcontractor experience or key personnel?	As a small business, this section of the MDoDS solicitation / requirement would not be applicable.
30	RFP	G.3.1	Subcontracting Plan Goals	Will subcontracting goals be monitored at the task order level, or only at the MATOC contract level?	As a small business, this section of the MDoDS solicitation / requirement would not be applicable.
31	RFP	G.3.1.	"The Contractor shall submit Individual Subcontract Reports (ISR) or SF 294 Report for Individual Subcontracting Plans, if applicable at the task order level. Contractors are required to adhere to their Subcontracting Plan, incorporated into the basic contract by reference. When a Contractor does not meet any one or more of their Subcontracting Goals for a given reporting period, the Contractor shall explain, in writing, the rationale for not meeting the goals in the comments section of the ISR or SF 294."	Please confirm that none of the language in Section G.3.1. Subcontracting Plan applies to small business bidders, and that small businesses don't have to submit any subcontracting plans or reports.	As a small business, this section of the MDoDS solicitation / requirement would not be applicable.
32	RFP	G.3.1.	Subcontracting Plan Requirement	Given that this on-ramping opportunity is a small business set-aside, can the Government clarify why a subcontracting plan is required? Per FAR 19.702, small business concerns are typically exempt from this requirement. Please confirm whether small business Offerors must submit a subcontracting plan for this solicitation.	As a small business, this section of the MDoDS solicitation / requirement would not be applicable.
33	RFP	G.3.1.	Small Business Participation	Can the Government please confirm that the Small Business (SB) subcontracting goal does not apply to SBs that are serving as prime contractors? Specifically, we are Refer toking clarification on whether a SB prime is allowed to subcontract up to 49% of the work to a Large Business.	As a small business, this section of the MDoDS solicitation / requirement would not be applicable.
34	RFP	G.3.1.	Subcontracting Plans are not required for small business concerns.	Page 24 states that subcontracting plans are not required of small businesses. Given that the entire competition is for small business Offerors, is Volume III, Tab D Small Business Participation Plan still a requirement?	As a small business, this section of the MDoDS solicitation / requirement would not be applicable.
35	RFP	H	H.8.1 Acceptable Accounting System	As a Tribal 8(a) organization, the entity operates under an approved and audited accounting from a sister company. The system was reviewed by the Defense Contract Management Agency (DCMA) and deemed acceptable in accordance with DFARS 252.242-7006 . This system ensures proper segregation, identification, accumulation, and allocation of direct and indirect costs for cost-reimbursement task orders and supports audit readiness. All sister companies under the same tribal ownership utilize this approved accounting system to maintain audited records, leveraging shared infrastructure and financial capabilities to support cost-reimbursable contracts and meet federal compliance standards. Can the Government confirm if this is acceptable for the validation of an approved accounting system?	Yes, if this in accordance with DCAA and DCMA issued guidance regarding joint ventures and the use of existing approved accounting systems.
36	RFP	H.11	Limitations on Subcontracting	As a Small Business Prime, is teaming restricted only to other Small Businesses, or may a Small Business team with a Large Business as well?	RFP Section H.11 deals with subcontracts under (future) task orders. Subcontracts may be with large or SB as long as in compliance with PRISM MATOC and TO terms and conditions.
37	RFP	H.12.	Prime to Prime Partnering	To enhance small business participation and promote access to a broader talent Pool, will the Government consider restricting large business PRISM MATOC primes from subcontracting or teaming with small businesses for this on-ramp? Such a restriction would help ensure more equitable opportunities for new small business entrants.	The Government will not modify the requirement.
38	RFP	H.3.1	FAR 19.503 Small Business Reservations	The solicitation references both three (3) reserved base contracts and two (2) Small Business awards for the MDoDS Pool. Can the Government clarify the actual number of base contract awards reserved for Small Businesses in the MDoDS Pool, and how many Small Business on-ramp awards will be made under this solicitation?	As stated in RFP Section M.3.1. The MDoDS Pool will award two (2) Small Businesses with base contracts under the PRISM MATOC
39	RFP	H.3.1	Pursuant to FAR 19.503 the Government has reserved base contract awards for small businesses within each of the two MATOC pools; three (3) base contracts are reserved for the MDoDS Pool.	Can the Government please clarify whether they anticipate or will consider awarding more than the three reserved base contracts to small businesses within the MDoDs Pool?	As stated in RFP Section M.3.1. The MDoDS Pool will award two (2) Small Businesses with base contracts under the PRISM MATOC
40	RFP	H.3.1	Pursuant to FAR 19.503 the Government has reserved base contract awards for small businesses within each of the two MATOC pools; three (3) base contracts are reserved for the MDoDS Pool.	Can the Government please clarify whether additional on-ramping opportunities will be available for small businesses within the MDoDs Pool over the life of the contract?	Potential Offerors are directed to reread RFP Section H.4 regarding on-ramping.
41	RFP	H.3.1 & M.3.2	H.3.1:Pursuant to FAR 19.503 the Government has reserved base contract awards for small businesses within each of the two MATOC pools; three (3) base contracts are reserved for the MDoDS Pool.  M.3.2: The Government will then move to the next highest technically rated Offeror to determine a fair and reasonable price. The evaluation process will continue this cycle until the top 2 for the MDoDS apparent successful Offerors are identified that represent the Highest Technically Rated Offerors with a Reasonable Prices. The Offerors within the Pool will also be ranked for the purpose of determining if there is a tie at the position of number 3 respectively. If there is a tie, all Offerors tied for this position shall receive a contract award.	If 2-3 awards are correct, can the Government explain why it intends to award so few contracts relative to the number of large business awards? Does the Government expect additional on-ramps expanding competition?	No, not at this time.

Q#	RFP DOC	SEC	RFP LANGUAGE REFERENCE	QUESTION(S)	GOV RESPONSE(S)
42	RFP	H.3.1 & M.3.2	H.3.1:Pursuant to FAR 19.503 the Government has reserved base contract awards for small businesses within each of the two MATOC pools; three (3) base contracts are reserved for the MDoDS Pool.  M.3.2: The Government will then move to the next highest technically rated Offeror to determine a fair and reasonable price. The evaluation process will continue this cycle until the top 2 for the MDoDS apparent successful Offerors are identified that represent the Highest Technically Rated Offerors with a Reasonable Prices. The Offerors within the Pool will also be ranked for the purpose of determining if there is a tie at the position of number 3 respectively. If there is a tie, all Offerors tied for this position shall receive a contract award.	Page 28 indicates 3 base contract awards. Page 110 indicates 2 potential awards. Can the Government please clarify which is correct?	Reference sentence in H.3.1 refers to all Small Business (SB) contracts in MDoDS Pool (one SB already holds an PRISM MATOC-MDoDS pool) and the other sentence in M.3.1 refers to number of SB awards for this RFP MDoDS Pool on-boarding process.
43	RFP	H.3.1. and M.3.1.	Three (3) base contracts are reserve (H.3.1.) vs Top 2 SB for MDoDS (M.3.1.)	There Refer toms to be a discrepancy between the number of potential awardees referenced on pages 28 and 110. How may SB awardees will be on-ramped? 2 or 3?	Reference sentence in H.3.1 refers to all Small Business (SB) contracts in MDoDS Pool (one SB already holds an PRISM MATOC-MDoDS pool) and the other sentence in M.3.1 refers to number of SB awards for this RFP MDoDS Pool on-boarding process.
44	RFP	H.4.2	Vertical On-Ramping	Can the Government clarify whether small businesses that outgrow their size status may vertically on-ramp into the MDoDS Pool without re-competing in an open season?	The Government would encourage potential Offerors to closely reread RFP Section H.4.2.
45	RFP	H.6	TDL Requirements	Will the Government provide a standardized template or process for Technical Direction Letters (TDLs) across task orders?	If (future) task orders contain TDLs, the individual task order request (TOR) solicitation will include applicable information and templates.
46	RFP	H.8.1	Accounting System Audit	Please clarify if the acceptable accounting system requirement includes a specific timeframe for audit completion relative to the proposal submission date.	The Government would encourage potential Offerors to closely reread RFP Section H.8.1.
47	RFP	H.8.1.	Acceptable Accounting System	To avoid limiting competition, will the Government accept a completed SF 1408 from an independent CPA in lieu of a formal DCAA-approved accounting system?	The Government would encourage potential Offerors to closely reread RFP Section H.8.1.
48	RFP	H.8.7	Teaming Commitment Letters	Can the Government confirm whether TCLs are also required if the subcontractor is not providing corporate experience, past performance, or Key Personnel (e.g., providing specialized technical support only)?	The Government would encourage potential Offerors to closely reread RFP Section H.8.7.
49	RFP	H.8.7	Large Business Subcontractors	Can a Small Business prime leverage the past performance and corporate experience of a Large Business subcontractor under this on-ramp, provided a valid TCL is submitted?	The Government would encourage potential Offerors to closely reread RFP Section H.8.7 and H.12. Nothing in the RFP would prevent this arrangement as long as all RFP terms and conditions are met.
50	RFP	H.8.7	Commitment Duration	For the required commitment period (base + one option year), does this apply only at the MATOC award level, or also extend to every Task Order competed under the Pool?	The Government would encourage potential Offerors to closely reread RFP Section H.8.7 and H.4.4.
51	RFP	H.8.7	Contractor Teaming Arrangement (CTA)	Can the Government define what constitutes a CTA under this solicitation and how it differs from a traditional Prime -Subcontractor teaming arrangement?	The Government would encourage potential Offerors to closely reread RFP Section H.8.7 and FAR Subpart 9.6.
52	RFP	H.9	SOFA and Deployment Support	Will the Government assist contractors in securing SOFA/TESA status and support required pre-deployment authorizations for OCONUS task orders?	The Government would encourage potential Offerors to closely reread RFP Sections H.9 ammd B.3.1.
53	RFP	H.9.2	Facility Clearance	Will any minimum Facility Clearance Level (FCL) be required for the base award, or will it be defined at the task order level only?	There is no Facility Clearance requirement at the MATOC level; security/clearance requirements are established at task order level.
54	RFP	H.9.2	DD254/Special Access	Will the Government provide a sample DD254 to help contractors understand the scope of likely clearance levels required (e.g., TS/SCI, SI, JWICS)?	PRISM MATOC security requirements are established at the task order level. As such, no sample DD254 was included with this RFP.
55	RFP	H.9.2	Facility Clearance	What is the Facility Clearance requirement for this MATOC? Are clearances required at the MATOC award stage, or only at the Task Order level?	There is no Facility Clearance requirement at the MATOC level; security/clearance requirements are established at task order level.
56	RFP	H.9.2	Facility Clearance for JV	If Top Secret clearance is required, can a Joint Venture member's Top Secret clearance suffice for the JV Small Business Prime Offeror?	There is no Facility Clearance requirement at the MATOC level; security/clearance requirements are established at task order level.
57	RFP	H.9.2.	Facility Clearance Level	For a joint venture (JV), will the Government consider the JV eligible to bid on a task order if only one of the member organizations possesses the required Facility Clearance Level (FCL)?	There is no Facility Clearance requirement at the MATOC level; security/clearance requirements are established at task order level.
58	RFP	H.9.2.	Facility Clearance Level	For a JV or prime contractor whose Facility Clearance Level (FCL) is currently in process, must the clearance be active at the time of task order proposal submission, or is it sufficient for the FCL to be in place by the time of award?	There is no Facility Clearance requirement at the MATOC level; security/clearance requirements are established at task order level.
59	RFP	K	Prohibition on Contracting with Inverted Domestic Corporations. (1)Government agencies are not permitted to use appropriated (or otherwise made available) funds for contracts with either an inverted domestic corporation, or a subsidiary of an inverted domestic corporation, unless the exception at 9.108-2(b) applies or the requirement is waived in accordance with the procedures at 9.108-4.	Can the Offshore partner be used in the CTA? Offshore means those contractors who operate outside the geographical location of the US.	Determined at the task order level.
60	RFP	L	L5 Formatting	Can the Government confirm whether title pages and table of contents pages are excluded from the five-page limit for plan documentation, as referenced in Section L.5?	The cover pages and tables of contents do not count toward the page limitations.
61	RFP	L	H.8.7	Are Teaming Subcontractors able to provide MATOC Key Personnel as part of their five (5) required "Factor 2 KPs"?	Refer to the relevant solicitation section.
62	RFP	L	L.4.1 SB OnRamping	Is this On-Ramp only for MDoDS Pool and not P&R Pool?	This on-ramp is only for the MDoDS Pool.
63	RFP	L	L.4.6 Proposal Due Date	Is the due date 20 Aug 2025 as there was a box around 20 with lines through it?	The due date for responses is 20 Aug 2025, at 5:00pm, Central.
64	RFP	L	L.4.6 Proposal Due Date	Request to add additional minimum 2 weeks after the Government responses to all Offerors questions and/or to extend the proposal to 3 Sep 2025 to give the Offeror to incorporate RFP changes.	At this time the proposal due date will not be extended.
65	RFP	L	Proposal Due Date	Will the Government extend the proposal due date to August 29th to provide a similar response time to the previous MDODS solicitation?	At this time the proposal due date will not be extended.
66	RFP	L	L.5 Proposal Format vs. L.6.1	For the MDoDS Pool what format do we use L.5 or L.6.1 (Pg 102)?	The Government would encourage potential Offerors to closely reread RFP Section L.5 and L.6
67	RFP	L	L.5 Proposal Format vs. L.6.1	Does the Offeror integrate Factors 1 through 6 into the format in section L.5.1? If yes, then specify the integrated format that integrates section L.5.1 and section L6.1.	The Government would encourage potential Offerors to closely reread RFP Section L.5 and L.6.
68	RFP	L	L.6 Tab A 4.	What are you looking for "4. A list of the proposal package contents besides stating the 6 Volumes?	Potential Offerors are encourage to bid it as they understand (RFP).
69	RFP	L	L.6 Tabs A through D	For Volume 1 does all the Tabs need to be in one file?	Potential Offerors are encourage to bid it as they understand (RFP).
70	RFP	L	L.6.1 MDoDS Submission	For MDODS Submission, does the Offeror submit the other volumes? What is the Volume that all the MDoDS Factors 1 through 6 go into? What is the name of the file?	Volumes are the same for both Pools.
71	RFP	L	L.6.2	Specify where does section L.6.1 where does factors 1 through 6 go into the 6 volumes filenames in section L.6.2.	Potential Offerors are encourage to bid it as they understand (RFP).

Q#	RFP DOC	SEC	RFP LANGUAGE REFERENCE	QUESTION(S)	GOV RESPONSE(S)
72	RFP	L	L.7	Does the Offeror include their teammates' (subcontractors') Section K Reps and Certs in Volume 2 Tab A?	Potential Offerors are encourage to bid it as they understand (RFP).
73	RFP	L	L.7	Does the Offeror include their subcontractors' information in Volume 2 Tab B if the prime and subcontractor was created for this specific solicitation and there was no prior existing relationship?	Refer to Section L.7
74	RFP	L	L.7	Does the Offeror have their subcontractor completed the GSA 527 and does the Offeror submit that in Volume 2 Tab C?	The Government does not have privity of contract with subcontractors.
75	RFP	L	L.8	Are there specific requirements and a template for the Corporate Experience Volume 3 Tab C?	No, there are none.
76	RFP	L	L.8	What is the minimum and maximum number of Corporate Experience submitted in Volume Tab C?	Per Section M.3.7. Up to five (5) CE submissions can be submitted per Funcional Area. Each submission must be limited to 2 pages max.
77	RFP	L	L.8	What is the contract dollar size, PoP requirements, NAICS Code required for the Corporate Experience for Volume Tab C?	Per section M.3.7...."Corporate Experience will be evaluated to determine if the offeror has the necessary relevant experience in professional services to meet the demands of a MATOC of this size and complexity."
78	RFP	L	L.8	Are there specific requirements/guidance for items to be included Technical Approach Tab A for Volume 3?	Refer to the relevant "M" section.
79	RFP	L	L.8	What are the key personnel required for Volume 3 Tab B?	Refer to the relevant "M" section.
80	RFP	L	L.9	Does have to submit PPQ if they have a current CPARS to determine project performance?	Potential Offerors are encourage to bid it as they understand (RFP).
81	RFP	L	Small Business subcontracting plan	In the Solicitation, Section G.3.1. Subcontracting Plan (Submit Plan in Section M), Page 24, it states "Subcontracting Plans are not required for small business concerns." However, the Solicitation Subfactor 4: Small Business Participation (Tab A4), Page 116, also states that "All offerors (both large and small businesses) are required to submit a Small Business Participation Plan for evaluation of the level of proposed participation of U.S. small businesses in the performance of this acquisition (as small business prime offerors or small business subcontractors) relative to the objectives and goals established herein. Please clarify if Small Businesses have to submit a Small Business Participation Plan.	A "Subcontracting Plan" is different than a "Participation Plan."
82	RFP	L	L.5 Proposal Format vs. L.6.1 vs. L.8	For the MDoDS Pool do we follow L.8 Volume 3 Technical Proposal?	Volumes are the same for both Pools.
83	RFP	L.10	Tab A	Can we submit a proposal without DCAA approval, with the intention of bidding only on Firm-Fixed-Price task orders if awarded?	No, this is not how PRISM RFP is structured.
84	RFP	L.11.2.	Price Narrative Attachment (Include with Tab A). Caution: Offerors are strongly advised to provide clear and convincing rationale to support indirect rates not generated from their acceptable accounting system, otherwise the proposed indirect rate may not be considered fair and reasonable, and the Offeror may not be eligible for award regardless of the technical score.	It is unclear if the solicitation requirement deems Government-issued documents such as an Approved Billing Rates letter as sufficient rationale to support indirect rates for this proposal.	If you have "Government-issued documents" allowing for the use of "indirect rates not generated from" your "acceptable accounting systems," submit it for review.
85	RFP	L.4.1.	"Proposal submissions shall not be locked, encrypted, or otherwise contain barriers to opening."	There are some documents which the Government designated as CUI (such as Forward Pricing Letters), and it is required to password-protect such documents. Please confirm whether bidders must use standard CUI procedures when submitting Government-issued CUI files.	Refer to the relevant solicitation section.
86	RFP	L.4.3.	All the evaluation elements that an Offeror is submitting a proposal for and taking credit for in accordance with Volumes 1 through 6, must be in the Offeror's name as submitted in Block 15A on the Standard Form (SF) 33, Solicitation, Offer and Award, with a corresponding CAGE Code and UEI Number in the CCR and/or SAM.GOV that matches the Offeror name on the SF 33, Block 15A.	Can the Government confirm that evaluation items (corporate experiences, past performance, key personnel, etc.) of partners that are within the requirements and limitations of the solicitation instructions are exempt from this requirement?	Potential Offerors are encourage to bid it as they understand (RFP).
87	RFP	L.4.3.	All the evaluation elements that an Offeror is submitting a proposal for and taking credit for in accordance with Volumes 1 through 6, must be in the Offeror's name as submitted in Block 15A on the Standard Form (SF) 33, Solicitation, Offer and Award, with a corresponding CAGE Code and UEI Number in the CCR and/or SAM.GOV that matches the Offeror name on the SF 33, Block 15A.	Would the Government allow an Offeror to claim evaluation items such as an Acceptable Accounting system, Corporate Experience, and/or Past Performance through Meaningful Relationships within their corporate structure?	Refer to the relevant solicitation sections.
88	RFP	L.4.6.	Proposal Due Date – Proposals shall be submitted no later than 20 August 2025 at 5:00 pm, Central. Offerors are notified that the Government will not reimburse costs incurred for Proposal preparation, to include potential pre-award site visits.	Given the number of discrepancies, would the Government consider an extension to both the question period and proposal due date?	At this time the proposal due date will not be extended.
89	RFP	L.5	Formatting Requirements	Can the Government confirm the required font type and size for proposal submissions, and whether smaller font may be used for tables and graphics?	Refer to RFP section L.6.
90	RFP	L.5	Graphics and Tables	Are graphics, tables, and charts permitted within the page limits, and if so, will they be counted towards the page count? Are fold-out pages allowed?	The Government would encourage potential Offerors to closely reread RFP Section L.5
91	RFP	L.5	Proposal Format Instructions	Are there any required formats or specific templates for the submission of the Technical Approach under Tab A of Volume 3?	Refer to the submission requirements.
92	RFP	L.5	Past Performance Questionnaire	Do Offerors need to provide past performance questionnaires if they have existing CPARS evaluations that cover relevant projects?	Refer to the relevant solicitation section.
93	RFP	L.5	The Offeror's proposal shall be formatted into Six (6) separate Volumes by Volume Number and Title as follows:	Can the Government please clarify whether each proposal volume should be submitted as 1) only one complete PDF file subdivided within the PDF file into tabs or 2) separate PDF files for each tab?	Potential Offerors are encourage to bid it as they understand (RFP).
94	RFP	L.5. Tab D	The Offeror shall submit a Professional Employee Compensation Plan in a single PDF file format	Can the Government please clarify whether the Professional Employee Compensation plan should be submitted separately from the rest of Volume 1 in its own PDF file?	Potential Offerors are encourage to bid it as they understand (RFP).
95	RFP	L.5., L.6.1., M.3.5.	Refer to Column B (multiple sections)	Each one of these sections provides different and/or varying instructions for the Technical Approach and what is required. Can the Government please reconcile the instructions and provide a clear description for the requirements for the Tech Approach? The evaluation describes a Management Approach under Technical.	Refer to the relevant "M" section.
96	RFP	L.6	Proposal Submission Timeline	Given the scope and complexity of this solicitation, will the Government consider granting a one-month extension to the proposal submission deadline?	No extenstions will be granted.
97	RFP	L.6.1	Sample Task Order Requirement	The solicitation notes 'Task Order Specific technical approach will be limited to the following.' Can the Government provide the sample Task Order for which the technical approach must be prepared?	Corrected in RFP Amendment 01.
98	RFP	L.6.1	Subfactor 3 Clarification	The instructions does not reference Subfactor 3	Corrected in RFP Amendment 01.
99	RFP	L.6.1	1. Factor 1 Technical Approach a. Subfactor 1 MATOC Management Approach b. Subfactor 3 Management Approach to Critical Functional Areas of the MDoDS Pool c. Subfactor 4 Small Business Participation	Subfactor 2 is missing from the requirements list. Can the Government please add Subfactor 2 and describe what it is?	Corrected in RFP Amendment 01.

Q#	RFP DOC	SEC	RFP LANGUAGE REFERENCE	QUESTION(S)	GOV RESPONSE(S)
100	RFP	L.6.1 vs L.8	Proposal Instruction Clarification	Can the Government clarify the difference between the instructions in L.6.1 requiring technical and price proposals for the MDoDS Pool, and the instructions in L.8 dividing Technical Proposals into three evaluation factors?	Potential Offerors are encourage to bid it as they understand (RFP).
101	RFP	L.6.2	Volume Naming Convention	For teaming subcontractors submitting proprietary cost/pricing data directly, will the Prime still be required to include a summary of the subcontractors labor categories and rates in its Volume 6 submission?	Proprietary information can be submitted directly to the Government.
102	RFP	L.7	Accounting System Verification	The solicitation requires an Acceptable Accounting System approved by DCAA. If a contractor has a DCAA approval letter older than three years, will that be considered valid, or is a recent audit required?	Refer to the relevant solicitation sections.
103	RFP	L.7	These risks are associated with the Government's decreased visibility into, understanding of, and control over how the technology that they acquire is developed, integrated, and deployed, as well as the processes, procedures, and practices used to assure the integrity, security, resilience, and quality of the products and services.	1. Will the U.S. Government consider modifying the solicitation to require ISO/IEC 27001 certification—for all security-related tasks?	At this time ISO/IEC 27001 will not be considered for this proposal.
104	RFP	L.7.	The Offeror must submit a complete copy of the Joint Venture or Partnership agreement that established the CTA relationship, disclosing the legal identity of each team member of the Joint Venture or Partnership, the relationship between the team members, the form of ownership of each team member, any limitations on liability or authority for each team member, and a specific statement of what resources each team member provides the teaming agreement	Are Mentor Protege JV allowed in teaming?	Refer to the relevant solicitation sections.
105	RFP	L.8 / M	Scope of Technical Approach	Should the Technical Approach address only the evaluation criteria subfactors in Section M, or must it also address all Task Areas from the PWS?	Refer to the relevant "M" section.
106	RFP	L.8 Tab A	Technical Approach Content	What must the Technical Approach include? Since all the subfactors within the Technical Approach appear relevant to the management approach, should Offerors to address task areas for the technical approach from PWS?	Refer to the relevant solicitation sections.
107	RFP	L.8 Tab B	Key Personnel Security Clearances	Are active security clearances required for Key Personnel at the MATOC award stage, or only at the Task Order level when specified in the PWS?	Refer to the relevant solicitation sections.
108	RFP	L.8 Tab C	Corporate Experience Alignment	For Corporate Experience, must Offerors address all three areas (MDoDS Sustainment, MDoDS Modernization, MDoDS Life Cycle Support), or is alignment to some areas acceptable? Should CE also be tied to all Task Areas from the PWS?	Potential Offerors are encourage to bid it as they understand (RFP).
109	RFP	L.8 Tab C	Non-Federal Corporate Experience	Can Corporate Experience include state, commercial, or subcontractor projects, or must it be Federal only? If allowed, can Past Performance Questionnaires (PPQs) be completed and signed by non-Federal clients?	Refer to the relevant solicitation sections.
110	RFP	L.8 Tab C	Corporate Experience Page Limit	Does the 2-page limit per Corporate Experience project in Volume 3 (Tab C) include tables, graphics, and PPQ references, or are those excluded from the page count?	Refer to the relevant solicitation sections.
111	RFP	L.8.	The Technical Response shall be clear, concise, and include sufficient detail for effective evaluation and for substantiating the validity of stated claims. Technical Proposals are divided into three (3) Evaluation Factors: o Tab A: Technical Approach (45 Page Limit) (No limit for Small Business Subcontracting Plan) o Tab B: Key Personnel (KP) (1-2 Page Limit per KP Resume) o Tab C: Corporate Experience (CE) (2 Page Limit per CE Project)	Relative to other Volumes, there are very few instructions provided for how to respond to the technical approach. Can the Government provide instructions for the requirements for all 4 subfactors under the Technical approach?	Refer to the relevant "M" section.
112	RFP	L.9	CPARS Contractor Past Performance Assessment Reporting System	Given that the Government will verify CPARS records, is submission of separate past performance questionnaires still required, or may Offerors rely solely on their CPARS profile?	Refer to the relevant "M" section.
113	RFP	L.9	Subcontractor Corporate Experience	If a Small Business prime uses subcontractor Corporate Experience through a TCL, can the subcontractors projects include state or commercial work, and will PPQs from those clients be acceptable?	Potential Offerors are encourage to bid it as they understand (RFP).
114	RFP	L.9	Volume 5 Systems and Certifications	Will MATOC Volume 5. Systems, Certifications, and Clearances be accepted from a subcontractor under a Prime -Subcontractor relationship, provided a valid Teaming Commitment Letter is included?	Potential Offerors are encourage to bid it as they understand (RFP).
115	RFP	M	M.3.5 SubFactor 1 (Tab A1)	For Evaluation Criteria a, where are different MDoDS Pool Functional Areas defined and described in the RFP package to reply to these criteria?	Refer to the relevant solicitation sections.
116	RFP	M	M.3.5 SubFactor 1 (Tab A1)	For Evaluation Criteria b, what and where are defined and described in the RFP package to response to criteria b?	The Government does not understand this question and is unable to respond accordingly.
117	RFP	M	M.3.5 SubFactor 1 (Tab A1)	For Evaluation Criteria c, does the Government want the Offeror to describe their approach in using TDL and Cost Type contracting to execute the task requirements for assessment of risks and mitigation plans? If not, they specify what type of response you want from the Offeror?	Potential Offeror's first understanding to the evaluation criteria is correct.
118	RFP	M	M.3.5 SubFactor 2	Where is the PWS for the MDoDS related task requirement that has the Critical Functional Areas? The PWS is for P&R that was attached to the other Pool.	PWS is for both.
119	RFP	M	M.3.5 SubFactor 2	Where is Tab A3 in the RFP package of various documents?	"Tab A3" is the label name for that section.
120	RFP	M	M.3.5 SubFactor 2	Where are the Critical Functional Areas located in the RFP documents?	Refer to the relevant solicitation sections.
121	RFP	M	M.3.5 SubFactor 2	Does the Offeror require SIPR experience for Corporate Experience in all 4 Evaluation Criteria for all 5 projects in each criterion? If not, specify how SIPR experience is required?	The Government does not understand this question and is unable to respond accordingly.
122	RFP	M	M.3.5 Subfactor 2, IV. b.2	Does the Offeror require SIPR experience for Corporate Experience in this Evaluation Criteria for 1 to 5 projects or do all 5 projects demonstrate this experience?	The Government does not understand this question and is unable to respond accordingly.
123	RFP	M	M.3.6 Factor 2 (Tab B)	For MDoDS Pool, does the Offeror need to submit a minimum 3 and maximum of 5 Key Personnel SMEs?	Potential Offeror is encouraged to reread RFP Section M.3.6.(b).
124	RFP	M	M.3.6 Factor 2 (Tab B)	For MDoDS Pool, does the Offeror need to submit a minimum 1 and maximum of 2 Key Personnel Project Managers?	Potential Offeror is encouraged to reread RFP Section M.3.6.(c).
125	RFP	M	Program Manager (PCPM) (1- KP)	Given that there is one PCPM across both PRISM Pools, for current PRISM P&R Pool contract holders, will the current MATOC Key Personnel evaluation for the PCPM apply to the MDoDS Pool, or will that resume need to be re-evaluated?	Current contract holders will NOT be reevaluated.
126	RFP	M	M.3.6	Is the Prime Contractor required to submit a minimum number of Factor 2 KPs?	Potential Offerors are encourage to bid it as they understand (RFP).
127	RFP	M	M.3.6	If the prime offerors team size exceeds more than 3 companies how should offerors meet the minimum submission of 5 resumes?	This is the structure established under PRISM.

Q#	RFP DOC	SEC	RFP LANGUAGE REFERENCE	QUESTION(S)	GOV RESPONSE(S)
128	RFP	M	M.3.7	Could the Government confirm that offerors can use a single individual project for more than one evaluation area (MDoDS Sustainment, MDoDS Modernization, and MDoDS Life Cycle Support)? In this context, could the offeror submit three (3) separate CE submissions for the same project with a single CPARS/PPQ?	A project can be submitted for multiple functional areas.
129	RFP	M	M.5 Tab F	What is security clearance for all the Key Personnel for MDoDS Pool?	Potential Offerors are encouraged to reread RFP Section M.3.5 and and M.3.5 (Tab F)
130	RFP	M	M.3.7 Factor 3 (Tab C)	What is the current size, complexity, and magnitude of task orders on the current MDoDS Pool so Offerors on the On-Ramp know the expectations of the project that they submit?	The Government is unable to provide this information.
131	RFP	M	M.3.7 Factor 3 (Tab C)	If the Offeror submits 2-3 projects each for MDoDS sustainment, MDoDS Modernization, & MDoDS Life Cycle Support will they score lower than an Offeror that submits 5 projects for each?	Potential Offerors are encouraged to carefully reread RFP.
132	RFP	M 3.2	Basis of Award	Can the Government please confirm that the intended number of awards to Small Business Primes is two, with a slight possibility for three awards? Why is the Government choosing to limit the total number of awards to this low number?	Potential Offerors are encouraged to carefully reread RFP.
133	RFP	M 3.3	Task Order Basis of Award	How will the Government ensure adequate competition to justify Small Business set-asides at the Task Order level with such a small number of on-ramp awards?	This is the structure established under PRISM.
134	RFP	M.1.	"The following documents will be evaluated on an Acceptable/Unacceptable basis regarding whether the requested proposal submission information meets the criteria for the information requested in Section L.5. and information is current, accurate, and complete: 1. Cover Letter (Tab A) 2. Exceptions/Assumptions (if applicable) (Tab B) 3. Uncompensated Overtime Policy (Tab C) 4. Professional Employee Compensation Plan (Tab D). 5. Refer to Section L for additional submission requirements."	Please provide more detail on what would be considered an acceptable vs unacceptable uncompensated overtime policy - or is submitting the company's current existing policy in its entirety acceptable, regardless of the policy?	Potential Offerors are encouraged to reread RFP Section L.6 (Tab C) and FAR Clause 52.237-10.
135	RFP	M.1.	"The following documents will be evaluated on an Acceptable/Unacceptable basis regarding whether the requested proposal submission information meets the criteria for the information requested in Section L.5. and information is current, accurate, and complete: 1. Cover Letter (Tab A) 2. Exceptions/Assumptions (if applicable) (Tab B) 3. Uncompensated Overtime Policy (Tab C) 4. Professional Employee Compensation Plan (Tab D). 5. Refer to Section L for additional submission requirements."	Please provide more detail on what would be considered an acceptable vs unacceptable Professional Employee Compensation Plan - or is submitting the company's current existing one in its entirety acceptable, regardless of the details within it?	Potential Offerors are encouraged to reread RFP Section L.6 (Tab D) and FAR Clause 52.222-46.
136	RFP	M.3.	Highest Technically Rated Offeror	What are the specific criteria used to determine the Highest Technically Rated Offeror during the evaluation process?	The Government would encourage potential Offerors to closely reread RFP Section M.3.2 and M.3.5.
137	RFP	M.3.	Lowest Evaluated Rating Benchmark	Will the Government disclose or publish the benchmark for the lowest evaluated rating from the original MDoDS Pool?	The Government will follow General Services Acquisition Manual (GSAM) Source Selection notification procedures IAW GSAM Subpart 515.370.
138	RFP	M.3.	Scoring Definitions	Can the Government clarify the definitions and scales used for the technical and risk scoring methodology described in Section M?	Potential Offerors are encouraged to reread RFP Section M (specifically M.3.4).
139	RFP	M.3.	Subcontractor Use in Factor 3	May Offerors rely on subcontractor corporate experience to meet the requirements in Factor 3, and if so, what documentation is required?	Potential Offerors are encouraged to reread RFP Section M.3.7.
140	RFP	M.3.1.	Basis for Awards	To maximize competition and enhance the Government's access to top-performing small businesses, would the Government consider increasing the number of small business awards under this on-ramp to at least seven? This approach would support the intent of H.3.1 (Small Business Reserves and Set-Asides) and ensure robust participation in future task order competitions.	Potential Offerors are encouraged to reread RFP Section M (specifically M.3.1).
141	RFP	M.3.1. & H.3.1.	M.3.1. The MDoDS Pool will award two (2) Small Businesses with base contracts under the PRISM MATOC. Pursuant to FAR 19.503 awards have been reserved for small businesses within each Pool; therefore, for the MDoDS Pool SB On-ramp there will be two (2) awards (2 SB). The Government reserves the right to award more or less Base Contracts in each Pool, including business sizes, if it is determined to be in the best interest of the Government.  H.3.1. Small Business Reserves and Set-asides. Pursuant to FAR 19.503 the Government has reserved base contract awards for small businesses within each of the two MATOC pools; three (3) base contracts are reserved for the MDoDS Pool.	We request clarification regarding the number of small business base contract awards intended under the MDoDS Pool in the PRISM MATOC On-Ramp Solicitation.  Section M.3.1 states that "two (2) Small Businesses" will receive base contracts, while Section H.3.1 mentions that "three (3) base contracts are reserved for the MDoDS Pool."  Could the Government please confirm the exact number of small business base awards currently anticipated under the MDoDS Pool for this On-Ramp?	Reference sentence in H.3.1 refers to all Small Business (SB) contracts in MDoDS Pool (one SB already holds an PRISM MATOC-MDoDS pool) and the other sentence in M.3.1 refers to number of SB awards for this RFP MDoDS Pool on-boarding process.
142	RFP	M.3.2.	"6. However, a failure to find or negotiate a fair and reasonable price or if the price is found to be unrealistic, unreasonable, or unbalanced for any of the Highest Technically Rated for each Pool, this will result in that Offeror being eliminated from consideration for award and the next highest ranked Offeror being placed in the HTRs."	Does the Government's language imply that the Government plans to negotiate the ceiling rates with the HTR bidders and give them a chance to revise the rates?	This RFP is conducted in accordance with FAR 15 source selection processes. Negotiation process shall be IAW FAR 15, supplemental regulations, and solicitation terms and conditions. As such, potential Offerors should submit their most competitive and realistic pricing since negotiations are not required, but are conducted base on Government purview.
143	RFP	M.3.2.	MATOC Basis of Award	The Government intends to make only two (2) small business awards for the MDoDS Pool A third award would only be made in the case of a statistical tie for the second position No additional awards beyond these parameters are contemplated. If this understanding is incorrect, please clarify the intended number of awards for the MDoDS Pool.]	Potential Offerors are encouraged to reread RFP solicitation, including Section M.3.2.
144	RFP	M.3.5	Factor 1 Subfactors	Factor 1 lists Subfactors 1, 2, & 4. Please confirm that there is no Subfactor 3.	Corrected in RFP Amendment 01.
145	RFP	M.3.5.	II. Cyber a. Approach to the impact of evolving Cyber Security policy and procedures on a Systems Lifecycle maintenance.	1. Will the U.S. Government consider modifying the solicitation to require ISO/IEC 27001 certification—for all security-related tasks?	At this time ISO/IEC 27001 will not be considered for this proposal.
146	RFP	M.3.5.	Evaluation Criteria include: a. Proposed approach to managing multiple active task orders awarded under different MDoDS Pool functional areas, performed in different locations throughout the Continental United States (CONUS) for different customers. b. Proposed approach for ensuring the necessary level of key personnel and other resources will be available for multiple active task orders awarded under different MDoDS Pool functional areas, performed in different locations throughout the Continental United States (CONUS) for different customers.	The evaluation clearly states an approach for CONUS support, however the PWS includes multiple requirements for OCONUS support. Can the Government clarify whether this competition includes OCONUS support?	IAW RFP Section M.3.5 CONUS work as stated in evaluation criteria will be considered for evaluation purposes.
147	RFP	M.3.6	M.3.6 Key Personnel	For key personnel positions that include ranges for each Pool, can the Government please confirm how many resumes are expected for this MDoDS Pool on-ramp?	As many as requested IAW with stated RFP terms and conditions.

Q#	RFP DOC	SEC	RFP LANGUAGE REFERENCE	QUESTION(S)	GOV RESPONSE(S)
148	RFP	M.3.6	M.3.6 Key Personnel	During evaluation, is the Government giving more consideration to an Offeror who provides the maximum vs. the minimum number of key personnel resumes per position?	Consideration shall be given IAW with stated RFP terms and conditions.
149	RFP	M.3.6	...a teaming commitment letter is required to be signed by both parties committing	Can the Government please clarify whether the teaming commitment letters for key personnel as indicated under "Factor 2: Key Personnel (Tab B)" should be included in Tab B in addition to Volume 5 Tab E "Teaming Commitment Letters"?	Teaming Commitment Letters should be provided in the section IAW RFP terms and conditions (Tab E).
150	RFP	M.3.6	Subject Matter Experts (Minimum of 3, Maximum of 10 – KP: 3-5 Each Pool); Project Managers (Minimum of 1, Maximum of 4 - KP: 1-2 Each Pool)	The requirements list the number of MATOC KP which range from 3 to 10. Can the Government clarify the number of required Key Personnel for the SME's and the Project Managers?	IAW RFP "Subject Matter Experts (Minimum of 3, Maximum of 10 – KP...)"
151	RFP	M.3.6	Subject Matter Experts (Minimum of 3, Maximum of 10 – KP: 3-5 Each Pool); Project Managers (Minimum of 1, Maximum of 4 - KP: 1-2 Each Pool)	The requirements reference 3-5 KPs for each Pool. This solicitation is only for the MDoDS Pool. Can the Government clarify whether KPs need to be proposed for both pools?	MDoDS only.
152	RFP	M.3.6	a. Sr. Business Operations Specialist (Maximum of 2 KPs) h. Sr. Database Administrators (Maximum of 2 KPs)	Can the Government clarify if there is a minimum number of KPs for subsections a. through h.? Is one acceptable?	Potential Offerors are encouraged to carefully reread RFP Section M.3.6.
153	RFP	M.3.6, Key Personnel and Exhibit 2, LCATs and Definitions Document	LCAT Requirements	Could the Government please clarify which LCAT requirements are the correct requirements for vetting candidates; is it the requirements in the On-Ramp Solicitation document, listed under Key Personnel, or in Exhibit 2_LCATS and Definitions document?	Those listed in the solicitation.
154	RFP	M.3.6.	... the candidate's relevant experience in the proposed role for this requirement and if the Key Personnel is employed by the Prime Offeror or is a subcontractor.	For Key Personnel (KP), will the Government evaluate a KP negatively if they are not currently employed by the prime? If so, will an Offeror receive a lower evaluation if a KP is not currently employed by the prime or subcontractor?	Potential Offerors are encouraged to carefully reread RFP Section M.3.6 (assume any necessary teaming commitment letters are included in potentially offers).
155	RFP	M.3.6.	If the prime contractor will be providing the Key Personnel of a subcontractor (or if the Key Personnel is not employed by the Prime Offeror), to meet the requirements for this evaluation factor, a teaming commitment letter is required to be signed by both parties committing to the base period of the MATOC Pool(s) for which the prime contractor is proposing.	If a Key Personnel (KP) is not currently employed by the prime/subcontractor, will a "letter of commitment" to the base period signed by the prime and proposed KP satisfy the requirement for a "teaming commitment letter".	Potential Offerors are encouraged to carefully reread RFP.
156	RFP	M.3.6.	LCAT Requirements	Could the Government please clarify which LCAT requirements are the correct requirements for vetting candidates; is it the requirements in the On-Ramp Solicitation document, listed under Key Personnel, or in Exhibit 2_LCATS and Definitions document?	Potential Offerors are encouraged to carefully reread RFP.
157	RFP	M.3.6.	Key Personnel Requirements Descriptions	Can additional years of experience be substituted for a degree?	Potential Offerors are encouraged to carefully reread RFP.
158	RFP	M.3.7	Up to five (5) individual projects (individual contracts, task orders, BPA Calls or Purchase Orders), where the performance took place within the last ten (10) years (of the proposal due date), demonstrating your corporate experience successfully executing work regarding the operation and sustainment of the MDoDS (MDoDS or similar Federal Government system.).	Would the Government allow for Corporate Experiences consisting of commercial OCONUS work for a US allied Government end user to cover the requirement for "demonstrating your corporate experience successfully executing work regarding the operation and sustainment of the MDoDS (MDoDS or similar Federal Government system.)" for each functional area?	Refer to the relevant solicitation sections.
159	RFP	M.3.7	Up to five (5) individual projects (individual contracts, task orders, BPA Calls or Purchase Orders), where the performance took place within the last ten (10) years (of the proposal due date), demonstrating your corporate experience successfully executing work regarding the operation and sustainment of the MDoDS (MDoDS or similar Federal Government system.). This includes the day-to-day program operation, program monitoring, life cycle maintenance, training, help desk services, management support, the program's cybersecurity posture, systems engineering and integration, and system testing necessary to support the evolving and emerging needs of DOD or other federal agencies.	Do we need to submit upto 5 Corporate Experiences for the entire MDoDS Pool or is it 5 per functional category, which will make it upto 15 for the MDoDS Pool?	Up to 5 Corp Experiences for each functional category. (?)
160	RFP	M.3.7	The Government will evaluate the Offeror's record of past and current performance to ascertain the probability of successfully performing the required efforts to be procured under this MATOC. Offerors (and Teaming Subcontractor's) are requested to provide a Past Performance Questionnaire (PPQ) or Contractor Performance Assessment Reporting System (CPARS) for all projects submitted under Factor 3 Corporate Experience to demonstrate the most relevant past performance. Offerors (and Teaming Subcontractor's) are also allowed to provide other relevant past performance (CPARS and/or PPQs) consistent with all solicitation requirements, including cost, schedule, performance, and management of subcontractors. Teaming Subcontractors are defined above in Section H.8.7.	How many PPQs can an Offeror submit?	One for each corporate experience proposed for consideration.
161	RFP	M.3.7 & M.4.	CE and Past Performance projects.	Can a single Corporate Experience (CE) project be used to satisfy multiple MDoDs CE/Past Performance (PP) categories? For example, could a single CE project be used to satisfy both MDoDs Sustainment and Modernization categories?	The Government positively confirms.
162	RFP	M.3.7 & M.4.	CE and Past Performance projects.	Can non-DoD projects (e.g., other Federal Agency systems) that are similarly enterprise in nature, be used as CE/PP references?	The Government positively confirms.
163	RFP	M.3.7.	The CE evaluates Offerors relevant experience working on projects in the same or similar functional areas, involving same or similar complexities and magnitude	Is there an estimated \$\$\$ value that would constitute being of similar magnitude for the SB Pool? The maximum task order is valued at \$400M, but is there a threshold to be considered of similar magnitude for the SB Pool?	No comment.
164	RFP	M.3.7.	Functional Areas 1-3	Can an Offeror submit a corporate experience in multiple Functional Areas? For example, an Offeror's single corporate experience covers both MDoDS Sustainment and Modernization. Can this corporate experience be submitted as one of the five in MDoDS Sustainment and one of the five Modernization?	The Government positively confirms.
165	RFP	M.3.7.	Up to five (5) individual projects (individual contracts, task orders, BPA Calls or Purchase Orders), where the performance took place within the last ten (10) years (of the proposal due date), demonstrating your corporate experience successfully executing work regarding the operation and sustainment of the MDoDS (MDoDS or similar Federal Government system.).	What qualifies as Project/PP? SLED/Fed/Commercial/or any other?	Potential Offerors are encouraged to reread RFP including Section M.3.7.
166	RFP	M.3.7. (TAB C)	"For each CE submission, Offerors must provide the Title of the Project, Contract Number, Contract Dollar Value, Location of Work, Narrative of the Contract that meets CE Evaluation Criteria, Owner of Requirement (name, title, and phone number), the Contract POP and if an associated CPARS or PPQ is included in Volume 4 Past Performance."	Can the Government confirm that a CPARS can be submitted in lieu of a PPQ - and that the format Past Performance is submitted in (CPARS vs PPQ) will not affect the evaluation of this component?	RFP requirement is as stated.

Q#	RFP DOC	SEC	RFP LANGUAGE REFERENCE	QUESTION(S)	GOV RESPONSE(S)
167	RFP	M.4	Past Performance does not specify a maximum number of projects. Factor 3 Corporate Experience specifies max of 5 per MDoDS functional area.	Can the Government clarify the maximum number of projects evaluated for Volume 4 Past Performance?	No maximum is stated/established.
168	RFP	M.4.1	Offerors (and Teaming Subcontractor's) are requested to provide a Past Performance Questionnaire (PPQ) or Contractor Performance Assessment Reporting System (CPARS) for all projects submitted under Factor 3 Corporate Experience to demonstrate the most relevant past performance	Please confirm that only a PPQ or CPARS is required for the project(s) listed in Corporate Experience, and that no written Past Performance narrative is required.	RFP requirement is as stated.
169	RFP	M.5	Evaluation Criteria Weighting	Would the Government provide clarity on the relative weighting of the evaluation criteria (technical approach, past performance, pricing) in the selection process?	Potential Offerors are encouraged to review RFP Section M.3.2.
170	RFP	M.5.	Tab B - Acceptable Estimating System (Optional): An estimating system is a system that includes policies, procedures, and practices for budgeting and planning controls, and generating estimates of costs and other data included in proposals submitted to customers in the expectation of receiving contract awards. Using an acceptable estimating system for proposal preparation benefits both the Government and the contractor by increasing the accuracy and reliability of individual proposals. Cognizant audit activities, when it is appropriate to do so, shall establish and manage regular programs for reviewing selected contractors' estimating systems or methods, in order to reduce the scope of reviews to be performed on individual proposals, expedite the negotiation process, and increase the reliability of proposals. > Offerors are encouraged to provide a current copy of an estimating system survey report, pursuant to FAR 15.407-5. • Tab C - Forward Pricing Rate Agreements, Forward Pricing Rate Recommendations, and Documentation of Approved Billing Rates (Optional): A Forward Pricing Rate Agreement (FPRA) means a written agreement to make certain rates available during a specified period for use in pricing contracts or modifications.	If other systems are preferred, how will it impact the evaluation? Will it benefit the Offeror with these systems in place, and at what stage of proposal evaluation?	Not sure what "other systems" are being referenced. Yes, it would benefit the offeror with these systems in place.
171	RFP	M.6.1.	"In accordance with FAR 15.404-1(g), the Government has established a direct labor rate range for the PRISM Base Contracts that are, by definition, realistic, fair, and reasonable. Labor rates and proposal pricing outside of these Government determined parameters may be ineligible for awards. All direct labor rates proposed for each LCAT shall be within the Government established labor rate range (Direct Labor Rate Range) as reflected in the PRISM Direct Labor Rate Range attachment."	The Government provided rate ranges in Attachment 7 - can the Government confirm those are direct labor rate ranges? And can the Government provide the ranges it estimated for loaded rates inclusive of indirect costs?	The document is title "PRISM Direct Labor Rates Range." The Government will not provide estimated loaded rates.
172	RFP	M.6.1.	"Note: Direct Labor Rates are defined as unburdened labor rates for both the Primes and the Teaming Subcontractors proposing on this requirement. The Prime is responsible for ensuring that the teaming Subcontractor provides a full and complete labor rate build that provides complete transparency for the direct labor rate component and each indirect rate applied to it."	If the bidder is proposing subcontractors which only have a specific area of expertise, can those subcontractors only submit the ceiling rate card for only the labor categories relevant to their scope, as opposed as filling out the entire ceiling rate card?	The Government positively confirms.
173	RFP	M.6.1.	"Note: Direct Labor Rates are defined as unburdened labor rates for both the Primes and the Teaming Subcontractors proposing on this requirement. The Prime is responsible for ensuring that the teaming Subcontractor provides a full and complete labor rate build that provides complete transparency for the direct labor rate component and each indirect rate applied to it."	The solicitation requires that ONLY prime bidders need to have approved accounting systems. Small businesses will likely propose T&M or FP subcontractors who do not work on a cost reimbursement basis (too burdensome for private companies). Thus, such subcontractors are unable to fill the ceiling rate card, as they do not have any Government-approved indirect cost structures. Please remove this requirement for proposed subcontractors, or allow them to submit a different type of rate card (e.g., fully loaded T&M rates). This does not preclude the Government from issuing Cost Reimbursement task orders to the prime, but it cannot flow down his contract type to subcontractors.	No, this is not how PRISM RFP is structured.
174	RFP	M3.5.	a. Proposed approach to managing multiple active task orders awarded under different MDoDS Pool functional areas, performed in different locations throughout the Continental United States (CONUS) for different customers.	Can the Government Clarify if Functional Area as used in this context is referring to MDoDS Sustainment, MDoDS Modernization, and MDoDS Life Cycle Support?	The Government positively confirms.
175	RFP	M3.5.	This subfactor evaluates the Offeror's proposed Management Approach to critical functional areas impacting the MDoDS system.	Can the Government Clarify if Functional Area as used in this context is referring to MDoDS Sustainment, MDoDS Modernization, and MDoDS Life Cycle Support?	The Government positively confirms.
176	RFP	N/A	-	Since establishing the PRISM MATOC in July 2024, the Government has awarded approximately 5% of the total ceiling value. With such limited usage of this vehicle, why does the Government believe it needs to on-ramp additional Contractors onto the MDoDS Pool?	No comment.
177	RFP	Tab A: MATOC Pricing L.11.3.	"The current BLS ECI 3-year average is 3.02%." "The escalation factor is based on the average annual Bureau of Labor Statistics Economic Cost Index for the previous ten years at the time the final solicitation is posted in SAM.gov."	Please confirm if the BLS average of 3.02% economic cost index is a 3-year or 10-year average.	This is the structure established under PRISM.
178	RFP	Tab C	"Tab C - Forward Pricing Rate Agreements, Forward Pricing Rate Recommendations, and Documentation of Approved Billing Rates (Optional): A Forward Pricing Rate Agreement (FPRA) means a written agreement to make certain rates available during a specified period for use in pricing contracts or modifications."	Please confirm that DCAA Approved Billing Rates letters fulfill this requirement for companies that don't have Forward Pricing Rate Agreements with the Government. It appears that is the case, since Section M.6.1 states on p. 125: "2. For each Indirect rate, Offerors shall propose indirect rates according to their most current DCAA/DCMA approved billing rates and/or forward pricing rate recommendations and/or agreements, if available."	We will not confirm a hypothetical. If you have "DCAA Approved Billing Rates" submit your documentation in your proposal for review.
179	RFP	TAB D	The Offeror shall submit a Professional Employee Compensation Plan in a single PDF file format that addresses the Offeror's methodology for determining salaries and fringe benefits for their professional employees in preparation of future Task Order requirements under the Base Contract.	Please provide more detail on this requirement - is the Government requiring any salary range tables, or only a methodology in narrative form for how the bidder determines salaries and fringe benefits?	The Government is requiring what's requested in the solicitation language.
180	RFP, Attachment 7 - MATOC Labor	F; H.4.3; Attachment 7	Period of Performance	F.3 states that the period of performance is "from the date of the Notice-To-Proceed through the base year, with four (4) 1-year options." However, H.4.3 states, "The period of performance term for any new awards is coterminous with the existing term for all other Contractors." Because PRISM entered Option Year 1 on July 15, 2025, for existing awardees: a. Should the PoP be updated to "from the date of the Notice-To-Proceed through the first option year, with three (3) 1-year options"? b. Does Attachment 7 MATOC Labor Rates reflect ranges for the base year? And if so, should the ranges be adjusted to reflect that the PoP begins in Option Year 1 and account for the appropriate escalation of 3.02%?	No comment.